6019. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the executive board of the Boston League of Women Voters, disapproving of any increased appropriation for armament; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6020. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the G. R. C. State League of Pennsylvania, relative to social reform and labor questions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6021. Also, petition of the advisory board of the Philadelphia and Camden Federations, Pennsylvania system lines, asking an investigation of the Pennsylvania system conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6022. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Grand Forks Council, No. 1260, Knights of Columbus, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6023. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Osnabrock, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *February 23, 1921.*

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Gay	Lenroot	Simmons
Brandegee	Gerry	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Gooding	McCumber	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Gronna	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Harris	McLean	Smoot
Culberson	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Cummins	Heflin	Myers	Sterling
Curtis	Henderson	Nelson	Sutherland
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Trammell
Edge	Kellogg	Phipps	Underwood
Elkins	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fernald	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Robinson	Williams
France	Knox	Sheppard	Willis
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Shields	Wolcott

Mr. BALL. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] are in attendance upon a hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] on official business.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] at a conference on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15682) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; that the House had receded from its disagreement to sundry amendments of the Senate to the bill and agreed to the same; that the House receded from its disagreement to certain sundry amendments of the Senate and agrees to the same with amendments; and that the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 53, 65 83, 104, and 106, and requests a further conference with the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to 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; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill, and requested a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas were appointed managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MCNARY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House joint memorial No. 11 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 11, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

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

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 11th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.] SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 11.

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

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the Senate concurring, respectfully represent this:

Whereas there is a long strip of country along the southwestern coast of Oregon that has no adequate shipping facilities and the country is greatly retarded by lack thereof; and

Whereas the people of Port Orford, Curry County, Oreg., have organized a port district and have built a wharf at Port Orford at a cost of $40,000; and

Whereas by a small expenditure of money a breakwater of approximately 500 feet in length could be built from a point near the present wharf to a point of rock in the ocean that would allow the largest vessels afloat to land at the wharf at all seasons of the year; and

Whereas there is a great demand for Port Orford cedar, and southwestern Oregon is the only part of the world where said cedar grows, and there is at present no proper shipping facilities for this and other products in said vicinity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to take the necessary steps to have a survey made of the port of Port Orford with the view of making said breakwater or jetty.

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon in Congress.

Adopted by the senate February 10, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house February 2, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 11. Introduced by Mr. Peirce.
W. F. DRAGER, *Chief Clerk.*

Filed February 11, 1921.

SAM A. KOZER, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. MCNARY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozer, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 8 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 11, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 11th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.] SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 8.

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

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent that:

Whereas your honorable body has under consideration a bill compelling every manufacturer, or handler, or seller of woolen fabrics and woolen garments, to place thereon a tag plainly stating the exact percentage of virgin wool and also how much and what other materials enter into such cloth; and

Whereas such a law will be of inestimable value to both those who wear clothing and also to producers of wool and mohair; and

Whereas Oregon is interested, both as a producer and as a user of woolen goods: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact such legislation; and be it

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Further resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the senate February 10, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house February 2, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 8. Introduced by Messrs. Egbert and Riberts.

Filed February 11, 1921.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk.
SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McNARY. I present a resolution of the Lincoln Club of Jackson County, of Medford, Oreg., in relation to compensation of ex-service men of the World War, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LINCOLN CLUB OF JACKSON COUNTY,
Medford, Oreg.

Whereas the World War, like the great Civil War, was one fought to determine whether nations conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal can longer endure; and

Whereas the millions of splendid young Americans who made it possible for the allied nations to be successful willingly offered their lives, if need be, and sacrificed business careers and chances for advancement in their chosen work; and

Whereas the difficulties of readjustment are causing in many instances suffering and privations to those patriotic young citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Lincoln Club of Jackson County, the representative Republican organization of southern Oregon, place ourselves on record as being heartily in favor of any feasible plan to recompense, as much as we possibly can, the ex-service men of the last war; that we appreciate what they have meant to America and to the world; and that we feel that all of them should have the care and protection which this great Nation can afford; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor the fourfold plan of adjusted compensation, the one most likely to furnish these men quickest and most comprehensive relief.

THE LINCOLN CLUB OF JACKSON COUNTY,
By J. E. VINING, *President.*

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Decatur and Sheridan Counties, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of the National Association of Dyers and Cleaners, of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the Council of Clubs of Kansas City, Kans., protesting against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of Todsville Local, No. 3560, Farmers' Union, of Marmaduke, Ark., favoring legislation to prevent gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution of Local No. 5, Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring legislation placing a protective tariff on fish, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sulphur Springs, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of maternity and infancy, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, remonstrating against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BALL presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Fourth Degree Assembly of Santa Maria Council, No. 195, Knights of Columbus, of Wilmington, Del., and a memorial of Anthony Giammatteo, of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MYERS presented a resolution of Chief Ignace Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Kalispell, Mont., protesting against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution of the Constantine Grange, No. 236, of Constantine, Mich., protesting against the Nolan land bill taxing all farm property over $10,000 1 per cent, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Detroit Butter and Egg Board, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the use of limewater for the pasteurization of cream, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Lansing Trades and Labor Council, of Lansing, Mich., favoring the release of political prisoners now confined in Federal prisons, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions of the Baraga Council, No. 1585, Knights of Columbus, of Iron Mountain, and Owosso Council, No. 1139, Knights of Columbus, of Owosso, both in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented memorials of Owosso Council, No. 1139, Knights of Columbus, of Owosso, and Grayling Council, No. 1382, Knights of Columbus, of Grayling, both in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Lansing Trades and Labor Council, of Lansing, Mich., favoring the abandonment of further prosecution and imprisonment of violators of the espionage act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a memorial of the Muskegon Coal Dealers' Association, of Muskegon, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Calder bill, to regulate the coal industry, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the enactment of House bill 13334, to prohibit, for the purpose of canning and export from Alaska, the fishing of salmon in the Yukon River, its tributaries and adjacent waters, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of Suwanee County Watermelon Growers' Association, of Live Oak, Fla., praying for readjustment of freight rates on shipments of watermelons from Florida to the northern and eastern markets, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of Jackson County Farmers' Union, of Marianna, Fla., favoring the adoption of the emergency tariff bill in its present form, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of the Rotary Club of Key West, Fla., favoring House bill 14899, making an appropriation of $150,000 for the promotion of safety in the navigation of Key West waters, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

COLORADO RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask leave to present a report sent me by the State engineer of Nevada relative to a bill that was introduced by me and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, dealing with the utilization of the Colorado River. I ask to have it published in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands. It is not very long. I merely wish to have it appear in the RECORD for the benefit of Senators who are interested in the matter.

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

STATE OF NEVADA,
ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
Carson City, February 16, 1921.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN,
Senior Senator from Nevada, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PITTMAN: Attached find certain data on the Colorado River situation which may be of interest to you. Please inform me as to your progress in interesting the Senators from the affected States in forwarding our proposed measure, copy of which is also inclosed.

Yours, truly, J. G. SCRUGHAM,
State Engineer.

(Inclosures, 3.)

Memorandum relative to the distribution of costs and benefits resulting from the proposed construction of a large storage reservoir on the Colorado River.

NOVEMBER 17, 1920.

The Kinkaid Act, passed by Congress in May, 1920, entitled "An act to provide for an examination and report on the condition and possible irrigation development of the Imperial Valley in California," instructed the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a policy for this great enterprise, and particularly to make recommendations to Congress as to the extent to which in his opinion the United States should contribute to the cost of carrying out the plan; also the approximate proportion of the total cost which should be borne by the various irrigation districts or organizations now formed, or which may organize in the future and the manner in which their contribution should be made.

The Kinkaid Act carried an appropriation of $20,000 for further investigations of Imperial Valley irrigation possibilities, conditioned on provision for at least one-half the cost of the investigations being provided for by associations and agencies interested in the lands of the Imperial Valley. The Imperial irrigation district has made a

contribution of $40,000, and the board of public service of the city of Los Angeles has offered additional funds that may be necessary for the adequate completion of the study in time for report to Congress during the present winter.

Borings are being made for a dam site in what is known as Boulder Canyon, a narrow granite gorge through which the Colorado River passes situated near the extreme southern end of the State of Nevada. If the foundations prove satisfactory, it is proposed that a dam be constructed at this point for a possible maximum height of 600 feet, which would provide a storage capacity of approximately 25,000,000 acre-feet—sufficient to regulate the flood flow of the Colorado River above that point and provide a water supply sufficient to irrigate all lands reached by gravity below it, either in the United States or Mexico.

The importance of the problem can scarcely be overestimated. A conference was called to consider this subject in August, 1920, by Arthur P. Davis, Director of the United States Reclamation Service. About 100 delegates were present who were in favor of proceeding with the construction of the dam if it is found feasible to build it.

The writer has been requested to prepare this memorandum for the Colorado River committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce as to an equitable manner of distributing the costs and benefits that might result from this enterprise.

Fundamentally the main and controlling feature of this project should be considered as the irrigation of arid lands. The power that will be produced, which will be of great volume and value, should be generated in accordance with the irrigation demands. The various irrigation districts, mutual water companies, and corporate holdings of lands situated in California, Nevada, Arizona, and Mexico, should ultimately be the owners or holders of the title to the dam and reservoir, together with its accessories.

A study should be made of the necessities of each of these various units for additional water supplies based (a) upon the amounts which they respectively now have available from the natural flow of the river, and (b) the additional amount which they will require when each is fully developed. The relation of the additional irrigation water, if any, which each of these different units will require to the aggregate regulated water needed for the entire area, including all lands in Arizona, Nevada, Colorado, and Mexico, would represent the proportionate benefit which each unit would receive from the reservoir project and also their relative contribution or liability for the cost of the work. This association of units, which could be called a conservation district, either directly or through the agency of the United States Reclamation Service, would install and operate the power plant connected with the project, wholesaling in block the electric energy so developed, both to the units themselves as required, to distribution companies, transportation companies, and to municipalities. The revenues derived from this sale of power should be considered as a credit to the enterprise which would tend to substantially reduce the cost of the irrigation water supply to the conservation district.

If this great reservoir is constructed on the Colorado River, it will practically control the danger from flood damage for the irrigated areas between such reservoir and the mouth of the Gila River. The Gila, however, would not be controlled by this reservoir, and this stream is subject to extreme and violent floods almost equal in volume to the flood flows of the Colorado River itself above the Gila. The floods of the Gila do not synchronize, except upon rare occasions, with those of the Colorado. The high-water stages of the Colorado occur in May, June, and July, which, fortunately, is the period when irrigation water is most required, while those of the Gila are apt to occur in the early spring or later in the summer.

It is suggested that the flood-protection problem for each one of the units should be separately considered and an estimate made on the cost of completing the works under present existing conditions for their protection against flood damage. When the dam is built, or at the time of its completion, a separate estimate should be made for each unit of the cost of flood protection for it with the stream regulation that will follow the completion of the dam. In the units above the mouth of the Gila this saving will be shown to be substantial, but below the mouth of the Gila it will be relatively much less, because these lower areas still will have to be protected against the erratic and violent floods of the Gila. The saving in the cost of these flood-protection works that will result from the construction of the large reservoir should be assessed against the various units and credited to the cost of the project for the benefit of the conservation district.

The problem of the distribution of the irrigation water on the various units is local and one to be solved by each one of these communities separately and administered by them individually.

These various units should be so organized as to have the power of issuing bonds. They should be called upon to contribute to the conservation district bonds in an amount sufficient to cover their benefits as outlined above. The conservation district in turn should deposit these bonds together with any securities or assets that might be available in the form of power contracts with the proper officials of the United States Government as security for funds to be advanced by the Government for the construction of the works. The contribution of the Federal Government to the enterprise would thus consist in obtaining a low rate of interest, perhaps 5 per cent, on the money that is necessary for the installation of the works.

In addition the Federal Government will be interested in obtaining a water supply for many acres of arid public lands, especially around the perimeter of the Imperial Valley and in the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona. In this capacity it should contribute toward the enterprise on the ratio of the benefits received by such unit areas for a complete water supply therefor. Under the provisions of existing laws these public lands can be included in a State irrigation district, and can only be taken up from the United States subject to the bonded debt of the district in which they are situated. This offers the opportunity for the Government to obtain a refund for the moneys advanced for the irrigation and flood protection of these public lands.

According to this program the older districts on the river which at present have a fair water supply will only be assessed on the basis of such additional water as they may require for periods of the year when such supply is now insufficient, and districts that have completed their levee systems, so that they are satisfactory, as in the case of the Yuma project, will have little, if any, assessment against them for the construction of such flood-protection works.

In conclusion, the controlling feature of the enterprise should be considered as irrigation and the costs should be distributed according to benefits received.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT.

NEW YORK STATE BARGE CANAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of H. R. 10453, which were, on page 1, in lines 10 and 11, strike out "within said 30 days, or as soon thereafter" and insert "as soon"; on page 1, in line 11, after "as," where it occurs the second time, insert "is"; on page 1, in line 11, strike out "all"; on page 1, in line 13, after "canal," strike out all down to and including "buy," in line 15; and on page 2, in line 1, strike out all after "same" down to and including "final," in line 8, and insert:

Provided, That all the money obtained from the sale or lease of these boats, barges, and tugs shall be available until expended by the inland and coastwise waterways service of the War Department in the inauguration and development of other inland, canal, and coastwise waterways in accordance with the expressed desire of Congress in section 500 of the transportation act, 1920: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 25 per cent of the boats, barges, and tugs built or purchased for the United States, herein authorized to be sold, may be retained by the United States for the operation of other inland, canal, or coastwise routes of the United States, until such equipment can be replaced by other equipment to be purchased from funds received from the sale prescribed above.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes."

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

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 809) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 663) fixing the term of service of Elijah C. Putnam during the Civil War, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 810) thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13944) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war (Rept. No. 811); and

A bill (H. R. 14063) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 812).

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 5031) for the relief of the heirs of Robert E. L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 5032) for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Shirland Avenue, in the city of Beloit, Wis.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 5033) for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; and

A bill (S. 5034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey title to certain lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a conference report on the Indian appropriation bill. I do not wish to call up the report at this time, but merely submit the report in order that it may be printed in the RECORD.

CLASSIFICATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, on March 22 last Senate bill 4106, to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and the standardization of compensation therefor, and for other purposes, was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], of the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries. The bill on being introduced, together with the report of the Reclassification Commission, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I was not present in the Chamber when the bill was

introduced and the report of the commission presented or I should have asked that the bill and report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, where they properly belong.

The bill provides for legislation in regard to the various branches of the civil service in the District of Columbia. I call attention to just two or three of the subjects covered in the bill. First, "allocation," providing that "the commission shall, as soon as practicable, designate the class within which the position of each employee should be placed in accordance with the duties of such position." Another subject is "amendments to classification." Another subject is "compensation." Other subjects are "efficiency ratings," "promotion appointments," "hours of service," "transfers," and other kindred subjects pertaining to the civil service.

I think it very obvious that the bill should go to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. It was not properly referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the consideration of the bill and report and that they be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object to that request.

Mr. STERLING. Then, Mr. President, I move——

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. STERLING. I move, then, that the bill and the report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. STERLING. I desire to say that at the earliest opportunity I shall renew my motion that the bill and report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 48, after line 16, to insert:

For the investigation and development of methods for the prevention of grain-dust, smut-dust, and other plant-dust explosions and resulting fires, including fires in cotton gins and cotton oil mills, $25,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is agreed to, without objection.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, my inquiry has really been answered by glancing at the RECORD, although I was of the impression that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] had asked that the first amendment on page 48 go over, with the understanding that it would be taken up this morning. May I ask if the Senator from Wisconsin would object to taking the amendment up now? It would be a very great accommodation to me, I will say to the Senator, as I have an important conference waiting for me, and I should be glad to have the item now disposed of. I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the Senator from Wisconsin, that the first amendment on page 48 may be now considered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am willing that the item shall be disposed of this morning. I only expressed the wish that it go over until this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood from the discussion last night that the committee was willing that the amendment striking out the item should be disagreed to, and if the Senate thought proper, that the appropriation should be increased from $23,500 to $50,000. If there is no objection, the Chair will put the question on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment striking out "$23,500" and inserting "$50,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on striking out the House text as amended.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House text now stands in the bill, with $50,000 appropriated.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 48, after line 20, to insert:

For the study of processes and methods of home tanning of lace and other leathers used on the farm, $15,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from North Dakota as to the preceding amendment, the one which was just agreed to, whether there was an estimate made for the item which reads:

For the investigation and development of methods for the prevention of grain-dust, smut-dust, and other plant-dust explosions and resulting fires, including fires in cotton gins and cotton oil mills, $25,000.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will say to the Senator there is a larger estimate than the sum appropriated. I think the estimate was for $100,000. I will look it up in just a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire what lace leather is? I know there was a species of "home tanning" in vogue when I was a small boy, but that was some time ago. Since then home tanning of lace and other leathers seems to need recognition. What is the home tanning of lace leather? Who knows?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not artistic.

Mr. GRONNA. There was an estimate made for the item.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not the estimate about which I am inquiring. I want to know what lace leather is.

Mr. GRONNA. I was trying to answer the inquiry of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. SMOOT. I had asked the Senator from North Dakota if there had been an estimate for the item beginning in line 17, on page 48.

Mr. GRONNA. There was an estimate for $100,000 for this purpose this year. Last year's bill carried $23,500 and the House inserted a like provision in this bill for $23,500.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not mean the item in regard to dehydrating materials. I referred to the item "for the investigation and development of methods for the prevention of grain-dust, smut-dust, and other plant-dust explosions."

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that there is an estimate for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to be a new item in the bill, and I was wondering whether we were going to enter upon that line of work.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a superfluous inquiry. We are.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have, according to the impression of the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS. We have.

Mr. SMOOT. I was fearful of it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will read from the letter of the department in regard to the item for the prevention of grain-dust explosions. This is a new item; it was recommended and estimated for, but was not included in the House bill. The department says:

Plant-dust explosions and fires have resulted in large losses of life and property. The educational work based on the department's researches, which has been carried on during the past three years in cooperation with the United States Grain Corporation, was terminated July 1, 1920. The results of the campaign were very gratifying, and during the three years that the Grain Corporation operated it suffered no extensive explosion or fire losses. The fact that at practically no time was the value of stocks in storage less than $100,000,000, and that at certain times it reached approximately $500,000,000, shows the importance of the saving thus effected, to say nothing of the safeguarding of human life.

I will say to the Senator that the estimate was for $50,000.

Mr. SMOOT. There was, then, an estimate for it?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; the estimate was for $50,000, as will be found in the Book of Estimates, on page 276. We cut that estimate in two, however, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] suggests.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the same question as to the amendment found on page 48, lines 21 and 22, reading as follows:

For the study of processes and methods of home tanning of lace and other leathers used on the farm, $15,000.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator will find the estimate on page 276 of the Book of Estimates, as follows:

For investigating the utilization of agricultural raw materials in the production of leather, tanning, and leather-making materials, and for developing and demonstrating improved methods or processes for producing leather, $15,000.

The committee changed the wording a little, but the item was estimated for.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] made an inquiry a moment ago as to what was meant by lace leather. It is leather derived from a peculiar form of tanning available for lacing belts, shoes, and so forth.

While I am on my feet I wish to call attention to the fact that I do not believe there is an item in this bill that is possibly fraught with more benefit to the country at large than the item which will enable the department to attempt to find some method by which people can relieve themselves of the intolerable burdens placed upon them in connection with the purchase of their leather and leather supplies, including shoes, and so forth. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who does not

recognize that of all the oppressive and iniquitous combinations in this country, the shoe and leather combine is perhaps the worst. I understand that there is being worked out a system of tanning by which local and small industries and possibly the home may be afforded some kind of relief from this intolerable burden.

We were told that we had an oversupply of hides, and so we took the duty off of hides; we took the duty off of leather and shoes, but the price went up, showing that there is no relief from this iron-bound combination.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator must be mistaken about that; he can not mean that following the removal of the duty the price of leather went up.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Surely.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a political impossibility.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It may be a political impossibility, but it is a commercial fact.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado directed to me an inquiry as to what lace leather is.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from South Carolina gave me the information, which is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator, if he will permit me, that this is an item in which the farmers generally are very much interested. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is very anxious to have this provision in the bill. Lace leather is used very largely in the sewing together of belts of all kinds, and is also used in mending and repairing harness. I farm on a somewhat large scale, and, of course, perhaps I use more of this leather than does the ordinary farmer; but I will say to the Senator from Colorado and to the other Senators that sometimes I use in connection with my farm work $25 worth of lace leather in a single day.

The hides that the farmers produce are worth practically nothing to them. I received an invoice of hides shipped by a farmer in South Dakota a few days ago, which I put into the RECORD, and from which it appears that the hides netted the farmer less than 1 cent a pound. Lace leather costs the farmer from $1.50 to $3 a pound. If by the expenditure of $15,000 we can teach the farmers how to tan the hides in a practical manner—and calfskins and light-weight hides are being used for lace leather—and to use them on the farm, there will be a saving of millions of dollars to the farmers throughout the country. It is a practical proposition, and I can not see why there should be any objection to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, my comment upon the item was not an objection, because I have long ago ceased to make objections to items in the Agricultural appropriation bill. I simply wanted some information with regard to the character of material which the Government is to study at a cost of $15,000 a year to the taxpayers.

Long ago we reached the point where any activity upon a farm, no matter where it may occur or what the activity is, at once proceeds with lightning speed to the city of Washington for an appropriation and for paternal investigation by the Government at so much per year. In the good old days when farming was farming, when farmers were not farmed as they are nowadays, the methods of securing for themselves needed articles both of production and of manufacture proceeded quite as well as if not better than since it has become what might be called an appropriation industry.

If it be true that the placing of leather upon the free list has resulted in its increase of price, then it must follow that the chief benefit to be derived by legislation in that regard is to put a high duty upon it and bring down the price. If that result would follow I might be induced to vote for a very high rate of protection. It is, of course, very important, if possible, to develop methods for the prevention of grain-dust and other explosions and resulting fires; but the destruction of gins and other factories engaged in the treatment of cotton by the incendiary fires that have punctuated the Associated Press dispatches for some time, and which seem to be designed to compel a restriction in cotton production, might also become the subject of investigation by an appropriate amount to be devoted for that purpose by the Congress, and which, perhaps, might also produce some very startling if not beneficial results.

I was greatly struck yesterday by a new method of securing appropriations in this bill. That is to produce some samples of the particular subject that is sought to be sweetened by an appropriation and pass them around to Senators. We had some figs and some dates yesterday, which cost the people of the United States just $10,000. Hereafter I have no doubt that when this bill is to be considered the Senate Chamber will be converted into a delicatessen store, and each Senator will have behind him his wares, goods, and merchandise to be passed around and sampled by the lawmakers, whose votes will be influenced to some degree by the palatable nature of the commodity which is sought to be protected. I hope that will not be extended to the animal department of this bill. You know we now make large appropriations for the purpose of exterminating predatory animals. There is one predatory animal whose presence in the Chamber might change its atmosphere and result in a stampede instead of an appropriation, so I hope the line will be drawn by those who desire to secure appropriations hereafter by confining the exhibits entirely to vegetables and fruits.

These two appropriations, Mr. President, will become permanent from now on. We shall be investigating and developing methods for the prevention of grain-dust and other dust explosions and resulting fires in the good year of our Lord 2222, provided always the Treasury has anything to appropriate by that time; and from now on the Agricultural Department will make a perpetual study of the processes and methods of home tanning of lace and other leathers.

It is one of those perpetual-motion investigations which has one beginning, but no end; and 50 years from now the aggregate amount of the appropriations made for these purposes, which, of course, will increase in constant progression, will be sufficient at least to make us realize that something has been done by the Government in that direction.

Mr. President, I have received a letter from a man who professes to be a farmer, and I think he makes his profession good. He seems to take a different view of the status of the farmer and of his financial condition from that which prevails in this Chamber, and which is always dwelt upon with eloquent unction whenever an appropriation is desired to assist the agricultural industry. I ask leave, as part of my remarks, to introduce it in the RECORD, together with a communication of this gentleman to the Nebraska State Journal of December 16, 1920, entitled "Ill-advised legislation." It will be a sort of an oasis in this desert of widespread and constantly increasing items of appropriation for the farmer. While it will do no good, it will serve to relieve my mind just a little.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter and communication will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VILLAGE FARM,
Funk, Nebr., December 25, 1920.

Senator THOMAS.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing a letter that was published in the Lincoln State Journal recently, inasmuch as so much is being said about the "distress of the farmer" which is purely buncombe. I believe you will be interested in the history contained in this letter. I want to say that if anyone will come here in this country that has been cursed in past years with almost repeated crop failures I will show him many men, renters in the past, who 10 years ago were worth practically nothing, who are comparatively rich now, and so with every farmer who made the most of his opportunities, like the laboring man, who by the big wages has gotten a taste of the better things of life and becomes discontented because he fails in the full fruition of his ambition. So the farmer, urged on by the professional agitator, is discontented because he is checked in his onward advance toward large wealth. I am a Republican, have entertained Senator NORRIS in my home, he and I once were very good friends, but I do not send this to him because he is the "farmers' friend," from a vote-getting standpoint, and facts and logic would have little weight with him. I send it to you because I have always admired your courage and fearlessness in standing against the fads and foolishness put up by the dreamers and theorists and would-be wreckers of this country. I am extremely sorry that you are not going back, as in times of stress and turmoil our country needs such men as you.

Yours, truly, L. T. BROOKING.

P. S.—This section of country I speak of lies between Hastings and Oxford, and Funk is 200 miles west of Omaha.

THE PUBLIC MIND—ILL-ADVISED AGITATION.

FUNK, NEBR., *December 14.*

To the EDITOR OF THE STATE JOURNAL:

With the governors and senators in our West talking about conditions being "critical" and "tragical" for the farmers, and demanding that something must be done immediately for their relief, with some of the farmers talking the same way, we may begin to wonder to what condition of mind are we drifting. When men seem to have lost either their reason or their memories.

I built the first house in our little town 33 years ago, and being in the grain-elevator business for 18 years was in constant touch with the farmers, and in conditions surrounding them. I am now trying to make a living on 6 acres of land, and in a position to prosper or otherwise, the same as the farmers, by the rise and fall of prices. I have a good remembrance of past crops and prices, hence I believe I am fairly well qualified to take an impartial view of the present conditions. I can well remember the struggle for existence the farmers of this community had, and myself as well, through the period of 1894 and 1895, years of crop failures and low prices. I can well remember the bumper crop of corn, and the disastrous hailstorm that destroyed the small-grain crop of 1896; how I bought 140,000 bushels of corn at 9 cents per bushel of that crop—1897 and 1898 came with fairly good crops, but the price was still extremely low; 1899, 1900, and 1901 came with almost total failures, much corn had to be bought at advanced prices and the freight to pay. The big crop of 1902 came and the wheat was sold at an average price of around 50 cents per

bushel. The corn was frozen the 12th of September and little or none marketed; good crops followed until 1907, and from this period we had eight dry years with short crops and much corn shipped in.

This brings us up to the wet year of 1915. During all these years of short crops, with the exception of one year when wheat reached the dollar mark, price for wheat was considerably below $1, and very little corn to sell, and some years it was shipped in. Just how our farmers managed to get through all these years of failure and low prices and at the same time reconstruct this country from a country of sod houses and sod outbuildings to a country of the finest farm properties the sun ever shone upon is a story well worth the efforts of some historian to tell, but not for me to undertake in this article; but they did it, and under the most adverse conditions.

The period from 1915 up to the present I need not dwell upon, it speaks of prices; prices that in the past periods were never dreamed of even by the wildest agitator, but when we consider the crops and prices of the years up to 1915 and all that was accomplished by the sturdy industry, the undying grit and tenacity of our pioneers, and consider the good crops and in a comparative sense the fabulous prices that all farm products have been bringing for the last five years, it is beyond my comprehension how any man can be so lost to the true condition as to use the terms "critical" and "tragical."

While our crops in this section of the State for the past five years could be called good, they have been better both east and west of us, and this section can well be taken as a criterion if any real distress was apparent. Outside of some who may have mismanaged and some who may have had a large share of ill luck, the situation is not "critical" or "tragical"; it is not even serious; a large majority of the farmers will not make the usual money this year and are doomed to disappointment, but all those who have not gotten deeply in debt by buying more land and who have conducted their business in a prudent way can pay every dollar they owe and have money left. During the war the Government officials spoke in terms of billions instead of millions, and so we have gotten the habit of speaking in terms of thousands where we formerly spoke of hundreds, and sums that formerly seemed large seem very small to us now, and added to this is the politician who wants to pose as the "farmers' friend" for the votes there is in it, and knows that the shortest route to this consummation is to be constantly taking the part of the dissatisfied farmers, whether there is any basis for the discontent or not. Then we have the promoter who adds to the farmers' discontent with the hope of getting $18 for this, $10 for that, and $2.50 for the other. Surely the millennium is dawning for the farmer if he gets the one-hundredth part of what is promised him. A lot of these agitators—and some may be sincere, but, in my judgment, shortsightedly—seem to think that the only way the farmers can get justice is to organize a gigantic farmers' organization, with the express object of entirely controlling legislation. This is what the Federation of Labor has been striving for, and to which we have all so strenously objected. If carried out according to promise, we have a government by class and not a government by all the people, and threaten the downfall of our Republic or a state of class and business demoralization. No class, whether labor, farmer, or business, can be trusted with power; it at once becomes autocratic; and even the class in power would not prosper as under our present government by all the people.

If the agitator would go to work and earn an honest living without trying to make it out of the people's discontent, this period of reconstruction would work out, as water finds its level; so would prices eventually. We know there is much injustice and inequality; too many making too much and too many making too little. Some have too much and some not enough. We know all these things, and if any remedy that is safe and sane and in justice to all classes can be applied we can all favor it, but let us look with suspicion upon all agitation that tends to upset the order of things and to bring about class power. The credulous man who is in poor health and has failed to get the expected relief from his old reliable family physician falls an easy victim to the traveling quack, who has a remedy for every ill and who promises relief at so much per bottle; and so the dissatisfied, credulous man is quick to patronize the political quack who has a remedy for every economic ill, and hence the stock in trade of these political charlatans is to create discontent by enlarging upon existing evils, and many that do not exist, and I believe if these agitators did not exist there would be but little discontent at the present time; that they are the chief cause, and not because any appreciable number of farmers are in distress. I am in daily touch with many farmers, retired and active, many of them are not discontented, but inclined to compare the present prosperous times with times past, that I have mentioned.

They take a philosophic view of conditions. They are proof against the traveling charlatan and take a hard-headed, sensible view of the situation. This agitation is not caused by the present depressed prices of farm products, but was started when wheat was $2.30 and corn around a dollar. This is a very significant fact, and plainly shows the hand of the element I have mentioned. The best friend of the farmer is the man who is trying to get all classes to pull together in a united effort to keep this Nation of ours big in a big way. To keep business going, to keep labor employed, thus making a market for his products, to discourage all efforts to tear down and upset the order of things, for as all classes depend upon each other, so distress to either one reacts upon the other, who preaches contentment to him instead of inflaming his passions, who encourages him to have faith in himself and in our institutions, to have faith in the future of his business, to have faith in the men selected to handle the big affairs of the Nation, and not to put a blind faith in the ax-grinding politician and promoter who is after his earnings and who fattens upon his discontent. Let us all get rid of this "get-rich-quick" notion and settle down to business; let us try and reason out this problem in a spirit of unselfishness, as nearly all wars are the result of selfishness; so this organizing of class against class is based upon selfishness, and while many favor it who are in favor of exact justice, the level-headed man knows that class power will never stop at that and that class power means autocracy and nothing else in the practical application. I have never had any political aspirations and am not guided in my expressions by how many votes of any class that I may get, hence I am free to say what I believe to be true, and I believe that the men who are so freely expressing themselves about the distress of the farmers are not guided by the true facts, but are either political demagogues or have not gotten the real facts of the situation. I have observed that the farmers who are the loudest in expressing their discontent are the ones that have made the big money in the last five years. When this reconstruction period is over it will be found that a hundred business men will have gone bankrupt to every one farmer, we will all be thinking in terms of hundreds instead of thousands, will be burning a little less gas, will be satisfied with a little less profit, and the people of this part of the State, who changed this from a country of sod houses in a period of adversity to a country of the finest farm homes in America, will not go bankrupt, will not suffer any distress as long as we have reasonable production and prices we can reasonably expect. Some may be induced to take the medicine mixers' medicine, but in the long run his industry, his tenacity to stick and farm, his desire to own good homes for himself and stock, his capacity for economizing when necessary, is going to take him through all emergencies, regardless of all the calamity howlers on earth. I have this faith in a big majority of the farmers, whose condition is not "critical" or "tragical."

Respectfully,

L. T. BROOKING.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask that the estimate of the department be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

LEATHER AND TANNING INVESTIGATIONS.

Page 46, between lines 22 and 23, insert:

"For investigating the utilization of agricultural raw materials in the production of leather and tanning and leather-making materials and for developing and demonstrating improved methods or processes for producing leather, $15,000."

This is a new item. It was proposed in the estimates but not included in the bill reported from the House committee.

Work on leather and tanning materials has been carried on in a small way by the Bureau of Chemistry for many years, but the desirability of making special provision for an investigation of this type is particularly important in view of the scarcity of leather and leather-making materials at the present time. The long-used vegetable tanning materials, which are direct products of the forest and farm, are totally inadequate under present conditions to supply the country's needs and others should be sought and developed. No investigations of leather and leather-making materials can be properly organized and completed which do not consider the composition and effect of the various tanning materials on the wearing qualities of leather.

Large quantities of hides, skins, and tanning materials are imported annually, much of which would be unnecessary if all the leather made in this country were of better quality. About one-third of the hides and skins used in this country are now supplied by country butchers and farmers. Owing to carelessness and lack of knowledge in curing these hides and skins, it is estimated that the farmers and country butchers lose annually $15,000,000, while the loss to the country in leather value is probably more than double that amount.

The work contemplated under this item has primarily an agricultural significance. The interests of agriculture in raw materials for leather making, in tanning, and in leather and leather substitutes are paramount, since the agricultural industry supplies nearly all the raw material and the farming population is the largest single class of consumers of the finished products. There are few industries more closely related to agriculture than that of tanning, and any research work in the field of tanning must be based primarily on agriculture. Owing to the discrepancy between the present low price of hides and the continued high price of leather, the department is now flooded with inquiries from farmers and others regarding the possibility of home tanning in a small way. The department desires, if this item is approved, to make some experiments along the line of developing processes for tanning on the farm. Whether or not such processes are practicable can not be determined without experimentation. If such a process can be worked out, it would result in a great saving to the farmers of the country, either by permitting them to do a great deal of their own tanning or by exerting its influence in maintaining a more equitable relation between value of raw material and of finished product.

Other countries have found it necessary to undertake investigations of the character proposed under this item.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word in support of this item. I was one of the Senators on the Agricultural Committee who were responsible for the insertion of the item.

I doubt if there is in the bill any small item like this $15,000 which will do more practical good to the farmers than this one, and I speak as a farmer—not that I dig in the ground myself, but I have a plantation, and use a good deal of leather. On one of my recent statements of current expenses I noticed that hame strings were charged at 50 cents each—50 cents for a single hame string!—and there are a great many hame strings used on every farm every year. We use a great deal of farm machinery now, and in that machinery and connected with it are a number of belts. It is absolutely necessary to lace the leather belts with lace leather. The belts themselves are made of leather, and they are laced with lace leather. There is a very large quantity of leather used on every farm, and leather is one of the most expensive things that farmers have to buy.

There is hardly a farm that does not slaughter every year a few head of cattle for home consumption, and at the present time, when the farmers are unable to sell their hides, I see no reason why they should not tan or dress on the farm leather for home consumption. It would save them a very material sum every year. In the aggregate, on the millions of farms in this country, it is my candid belief that millions and millions of dollars would be saved if the farmers could be taught how to tan the leather at home, especially lace leather. I am certain, from my practical knowledge and experience on that subject, that it would be very beneficial; and I do not believe there is a single item in this bill that would be of more substantial, practical, everyday benefit to the farmers than this. I sincerely hope it will be kept in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any doubt but that the item will be kept in the bill. But I have not the same faith the Senator from

Louisiana has with reference to its great benefits. Of course, I know, Mr. President, that under it there will be some people employed to run around the country. But the idea of appropriating $15,000 to find out some new process for tanning leather, when America is renowned the world over for the best processes of tanning leather. There is no secret about it. Everybody interested knows how it is accomplished.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President——

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

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. RANSDELL. I would appreciate very much if the Senator would give me his recipe for doing it. I have been trying to get one. I have a number of hides on my plantation which I could not sell for anything. I do not believe I could give them away. I believe they would be in the same class as the sheep sent from Montana the other day, which netted 32 cents a head in the Chicago market after paying all expenses. I believe I would have to give my hides away in just exactly that same manner. I have been trying to get a recipe for tanning so that I could send it down to my manager, and I finally got a long document from the Department of Agriculture, which is so difficult to understand and apply that I am not going to ask my plantation manager to try to understand it.

The Senator says everybody knows how to do it. I ask him right now to please send me his recipe, so that I can use it on my plantation.

Mr. SMOOT. Everybody does not know a process by which one hide can be successfully and profitably tanned, nor will anybody ever find such a process. Mr. President, this is going back to the ages when every housewife knit her husband's socks, and darned them with the wool taken from the sheep's back, when she washed it and carded it and spun it into yarn, and then wove it into cloth and then made the cloth into suits. Nobody could possibly take one hide and make leather out of it profitably to himself or to anyone else.

The Senator is speaking of the letter from the Agricultural Department, which nobody could understand, in answer to one sent by him, a letter which will not be clarified by the item under consideration. Continue this appropriation of $15,000 for the next hundred years for the same purpose, and increase it each year if you will, and at the end of the hundred years there would be nobody in all the world who could understand it any better than the Senator does to-day. So, Mr. President, this is but the beginning of a new appropriation to employ certain people to run around the country to pay a visit to the farmer and talk as to how the weather is and how the children are——

Mr. THOMAS. Not the weather, but the leather.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the weather. Leather will be very, very far removed from the discussion that will take place. If there was any real chance of getting any benefit for the farmer or anyone else, I would not object to the appropriation. But the idea is absurd that a farmer will kill a calf and have it skinned and take that skin and try to tan it under any process that was ever known or ever will be known. Business is not carried on to-day on that scale. It would cost him more than its weight in silver dollars.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, for the information of my friend the Senator from Utah I want to inform him that there are quite a number of people in my State, and I expect a few in his State, who are doing that now. I refer to the American Indians. They know how to tan, and they are doing it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the American Indians take a buck's skin and tan it, and that is about the only thing they have ever tanned and they have given that work up lately.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the American Indian knows how to do this, should not this appropriation be made for him, and should we not set him to work on the plantations in Louisiana and in North Dakota?

Mr. RANSDELL. If the American Indian could be induced to give the recipe for tanning buckskin to the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture could issue a plain, simple bulletin, not to send men all around the country, as the Senator from Utah suggests, but just issue a plain, simple bulletin giving the home recipe of the American Indian, that would be fine, it seems to me. I know when I was a boy we used to kill a good many deer in my section, and we would get the nearest Indian to dress the deer skins for us. They were wonderfully useful. I have not seen a dressed deer skin for many years, but if I could get cow hides or calf hides dressed as well as those deer skins were dressed, it would answer my purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. No Indian ever tanned a cowhide or a calf hide. The only reason the Senator sent his deer skin to the Indian was that it did not cost him anything for the Indian to treat it, for he simply made a frame and stretched the skin to the size of the frame and dried it out. Neither the Senator nor anyone else living in his State could afford to take the time to follow that slow process. The Indian did not make a cent a day out of it. All he got out of it was that at the end he sold it for 50 cents or a dollar, and the Indian considered himself that much ahead.

The American people are not going back to the Indian style of making buckskin. No Indian ever made any leather. I know, of course, the prices charged for lace leathers, which has been referred to by the Senator from North Dakota. Mr. President, I was superintendent of a woolen mill, which had all of the machinery necessary for an 8-set mill requiring 400 employees. Some of the belts required were over 24 inches wide and all of the machinery was driven from the main shaft by belts, and the lace leather never cost us $75 for a whole year running 24 hours every day. I can not understand why the Senator was compelled to pay $25 for lace leather for a few thrashing machines running a few weeks each year.

Of course, it is perfectly useless trying to get an appropriation cut out of the bill, but I did want to say that if the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] remains in the Senate for 30 years, at the end of 30 years he will find this item in the Agriculture appropriation bill, if it goes in now, except that it will be for an increased amount.

Mr. President, on page 48 of this very bill the first item we find is:

For investigating the grading, weighing, handling, transportation, and uses of naval stores, the preparation of definite type samples thereof, and for the demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, in cooperation with individuals and companies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $10,000.

I remember when the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] stood upon the floor of the Senate and asked for that appropriation about six years ago. He said he thought the appropriation ought to be made, and it would not take more than $10,000. As I remember, two years ago, when a similar appropriation was under discussion, he said, "Well, just let it go in once more." It went in once more. It is in again once more, and, Mr. President, as long as the Senate will vote for this appropriation it will remain in once more.

I do not know any reason why such an investigation of naval stores should be made now, nor why it should have been extended beyond the first appropriation. I can not see why we should throw $10,000 away for that purpose. I only point to this item to show that whenever an appropriation gets in the bill it will remain in, no matter whether it is necessary or whether it is unnecessary.

I am not saying this particularly as affecting the pending bill. It is about the same in every appropriation bill. This is no different from the other appropriation bills in that respect. When once the items get into the bill, Mr. President, it is almost impossible to make a change. Of course, if the Senate wants to put this item in, well and good.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the adoption of this amendment, but I can not help feeling that there seems to be a disposition among some of the Senators here to attack every little item in this particular bill. I realize as much as anyone here does that we are perhaps trespassing upon the great industries of the country if we are to teach the farmers of the country how they will be able to manufacture some of the leather to be used on the farms.

I realize that if we do that we will take from the profits of tremendous concerns, and I am not trying to prevent these huge corporations from making profits. I am not trying to legislate so as to prevent them from going on and making profits. But only yesterday we passed a bill which involves at least $350,000,000, according to the statement of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. We had to limit the time in order to pass that little bill.

I know that the large corporations in the country will attack anything we are trying to pass in this body which affects their interests. I know there is not a single paragraph in the Agricultural appropriation bill where it affects the packers which they do not oppose. I do not guess on this, because I have talked with them.

You may ridicule a provision in the bill appropriating a small amount to teach the farmers how to tan lace leather and other kinds of leather, but let me say to you that if conditions do not change the only way the farmers will get leather will be to tan it themselves. They will not have the money to pay $3 a pound for lace leather tanned by the big packers.

Mr. President, this question deserves much more than simply ridicule. It involves the welfare of at least 7,000,000 farmers of

this country, because they all use this product more or less. I am somewhat sick and tired every time an item of this kind is brought before this body to hear some of these very able Senators, who are all friends of mine, attack it by ridiculing it. I very often myself ridicule things with which I am the least familiar, but I find by a careful study of the matters which I attempt to ridicule that they have merit in them.

I have no more interest in this item than anyone else, but the Senator from Utah is attacking this proposition. In his first statement he said, "Everybody knows about it now," and then when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], who was deeply interested in it and who is really the father of the amendment, asked him for a recipe, the distinguished Senator from Utah was unable to give it.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President; the Senator from Utah can give a recipe very easily. It used to take a year, when the people first went to Utah, to tan a piece of leather, but that was absolutely necessary, as we could not get leather in any other way, and that is the length of time it will take the Senator from Louisiana with the processes to be investigated under this appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. Then perhaps the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Utah can get together, and if they can I will ask that this item be passed over. Perhaps we can save $15,000.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I would like action on it now. I am afraid the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Louisiana would never get together on a simple, practical little item like this. We want it for the benefit of the farmers.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] suggests to me we could not get together unless it was on sugar. I do not know about that; but if that is the case, I am glad there is one thing on which the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Louisiana can get together.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether we could get together on sugar.

Mr. RANSDELL. Well, I am a little disappointed then.

Mr. SMOOT. I, too, get a little tired, the same as the Senator from North Dakota gets a little tired, when he and other Senators take the floor and rant and rave about the industries of the country. As to this item, there will be no more competition with the packers than there would be for a baby a day old competing with a man in the full bloom of manhood. I do not know what the Senator from Louisiana wants to do, but if he thinks that leather is made the same as buckskin is made by the Indians, of course I have not any complaint to offer as far as he is personally concerned. His judgment may be that he can get something out of the appropriation of $15,000. I have no doubt that perhaps there will be men visiting his city and stopping at hotels and drawing $4 per diem, with a salary attached of $1,800 or $2,000. That would happen, and there is no doubt about that. So far as the results of their labors are concerned, little would come from them. I expect to live for at least a quarter of a century, but I have no more idea of ever seeing favorable results come from this appropriation than that I shall die to-morrow morning.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 48, after line 25, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Chemistry from "$944,561" to "$973,061."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 26, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Chemistry from "$1,275,251" to "$1,303,751."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 6, to increase the appropriation for chemical investigations of soil types, soil composition, and soil minerals, the soil solution, solubility of soil, and all chemical properties of soils, etc., from "$23,110" to "$33,110."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 13, after the word "supply," to strike out the word "of" and insert "and methods of obtaining," so as to read:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply and methods of obtaining potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, $86,840.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am very much surprised to see such an item in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Is not that amply taken care of by the appropriation for the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines? I know that both those branches of the Government are engaged in that work, and I can not see any possible use of the appropriation here.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but we have our nitrate plant built now ready to operate. However, the item went in once and it must remain in the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If it were not otherwise provided for I should say that the appropriation was a most commendable one, but we are engaging in a branch of work here, embarking the Agricultural Department in a line of investigation, that is certainly not appropriate at all to its functions and is peculiarly appropriate to the functions of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Department of Agriculture have been making investigations in the same field. They were instructed to do so. In 1916 they made a report on the fertilizer situation and the report ought to be on the desks of Senators today, just submitted by the Department of Agriculture, showing the sources of supply and the materials entering into commercial fertilizers. They are actually making experiments.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Geological Survey have issued numerous bulletins concerning the supply of potash and nitrates in the country, many of which have been referred to from time to time on the floor here. Bear in mind, I commend the investigation as one that ought to be encouraged, but we are certainly embarking the Agricultural Department in investigations that are particularly appropriate to mining operations.

Mr. FLETCHER. In some respects it pertains to mining operations, but in other respects I think the investigation does not, because the Agricultural Department is making experiments now in the matter of developing potash, nitrates, and acids for reducing potash into sulphate of ammonia, ammonium potash, and so forth. I think they are doing a very important work in that line. I believe it will be well to keep it up for the present at least. I am sure that it is a splendid work.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, there was an appropriation carried several years ago in the Agricultural appropriation bill to enable the Department of Agriculture to determine the commercial value of kelp on the Pacific coast. They have made extensive investigations and their reports from time to time have given to the public full knowledge of the possibility of the different processes of obtaining potash from the kelp weed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator from South Carolina will permit me, that is entirely proper. Kelp is an agricultural product, it is a plant, and the chemists of the Bureau of Agriculture might very properly take into consideration the question of how they could extract from plants this useful basis of fertilizer. That, I think, might find some justification, but it is proposed here to conduct explorations for the purpose of locating deposits, mineral deposits, deposits of nitrate and of potash. I am a little surprised that phosphates, in which the Senator from Florida would be interested, are not included in this, except in the basket clause, as well as nitrates and potash. It seems to me that an appropriation to determine the availability of kelp, a plant, as a source of material for fertilizer would form no justification whatever to carry on mining explorations for the purpose of locating other sources of supply.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not understand that this means an investigation of the mining possibilities. As the Senator from Montana knows, the sources of supply of these ingredients are limited. Nitrates and potash are items that are not found in any great abundance like the phosphates are in the great mines in Florida and Tennessee. No investigation would improve that situation, because they are easily obtainable and in almost inexhaustible quantities. But the other two ingredients are more or less difficult to find.

As to the potash situation, I understand there is quite a source of potash obtainable from the by-products in the process of manufacturing sugar. There is also a considerable quantity of potash discovered in the process of reducing coal to coke. There are vast fields open for investigation in the legumes. As I understand the proposition, it is not to restrict nor to any great extent to go into the question of our mineral supplies, but it is the broad question of ascertaining where the supply may be obtained from other than and including that if they shall find it is profitable to do so.

I think the Senator from Montana will appreciate the fact that this is a field that is germane to the Department of Agriculture and in no sense would it necessarily duplicate the work of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and Mining. It leaves it open for them to find the ingredients, whether from a vegetable source or a mineral source, as they may have oppor-

tunity so to do. The kelp beds, the legumes, and other sources that would not fall within the field of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and Mining should be left open. In my opinion the appropriation should be granted.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from South Carolina correctly understands the situation if he intends to convey the impression that the appropriation means any work in connection with the study of the process of obtaining potash from kelp. That is covered by another item in the bill. There is a plant now operating in the State of California. Ample appropriation has been made for the study of that source, I am informed, at the top of the next page of the bill. I think the appropriation in the item under discussion is not even used for the purpose of studying the habits of the nitrates that may be obtained from leguminous plants. I think it is used perhaps in connection with some other department of the Government to ascertain and locate and work out certain mineral deposits in the Western States that may contain these elements. For instance, in the State of Utah and in the eastern part of the State of Oregon and in other Western States there are large deposits containing some of the nitrates, and I know that the Government, through this department, has been working with those minerals to ascertain if it is feasible to use the rock product and elements as a plant food. I think to that extent only is this contemplated, and I think the appropriation should be made for the very great service that the department is rendering the Government in that line.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question at all that it is a duplication of work. The work ought to be done by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. Those are the agencies that have the whole subject matter in charge. Potash deposits are frequently found on public lands, for instance.

Mr. FLETCHER. Neither of the services actually makes experiments, as I take it. They merely locate deposits and map and plat them, and that sort of thing, and show where the product possibly can be obtained, but the Department of Agriculture has a bureau which actually experiments with these different elements to determine the commercial value of the product.

Mr. SMOOT. The Bureau of Mines make experiments in every way, shape, and form. In the West they have a little experimental plant built in the State of Utah. There was a company formed in Utah for the purpose of extracting potash from the waters of the Great Salt Lake. I think they spent about $600,000, but potash has dropped so now in price that all of their investment is lying idle. There is not a thing being done at that plant. Unless the price of potash increases, of course, they will lose all their money.

The Bureau of Mines was created for the very purpose of working out plans for the extraction of valuable minerals, and they are doing it successfully. They are doing it as far as nitrates are concerned. No one can secure title to a piece of land containing nitrates unless he complies with the laws of the United States. Not only that; a patent will never be issued, but a lease might be secured, but not until an examination and ascertainment is made of the value of it for minerals, and that examination is made by the Geological Survey. We have nearly all of the lands of the West classified now as to whether they are grazing lands or whether they are mineral lands, or whether they are agricultural lands, and each class can only be utilized by complying with the laws affecting each class of land.

The Bureau of Mines, I understand, have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the investigation of certain rock deposits in New Jersey for the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility of extracting potash from the same. They had all sorts of experiments made, and I know they have done similar work as far as the West is concerned. Take the item of extracting oil from shale. Who is doing that work? The Congress is appropriating the money and giving the authority to the Bureau of Mines to do the work, and I think the Bureau of Mines is doing the work just as well as it is possible to be done. They have spent thousands of dollars in experimenting in extracting oil from shale. They spent thousands and tens of thousands of dollars in developing the nitrate deposits in America.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that Congress for many years has appropriated large sums of money for experimental plants to develop the potash industry, and especially the extraction of potash from kelp. This year there is no appropriation for that purpose, except $5,000 to take care of the machinery. If the Senator will permit, I wish to show to the Senate the large sum of money that is being saved. The only paragraph of which I know in this bill that contains any reference to this particular subject is this item.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that thoroughly. Let me ask the Senator, before he interrupts me, why is not the department asking for an appropriation for investigations in regard to extracting potash from kelp?

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator that they are asking for an appropriation for that purpose. In the Book of Estimates, on page 169, it will be found that the department has made an estimate for $208,500 for that purpose. If the Senator will allow me, I will say that there was an appropriation in 1919 of $127,600 for that purpose; in 1920 there was a like amount; in 1921 there was appropriated $192,900, and this year the estimate is for $208,500. All these paragraphs have been combined; there is only this one appropriation of $86,000, and an appropriation on the next page, which the Senator will observe, of $5,000. That is only to take care of the machinery in the kelp plants. It seems to me that the least we can do is to give the department this one appropriation, for they certainly must have it.

I wish to say to the Senator that I have gone into this question quite thoroughly. The Department of Agriculture has some very able and distinguished scientists who are now working on the question of developing potash, and no one knows better than does the Senator from Utah how important that question is.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but the Senator from Utah also knows that the Geological Survey has the best scientists that it can get in the world, and so has the Bureau of Mines, and they are doing exactly the same work.

So far as the extraction of potash from kelp is concerned, I am very glad that that appropriation has been eliminated. They have succeeded in producing potash from kelp, which is a vegetable substance, and nobody objected to that originally being in the Agricultural bill; but this item proposes to have the Agricultural Department enter the domain of the Bureau of Mines and of the Geological Survey.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator from Utah object to the appropriation? It is a House appropriation. The only amendment which the Senate committee made was to insert certain words.

Mr. SMOOT. When the time comes I hope that some Senator will move to strike out the whole provision.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I call the Senator's attention to a report which was just laid on our desks in reference to this subject?

Mr. SMOOT. I have a copy of that report.

Mr. FLETCHER. I knew the subject was going to come up this morning, and I asked to have the report distributed. It is a report from the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Senator will find, on page 16, just what has been done by the Department of Agriculture under the heading:

IV. A report on investigations made and results since the publication of Senate Document No. 262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, on January 26, 1916—

I find this statement:

When President Taft took cognizance of American dependence on Germany for all of the potash entering American fertilizers through serious difficulties which had arisen regarding contracts and prices between American manufacturers and the Government-controlled potash syndicate in Germany, Congress granted an appropriation for the Bureau of Soils to make investigations of the fertilizer resources of the United States, including a search for potash.

Following that is a statement which shows that they have done a very important work.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; they claim that they should have credit in connection with the work done at Searles Lake and also in connection with the extraction of potash from the salt waters of Nebraska; but I want to say to the Senator that they have done nothing in that respect that the scientists in the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines have not done.

Mr. FLETCHER. I take it they use all the information they can get from the Bureau of Mines and from the Geological Survey as well as from all other sources.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the trouble about it. There should be but one Government agency for the collection of this information, and there ought not to be any other source. There should be no further appropriations other than for that one source which should collect the information.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does not the Senator from Utah think that the matter of fertilizer is one which peculiarly pertains to the Department of Agriculture, determining the source of fertilizers, the elements which enter into plant food, and the way to develop them and to make them available for the producers of the food of the country on reasonable terms? That, it seems to me, belongs to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah believes that the great bulk of potash produced in the United States—and this statement will be true as to the future—has come from the extraction of potash or nitrates from the rocks which are found in the everlasting hills of the West. That whole question is in the hands

of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines. They have the scientists there, and they pay them for the purpose of making these investigations.

It seems to me that this work should not be placed under the Department of Agriculture, for the scientists in that department who have been educated to study questions relating to plant life, growth, and development, and other matters connected with products of the soil are not the proper ones to handle it. It takes men who have studied for years and years along a particular line, who have studied the geology of the country, and more than likely have spent their early lives in the mines of the West. It takes practical men, and when such men are hired by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, if we can not get the information from them, there is no need of the Government expending money to have a duplication of the work in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, reference has been made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the report just issued by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the resolution of the Senate No. 435, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain as nearly as possible, and to report to the Senate as soon as practicable, the following: The amount of commercial potash, nitrogen, and phosphoric acid available for fertilizer purposes, and the price of each of these articles as compared with the prices for 1913, as shown by data in the office or that can be secured without material expense.

Reference was made then to the report at page 16, from which I read, as follows:

The Bureau of Soils made a thorough investigation of surface indications of potash salts and nitrate of soda deposits in the Western States and a more general investigation of the salt deposits of the Northern States. These surveys, with the exception of Searles Lake and some of the smaller lakes, gave indications of no workable deposits of potash salts occurring as such or of nitrate of soda. The bureau reported, however, on the possibilities of the commercial production of potash from the giant kelps of the Pacific coast, the deposits of Searles Lake, Calif., the saline lakes of western Nebraska, the dust from cement mills and from blast furnaces, the feldspars, green sand marls, wool waste, alunite, beet-sugar waste, and distillery waste. The bureau pointed out that the commercial success of extracting potash from all of these sources at prewar prices depended upon the utilization of by-products.

Mr. President, if the Department of Agriculture did make any such investigation as that, the money expended on it was practically thrown away, because the Geological Survey had years ago undertaken and carried out with its able corps of assistants exactly that kind of an investigation. It has located as accurately as it can all of these deposits in the Western and Northwestern States, and the information they have obtained is available to any Member of Congress in bulletins of value published by the Geological Survey.

Now, with reference to Searles Lake, the deposits there have not only been made the subject of repeated reports by the Geological Survey, but investigations by Congress have been conducted time and again as to that remarkable deposit, and the information thus derived is available.

Mr. SMOOT. And special legislation was passed by Congress in order that the salt deposits there might be worked.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Precisely, and we need only to turn to the reports of the Bureau of Mines and of the Geological Survey to ascertain from that source that this work is being conducted by them. I refer to the last report of the Geological Survey, and I find among bulletins published during the year just passed, Bulletin No. 715-A, Potash Deposits in Spain, by H. S. Gale. A memorandum says:

Potash was discovered accidentally in the salt deposits of the Province of Barcelona, in the northeast corner of Spain, in 1912, though the salt deposits themselves had been known for a hundred years.

The memorandum proceeds with a brief description of what is contained in the bulletin.

Then, Bulletin 715-B, The Potash Deposits of Alsace, by H. S. Gale.

That bulletin describes the potash deposits of Alsace.

Turning now to the report I read as follows:

Field studies of reported deposits of potash and nitrate in the Pacific Coast States and in the Southwest, by H. S. Gale, L. F. Noble, and G. R. Mansfield, not only contribute to our knowledge of the potash and nitrate resources of the United States but combine to form an analytical determination of the physiographic, climatic, rock soil, and water conditions that control the mode of occurrence of nitrates and potash salts in the western Pleistocene and Recent lake basins.

Then turning to the report of the Bureau of Mines, on page 55 it appears that they are considering methods of securing potash. I read:

At the Berkeley station a study of methods used in potash recovery at Searles Lake was completed and a report was prepared.

At the Salt Lake City station laboratory experiments on the recovery of potash from the low-grade alunite ores of southern Utah showed that concentration and recovery by calcination, leaching, and electrical precipitation was feasible. The Aluminum Potash Co. continued experimental work in the station laboratories, using the bureau's furnace, leaching plant, and electrical treaters.

So, Mr. President, the whole subject is being taken care of, and there is no occasion whatever, so far as I can see, of making this appropriation and turning the work over to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to refer to the report to which the Senator from Florida has called our attention. If the Senator from Florida has read the report, he knows that while in this bill the appropriation for the extraction of potash from kelp is cut out, this report asks that it be continued; and what is the result? I ask Senators to read the report in full, but I want to call the attention of the Senate particularly to page 17:

When it was found that the giant kelps of the Pacific coast carried a high percentage of potash salts, surveys were made by the Bureau of Soils of the kelp beds lying in that coastal region of the United States and its Territory, Alaska. The enormous tonnage found represented a source of potash of great potential value. This material offered the possibility of valuable by-products obtainable with potash. Upon the outbreak of the war the facts established by the department were taken advantage of by private enterprises and a considerable number of plants were erected on the west ocast, principally in southern California and Puget Sound, for the manufacture of potash from this material.

Potash now has declined in price. It went sky-high during the war. It was not a question of what the purchasers would pay; it was simply a question of getting the potash. The price went so high that they could extract it from the salt waters of the great Salt Lake, they could extract it from the brackish waters found in Nebraska, they could extract it from kelp, and they could extract it from almost any article in which potash was found, because when it was extracted the price of potash was so high that there was hardly a limit to the price paid.

I continue:

At the same time Congress appropriated money for the erection and operation by the Bureau of Soils of an experimental and demonstrational kelp-potash plant with a view to determining the commercial feasibility of producing potash and the by-products which can be gotten from kelp, and with the hope that this information could be established in time to enable the private concerns operating to so develop their processes that they could continue the manufacture of potash from kelp upon restoration of normal conditions.

As far as the price of potash is concerned, it is nearly back to normal conditions, and that develops the fact that they can not extract potash profitably from this source.

The early termination of the war made this impossible, but subsequent experiments in this demonstrational plant have established by-products of sufficient value to carry the manufacturing cost of the potash. The results as they now stand show the commercial feasibility of extracting potash from kelp with by-products and selling the potash, where freight rates are not prohibitive, in competition with potash from any other sources.

While it is felt that the commercial feasibility of recovering by-products of sufficient value to carry the cost of extracting potash has been demonstrated, it is the desire of this bureau to continue the operation of this plant until the efficiency of these processes has been increased to the point where the economic features will persuade outside concerns to reenter the industry.

Then they ask for an appropriation. In this bill that appropriation has been cut out, and the appropriation that is left in the bill simply means a duplication of the work in the Bureau of Mines and in the Geological Survey.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a word more has been said on this subject by Dr. Whitney, who is Director of the Bureau of Soils.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a moment? The Senator from Utah says that the provision for continuing this kelp plant has been cut out. Is not that a mistake?

Mr. GRONNA. There is no appropriation for the continuation of the kelp plant. There is only an item of $5,000 in the bill to take care of the machinery, but the $208,000 asked for was cut out by the House.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, of course this appropriation for the care of the machinery is only to care for it until an opportunity is had to dispose of it. The situation, I take it, is that private enterprise is now invading the kelp field. There are manufactories of very considerable extent, one very large one at San Diego, Calif., and they conduct extensive operations. They have machines by which the kelp is cut out in the ocean, loaded by machinery upon scows, and transported to the plant; so that private enterprise is now engaged in the experimentation and development of this source of supply of nitrate, and it is not necessary for the Government to carry it on any longer.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that may be true. That perhaps was the attitude of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is the reason why the appropriation was cut out, and the $5,000 carried for maintenance; but, as showing the limitations which the Senator from Utah has placed

upon this item, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to Dr. Whitney's testimony before the House committee:

There is the investigation of garbage as a source of fertilizer. Through the work of the Bureau of Soils city garbage has come into quite a prominent place as a fertilizing material. We contributed quite materially to that. We are still looking for deposits of nitrate of soda in this country. We have not very much reason for believing that we will get workable deposits, but we should continue the search. We are still looking for possible deposits of potash, and we are working on phosphates and the economic use of our phosphate-rock deposits. That is being carried on now under the item for fertilizer resources. These investigations have gone so far, they have gone to the point where they are about ready to be taken up by commercial interests. Because we have them in definite shape we want to have an appropriation now to finish the work.

There is a clear, positive statement of the Chief of the Bureau of Soils that this work is getting so nearly completed that it embraces subjects far afield from what the Senator from Utah was discussing. I think it would be a mistake, in the interest of the agricultural people of the country, to discontinue further investigation of this subject, which is so very important to the farmers of the country.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. Is it not true that the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey do not handle at all the work to which he has referred?

Mr. McNARY. That is precisely my understanding; and all the private concerns engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of fertilizer will profit by the investigations made by the Government.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, of course the question addressed to the Senator from Oregon by the Senator from Georgia draws out only a kind of a general statement; but what is the fact? This is an appropriation to locate sources of supply of potash and nitrates. The Geological Survey is undoubtedly conducting investigations for the purpose of locating those sources of supply.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In minerals.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; in minerals.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But not generally, outside of what would fall within the scope of geological and mining work.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; that is not quite true, I am able to say to the Senator, because the Bureau of Mines are obliged to carry on experimentations with respect to the manufacture of coke, and they are conducting experiments for the purpose of utilizing the gases escaping from coke ovens, and they are conducting experimentations in relation to smelting, for the purpose of utilizing the gases contained in the fumes that go up from the smelters, and all that kind of thing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As I understand, a line of work is being done by the Agricultural Department in this respect which the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey do not handle, theirs being more technically mining and mineral investigation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is what I am looking for. If there is any such thing, I should like to know it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I was asking the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the Senator from Oregon gives the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of Soils, who tells just exactly what they are doing. He tells in the report to which I have invited your attention. Now, if there is any line of investigation, any field that they can occupy, that is not occupied by the other governmental establishments, I should think we ought to have it.

I referred to the report made by the Department of Agriculture just a day or two ago, to which the Senator from Florida has referred. They tell us in that report that they are conducting investigations in the regions out in the West and in the Northwest where it is supposed that deposits of potash and of nitrates might be found; and apparently the only other source suggested is the fumes arising from coke ovens and from smelters of various kinds, and that investigation undoubtedly is being conducted by the Bureau of Mines.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, would it be appropriate at this time to move to strike out the paragraph?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the committee amendments are first to be considered.

The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 50, line 23, after the words "agricultural lands," to insert "in the national forests," so as to read:

For examination of soils to aid in the classification of agricultural lands, in the national forests, in cooperation with other bureaus of the department and other departments of the Government, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 20, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Soils from "$314,375" to "$324,375."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 21, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Soils from "$393,615" to "$403,615."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 24, after the word "nuts," to strike out "$178,500" and insert "$188,500, of which $10,000 shall be immediately available," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, $188,500, of which $10,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if there is any special purpose for which this $10,000 is to be used; and I will state to the Senator the reason why I ask the question.

I have received several telegrams from people in my State, and in other States in the West interested in apple production, in which they refer to the cutting out by the House of an appropriation of $10,000 to take care of the codling-moth situation, and I wondered if the $10,000 which the committee has put in here was intended to take care of that situation?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Oregon will answer.

Mr. McNARY. It was the intention of the committee to care for the suggestion made by the Senator from Washington at another place, under the general subject of the destruction and study of the habits of moths, I think on page 54.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I remember that I spoke to the Senator with reference to taking care of this item there, yet when I saw the language in this place—"for investigation of insects affecting deciduous trees, orchards, vineyards, nuts, and so forth"—and then saw this appropriation of $10,000, to be immediately available, I wondered if the committee, in considering the matter, was really intending to take care of that situation by this appropriation. I thought it would be a very good place to do it, and a very proper way to do it.

Mr. McNARY. I can say to the Senator from Washington that the committee thought it should be inserted on page 54, after line 16, which deals with the prevention of the spread of moths. That covers the subject of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth, and it was thought the codling moth might well come in there, and out of that appropriation, without increasing it a dollar, three pests would be cared for.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a notation made of that kind, and that is where I was intending to offer an amendment until I saw this provision.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator having this matter in charge if the increase of $10,000, which is made immediately available, is not to cover a deficit that has already been made?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have the notes of the department here as to that.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator read them, please?

Mr. GRONNA. Which particular item is it to which the Senator refers?

Mr. SMOOT. For investigation of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, at the bottom of page 52.

Mr. McNARY. That is for peach blight.

Mr. GRONNA. That is an additional amount for peach blight. It is for an insect investigation in the South and in California, wherever they raise peaches.

Mr. SMOOT. I expected that was what the money was to be used for; but what I wanted to know was whether this $10,000, to be made immediately available, is not to take care of money they have already expended over and above what was appropriated last year?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may interject, I understand it is not for that purpose, but it is to be available immediately to be used for the extermination of the peach blight, which affects the tender leaves of peach trees along early in the spring, after the blossoming period; and that season is approaching in the Southern States and in California. The money was to be made immediately available, on the passing of this measure, so that it could be used in experimentation and study of the destruction caused by that blight.

Mr. GRONNA. I might say to the Senator from Utah that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] introduced a special bill appropriating $10,000 for this purpose. But I will read what the department has to say on it:

It is understood that this item has already been covered by an amendment to H. R. 15812, an amendment introduced by Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, for investigation of peach insects in Georgia. An appropriation was originally requested by the department in order to undertake work against the plum curculio in Georgia. The situation is acute, and unless energetic measures are taken to meet it the pest will undoubtedly cause serious injury to the Georgia peach-growing industry.

So it can not be said to be a deficiency at all. It is for new work.

Mr. FLETCHER. Was not the estimate $198,500?

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we ought to increase it by $10,000.

Mr. SMOOT. It has been increased by $10,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This additional $10,000 was added to meet a recommendation of the Department of Agriculture on an appeal from the agricultural department of Georgia to give active help at once to meet insect attacks upon peach orchards. This provision making it immediately available was, I think, inserted at my request in the committee, and it was done in compliance with the request of the State authorities. The Department of Agriculture recommended it and the department of Georgia had brought to their attention the necessity for immediate action, the loss last year having exceeded $2,000,000.

Mr. GRONNA. As I understand it, the work must be done now or there will be no crop this year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not go into it technically, but I read the appeal from the State and I read the report of the Department of Agriculture, and was satisfied it was entirely meritorious.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, all I wanted to know was that this $10,000 was not added to the appropriation and made immediately available to cover a deficit. I will say to the Senator that that often happens. Departments spend all their appropriations, then they find themselves short ten, twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty thousand dollars, and in some appropriation made for that same specific purpose in the coming fiscal year they say so much shall be appropriated and made immediately available.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was not the case with reference to this appropriation. I presented the evidence from the agricultural department of the State and the peach growers' association, and I also called attention to the recommendation of the Agricultural Department here. They asked for more, but the view in my own State was that $10,000 was all that could be used. They have raised a fund for the purpose also. The peach growers have raised a fund, and by supplementing that with the appropriation of $10,000 the work can be done.

Mr. GRONNA. It is not for a deficiency; it is for new work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 3, after the words "chinch bug," to strike out "$175,660" and insert "$200,000," "*Provided*, That not less than $50,000 shall be used for investigating methods for the control and eradication of the grasshopper;" so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly, grasshopper, and the chinch bug, $200,000: *Provided*, That not less than $50,000 shall be used for investigating methods for the control and eradication of the grasshopper.

Mr. POMERENE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how he expects to control grasshoppers?

Mr. GRONNA. This is not a new question to those who have been unfortunate enough to have grasshoppers. Instead of $50,000, we ought to have $200,000.

Mr. POMERENE. I am calling attention rather to the phraseology than anything else. I believe in the eradication of the grasshopper; I believe in doing anything to destroy him, but why the word "control"? I move to strike out the words "control and," so that it will read: "Methods for the eradication of the grasshopper."

Mr. GRONNA. This is the language which is always used to provide appropriations for controlling and eradicating insects and pests. It is not new language at all. Of course, I have no serious objection to the Senator's amendment, if you can eradicate them. That is the only way you can control them.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I take issue with the chairman. I think it is proper language. When you control a pest you localize it, or keep it within a zone. That is all "control" means. If you can keep it in a particular district, so that it will not spread, you are controlling it, and the prevention of its spread is sometimes the most effective way of eradication.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows that we appropriated $500,000 for the control and eradication of the corn borer, and no one found any fault with that. We are appropriating a large sum of money this year for the control of the corn borer.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not know whether the word "control" is proper or whether it was used. I am not finding fault with the appropriation here; I am simply calling attention to the phraseology.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not care anything about it, either one way or the other.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we have a great many grasshoppers in the State of Utah, and the only way to get rid of them is to get the men out to fight them and eradicate them. You can not do it by appropriating money and talking about it. You must just get out a machine and go to work in the field at the proper time, when they come, and drive them in the creek and drown them, or else drive them into a trench and cover them over, or catch them and burn them up. Those are the only methods by which you can eradicate them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 10, after the words "Argentine ant," to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$175,000," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, $175,000, of which sum $25,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 12, after the word "forests," to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$65,000," and also the following proviso: "*Provided*, That $25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to forest trees on and near the national forests, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with States, counties, municipalities, or with private owners," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting forests, $65,000: *Provided*, That $25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to forest trees on and near the national forests, independnetly or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with States, counties, municipalities, or with private owners.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I would like to inquire why this amendment is inserted?

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Oregon to explain it to the Senator from Delaware. It was his amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I offered the amendment in the committee for the purpose of meeting a very serious situation which obtains in the Pacific Coast States. Recently a new bug has appeared in the forests, known as the pine beetle. It is found in the national forests to a very large extent. I have sufficient data to convince the Senator from Delaware that this beetle is doing more to destroy the mature and partially mature forests of the West than any other insect or any other cause, save the loss by fire.

A few years ago this beetle was not known, but now it is a very common infestation; in fact, 15 per cent of the trees of the forests of the West are infected with this disease. Private industry is doing a tremendous lot to control the disease and to eradicate it. This appropriation is to be used in cooperation with private institutions, individuals, and States in the eradication of the pine beetle upon Government land.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The language is:

That $25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to forest trees on and near the national forests.

It struck me, upon the reading, that this was a proposition to appropriate Federal money to protect forest trees of private individuals, and why should the Government do that?

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that the term "national forests" does not include the Indian reservations and other places owned by the Government. In the southern part of Oregon are to be found some of the finest agricultural lands in the world. That is found not in the national forests but on the Indian reservations, and I think the Senator can recall, on a moment's reflection, how near an Indian reservation comes to being governmental property.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, yes; but may I ask the Senator if it is the purpose of this amendment to have the money spent only upon forests that are on Government property?

Mr. McNARY. The Senator must well know, on further reflection, that when the private interests are spending more money than the Government to prevent the spread from the forests owned privately to the Government forests it becomes a national enterprise.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I did not catch that.

Mr. McNARY. I say, private interests are spending thousands of dollars to eradicate and control the pine beetle and other pests which affect the forests, and if it is discovered on private property, the Government will join with the private individuals to prevent it from spreading to the Government forests.

In the fire-prevention provision of this bill, and all other agricultural appropriation bills which have come before Congress for years, the Government, in cooperation with the States and individuals, has expended thousands of dollars to prevent the spread of fires on private lands; upon the theory that that is protecting directly the national forests, and protecting one of the great resources of the country. So, in this instance, when there is infestation on private land located near Government land, it is proper for the Government to cooperate with the individuals to prevent the spread of this injurious beetle to the Government forests. It is an assurance against great destruction, and that is the reason upon which a provision of this kind is founded.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can very readily see, then, some rather plausible reason for the insertion of the amendment. When the Senator stated to me that the forests on which it was proposed to spend the appropriation were forests upon Indian reservations, and therefore upon Government property, and the appropriation therefor eminently proper, it seems to me he was not exactly representing the whole situation, because it turns out upon further inquiry from the Senator that it is contemplated that some of the money shall be spent to do work upon private property. There may be some justification for that in the reason the Senator has suggested, namely, that the private property is contiguous to the Government-owned property.

Mr. McNARY. Let me call the Senator's attention to an appropriation which follows, a part of which is undoubtedly used in his State, for preventing the spread of moths, $400,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But the sum appropriated in the amendment to which I am referring is only $25,000.

Mr. McNARY. I am calling the Senator's attention to an item on page 54, to prevent the spread of moths, all of which money is used in the Eastern States on privately owned lands, the appropriation being $400,000. Has the Senator any objection to that item? Does he desire to change the policy of the Government?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator certainly can not understand English if he confuses such language as that. The language in the paragraph on page 54, starting with line 16, is:

> To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths, by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects.

Whereas the amendment he is seeking to have incorporated asks the United States Government to spend money to fight, by fumigation or whatnot, insects on private property.

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator from Delaware that if he understood the proposition he would not make that statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand what has been referred to.

Mr. McNARY. That provision refers to localizing the gypsy moth, which is infesting privately owned shrubbery and trees in the East and is something to be eradicated by spraying, but no one is advocating the saving of the wonderful forests in the West by spraying.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know the method. The Senator is proposing an appropriation of $25,000, not to study methods of exterminating the pest, but to spend $25,000 to prevent and combat the pest. If this were an appropriation of $25,000 for the purpose of investigating methods of exterminating the pest, then the appropriation would be in entire harmony with the whole scheme of the pest investigation.

I will state what prompted me to make the inquiry. There is an item in the bill "for investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts." My contention is that the amendment under consideration should be worded the same, and not "for preventing and combating infestations of insects." There is another item for the investigation of insects affecting truck crops, and an item for the investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, and so forth, but when we come to the amendment under consideration we find "that $25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects." In the other cases the appropriation is for studying methods to combat, but when we come to these insects attacking the forests we are asked to appropriate money not for the purpose of investigating methods to combat the insects, but to appropriate $25,000 for the purpose of preventing and combating infestations and to provide that the Government may do so independently or in cooperation with States, counties, municipalities, or private interests.

Therefore, it occurs to me that this particular appropriation is somewhat out of line with the whole series of appropriations. I can see why the United States Government, if it has a valuable forest or reservation, should in the protection of its property perhaps go on the property of private individuals and spend some money combating the advance of an insect which, if it comes over on the Government property, will cause an impairment of Government values there. But at the same time the Government is protecting its property, it is doing a benefit to the private individual who owns the adjoining property, and why should not that private individual pay something, too?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think, if the Senator will reflect, he will find no objection whatever to the appropriation. Out West we are obliged to combat destructive forest fires. There is a forest fire raging in the vicinity in which I have some property, for instance. It is not on my property at all, but it may reach there, and so I join with all my neighbors and we throw in together and establish a fund and go out to put out that fire. It is not raging on our properties or on the property of any of us, but nevertheless we have contributed. So the Government of the United States contributes jointly with the States and individual owners of property to extinguish forest fires lest they should destroy property of the Government.

So with the insect pests. They spread, they multiply, they are upon property adjacent to the national forests, property regarded as highly valuable. If they are allowed to spread without restriction, they will undoubtedly eventually embrace and include in their devastations the forests belonging to the Government upon the forest reserves. Why is it not entirely proper for the Government to make an appropriation to join with sums appropriated by the owners of private lands and by the States, the owners of lands also, to combat this peril?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say that exactly the last reasoning of the Senator has occurred to me, and I do not take issue with him, but I wish to call the Senator's attention to one fact. This is not a proposition that the Government must, if it does anything at all, cooperate with these particular bodies, because the language is that the Government may independently of private owners do this work. I say, regardless of the high opinion I have for the Senator's judgment, that if the United States Government is going to go out and clean up the forest lands of private parties of an infectious insect, that while it is protecting itself and benefiting itself, it is doing a great good to the private party and it ought to be a cooperative scheme. Therefore I desire to move to eliminate from the amendment the words "independently or," and make it purely a cooperative situation.

Mr. McNARY. If that amendment should prevail it would prevent the Government from exterminating the beetle on its own land.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let the Government fight it when it gets on its own lands, then. If private parties have forests and will not help the Government exterminate the beetle until it advances, then let it eat up the private forests and let the Government fight it when it gets on the Government property.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to state to the Senator from Delaware that it affects thousands and millions of trees on Government lands of the West to-day, and in fighting the amendment he is causing a great loss to the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not attacking the amendment. I am sure the amendment will go through, regardless of what I may say or do. The Senator stated that private parties have spent a great deal of money in this work. What I object to is that they do not spend it in cooperation with the Government.

Mr. McNARY. That shows the Senator's spirit. A spirit is found in the West in all these cooperative movements which can not be found in all the States of the East. I have a letter from the Klamath County Chamber of Commerce, in Oregon, where Government timber is located, from which I read:

> The timbermen state that investigations covering this country show that from 1 to 10 per cent of the standing timber is being destroyed and that the ravages of this pest are rapidly gaining. For instance, in 10 years preceding 1918 there was perhaps 6 per cent of the timber killed, while during the last 2 years the amount has been increased to 15 per cent. The timbermen state that they are willing to take care of the destroying of this pest on their own land, but that this work is almost useless unless they receive the cooperation of the Government on the Government lands and on the Indian reservations and the national forest reserves.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the appropriation is estimated for?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I find that there was an estimate for $67,000. I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware if it is his understanding that the amount appropriated for the eradication of the corn borer is not expended on private lands and that it is only for the study of it and not for the actual eradication of the insect?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The language of the corn-borer appropriation is:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the spread of the European corn borer, and to provide means for the control and prevention of spread of this insect throughout the United States, in cooperation with the States concerned, including employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $275,000.

The language there is "in cooperation with States concerned." I am asking that this appropriation be put on the same basis. Let it be done in cooperation with private owners. I am not opposing the idea of the appropriation going through, but let it be put on the same terms with other appropriations in the same category. I object to the words "independently or" in this particular appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator must know that this is a different situation. A large portion of the appropriations will, of course, be expended in the national forests, but suppose there is vacant Government land adjoining a national forest not owned by individuals but owned by the National Government? That would not be a national forest; and there are hundreds of thousands of such cases as that. I am really surprised that the Senator from Delaware should criticize the language. Of what value would it be to the forests if the Federal Government should destroy the insects in the national forests and then have them attacked again by the same class of insects located on the lands surrounding them, either other Government lands or privately owned lands?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is entirely proper, I will say to the Senator, for the Government to be allowed to spend money on the forests and upon Indian lands owned by the Government adjoining forest reservations. I would not object to a change to that effect.

Mr. GRONNA. What about Government lands?

Mr. WOLCOTT. What I am objecting to is that the language leaves it open for the Government of its own accord to spend money to eradicate the pest on privately owned lands. That is all I am objecting to. I want to make it so as to keep it particularly within the idea that the Government shall make expenditures on its own property, or, if it does it on property owned by private individuals, they shall bear some part of the expense. Therefore I move to strike out the words "independently or."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I believe——

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not know the Senator from North Dakota had the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to suggest that it does not seem possible that a case could arise where there would not be cooperation in this work, for an individual owning a forest adjoining a national forest or a Government reservation would certainly be willing to cooperate with the Government to the extent of his own labor and time anyway. This leaves it wide open for the Government to say what sort of cooperation it will require. I do not believe the Senator from North Dakota would find that striking out the words "independently or" would hamper the operation of the section.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have some further amendments which I desire to offer if the amendment to the amendment now being considered should be adopted.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Delaware is evidently not familiar with the conditions in some of the Western States. There are still Government lands, and perhaps on some of those Government lands are homestead settlers, but the land still belongs to the Government until the claims have been proven up.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that eliminating the words "independently or" from the amendment would not prevent the employment of these funds for combating pests on other Government-owned land; that is to say, on Indian-reservation land.

Mr. GRONNA. But a national forest is one thing and Government land is another.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand, but the elimination of the words I am suggesting would not prevent the employment of this money for combating pests on Government lands at any time.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that it might if the lands were held by homestead settlers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the title to the land which the homestead settlers occupy is still in the Government, then, I say to the Senator, he is wrong in his point of view, because the language of the amendment is:

* * * for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to trees on and near the national forests.

I have moved to amend by striking out the words immediately following "independently or"—

in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government—

And so forth.

The money may still be spent "in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government" under the express terms of the amendment. So, with all due deference to the Senator's judgment, I think he is in error when he thinks that eliminating the words which I suggest to strike out would prevent the expenditure of money on other Government-owned lands within the national forests.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Senator from Delaware; I know he is a good lawyer, and, as a common, ordinary hayseed, I dislike to oppose him or to put up my judgment against his; but I am more familiar with this situation than is the Senator from Delaware.

Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that we are appropriating in this bill $400,000—for what? For the control and eradication of insect pests on Government land? No; but on lands in the New England States for the control and eradication of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth. The bill also carries $100,000 for the white pine blister rust. Where is white pine blister rust found? In the New England States. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate increased the appropriation for white pine blister rust to $214,000. So I will say to the Senator that I hardly think we can split hairs as to the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" when it comes to small appropriations of $25,000 for the protection of national forests. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be voted down, and that the committee amendment may then be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. In the next item, beginning in line 19, on page 53, when it is in order, I propose to submit an amendment increasing the appropriation from $110,000 to $150,000. I am calling attention to the clause now, and I will ask the chairman of the committee in the meantime to consider the amendment which I intend to propose. I think a mistake has been made by confining the appropriation to the sum of $110,000. As I have stated, the amendment is not now in order, but when it is in order I am going to move to increase the appropriation from $110,000 to $150,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only committee amendments are in order at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that, but I wanted to give the notice of my intention to move to amend the text of the bill in that respect at the proper time.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 54, line 2, after the word "subtropical," to strike out "plants" and insert "fruits, including plants," and in line 5, after the word "Board," to strike out "$51,500" and insert "$60,000," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting citrus and other tropical and subtropical fruits, including plants, and for investigations and control of the Mediterranean and other fruit flies and the camphor thrip, in cooperation with the Federal Horticultural Board, $60,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like a word of explanation regarding the proposed amendment which has just been stated, from which it appears that some insect is interfering with the production of camphor.

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to give a satisfactory explanation of the amendment to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the insect referred to in this amendment, the camphor thrip, is one which threatens the young camphor trees as they grow up. It is something on the same order as the white fly, the black fly, and insects of that kind, which attack the leaves and the body of the young trees. The camphor industry has gotten to be quite an important one. As the Senator from Colorado knows, we have been very largely dependent on Formosa and Japan for camphor.

Mr. THOMAS. We produce it now synthetically.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is now being produced synthetically to a considerable extent; but in Florida we have several groves of 2,000 or 3,000 acres, and I believe one contains 10,000 acres, where they are producing the trees. They clip the young growth of the tree each year and distill from that the gum. They do not cut down the tree, as is done in Japan, and distill the tree itself, but they clip off the young growth each year and distill that, so as to make the camphor gum. That has got to be quite an important industry. The camphor thrip is an insect which has appeared and which is seriously threatening the growth of the industry. The State, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, and private industry are cooperating with the Government. A very small portion of this appropriation goes to the investigation of the camphor thrip. I think the estimate was for $66,500 for the items covered by the paragraph.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not objecting to it; but I was a little curious to know what it meant.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the estimate was for $66,500. I will ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think we ought to increase the appropriation to $66,500? The committee has only raised the House appropriation by $8,500.

Mr. GRONNA. No; I do not think we should increase the appropriation. The committee considered this matter very carefully and was unanimously of the opinion, as I remember, that the $60,000 would be sufficient for this year.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am willing to abide by the judgment of the committee, although I really think they should have made it $66,500.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to have been a narrow escape for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 54, line 10, after the word "insects," to strike out "$52,330" and insert "$70,000: *Provided*, That $17,000 shall be used for investigations of the blow fly and screw worm," so as to read:

For investigations, identification, and systematic classification of miscellaneous insects, including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, household insects, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, $70,000: *Provided*, That $17,000 shall be used for investigations of the blow fly and screw worm.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 15, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Entomology from "$795,670" to "$906,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology from "$1,599,940" to "$1,710,450."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 11, after the word "appropriated" in line 10, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$7,500"; and in line 11, after the word "expended," to insert "of which $2,500 shall be used for the construction of new buildings," so as to read:

For the improvement and maintenance of the game preserve in Sullys Hill National Park, in the State of North Dakota, including the construction of all fences, sheds, buildings, corrals, roads, shelters, and other structures which may be necessary for the protection of game or for the use of visitors, in addition to the amount heretofore appropriated, $7,500, the same to be available until expended; of which $2,500 shall be used for the construction of new buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 20, after the words "ground squirrels," to insert "jack rabbits"; and, in line 24, after the word "animals," to strike out "$452,240" and insert "$550,000," so as to read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and other animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with rearing fur-bearing animals; for experiments, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, bobcats, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, jack rabbits, and other animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wild game; and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies in predatory wild animals, $550,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 7, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Biological Survey from "$714,755" to "$815,015."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Biological Survey from "$795,825" to "$896,085"; also on page 59, line 14, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "4" and insert "5"; in line 15, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "13" and insert "14"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," in line 16, to strike out "$51,220" and insert "$54,020," so as to read:

Salaries, Division of Accounts and Disbursements: Chief of division and disbursing clerk, $4,000; supervising auditor, $2,250; cashier and chief clerk, $2,250; deputy disbursing clerk, $2,000; accountant and bookkeeper, $2,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 7 of class 2, 14 of class 1, two at $1,000 each; messenger, $720; messenger boy, $600; in all, $54,020.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think it is about time to stop increasing the number of employees in the departments. In the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, in which the salaries of a great majority of the employees are provided for, we tried to begin to retrench a little and cut off employees where that was possible, and in no case did we add to their number. I know, of course, that the head of the Division of Accounts and Disbursements will ask for more clerks and will continue so to do just so long as the Government lasts; but really does not the Senator believe that we ought to decrease the number of employees in the District of Columbia? There are about 87,000 of them now, whereas before the war the number ran from forty to forty-three thousand.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am in perfect accord with the Senator from Utah, and he knows from my work on the Committee on Appropriations with him, that I make every effort possible to save every dollar that can be saved; but this item—and I want to be frank with the Senator—is for Mr. Zappone. He can not possibly do the work unless the additional help is given him. I sent a special representative to his division, and I am absolutely certain from the information that was brought to me that the additional employees are necessary. They were estimated for, but were not allowed in the House. I hesitated, and the committee hesitated, to insert the provision, but after investigation it was found that it was necessary. I do not believe it is economy to deny the head of this division the proper help; I believe it is rather in the interest of economy to grant him what he needs. The Senator knows that there ought to be a reorganization of all the executive departments and that it is a difficult matter for us to .it in these particular places; but until the general reorganization is brought about we must give the head of this division the help which is absolutely required.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, nobody wants to deprive any department of the help that is really required, but that does not mean to give them what they ask for. If we gave all the departments of the Government the number of clerks which they ask we would have 150,000 employees in the District of Columbia. We will never get rid of any of them so long as we continue to appropriate for them; that is one thing sure. I thought now that conditions are getting back to normal, the war having been over for two years and a half, that we ought, while providing an adequate number of employees, to make those who are employed do a fair day's work.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to say for Mr. Zappone that during the present winter he and and his force have, to my knowledge, worked as late as 2 o'clock in the morning. I know that to be a fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Was that for once or more than once?

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, no; that happens very frequently. There is a tremendous amount of work for these men to do.

Mr. SMOOT. What has caused that extra work, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. GRONNA. There is nothing new about it. These men have been overworked not only during this session of Congress, but during the last session of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I am going down to that division of the department, for I should like to see it.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will do so.

Mr. SMOOT. If what the Senator says is true, it is the only place under the Government departments that I know anything about where the employees are overworked.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows I would not state it if it were not so.

Mr. SMOOT. I take the Senator's statement for granted, and that is the reason I am going down there, because I should like to see one department of our Government whose clerks are overworked. I do not know but that it would take my breath away to find such a condition. I know that I got a letter the other morning saying that when I entered one of the departments the other day a man who stood at the door immediately telephoned to every division there, "Get to work, and be at your typewriters. Senator SMOOT is coming."

Mr. President, I know one division of our Government where it is absolutely true that the ladies of the department made their trousseaus in the office during working hours. If the work is to be done in the same way that it is now going on, and there

is to be no change, we might just as well make up our minds that we can double the number of employees. Washington is a delightful place to live in. Girls receiving salaries of sixteen and eighteen hundred dollars, with a $240 bonus, have plenty of time to go to the theater and do fancy work during working hours. Who would want to give it up?

I am glad, however, to hear the Senator from North Dakota say that in this division it is different. I think if they are we ought to make special provision for them and give everyone of them a chromo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 59, line 20, in the items for salaries for Division of Publications, to insert "assistant editor, $2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 17, to increase the salaries for the Division of Publications from "$252,180" to "$254,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 20, after the numerals "$11,380," to insert "of which sum $3,000 shall be used for salaries of employees engaged in the distribution of bulletins," so as to read:

For extra labor and emergency employments in the District of Columbia, $11,380, of which sum $3,000 shall be used for salaries of employees engaged in the distribution of bulletins.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I have to ask a question about this amendment, due to the fact that I could not attend the later meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. What is the nature of the work of these employees with respect to distribution? The amendment says "engaged in the distribution of bulletins."

Mr. GRONNA. This does not increase the appropriations, as the Senator will observe, but it is for the purpose of furnishing extra help to distribute the bulletins. As it is to-day, what may be called picture shows have been held. I have no objection to that if it does not cost too much money and if it is for the purpose of educating the people throughout the country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. These people are employed in the District of Columbia, however, are they not?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; these people are employed in the District of Columbia, and for that reason the committee saw fit to direct that so much money shall be used for this particular purpose, because we thought it would be of more benefit to the people all over the country to get these bulletins, and to have the extra help required to distribute them, than to have these shows that I have mentioned.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I see. Then, as I understand, these people would be employed in keeping track of the mailing lists, folding, and sending out bulletins?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; that is what the amendment is for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 61, line 24, to increase the total appropriation for Division of Publications from "$380,110" to "$382,110."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 12, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "$61,500" and insert "$81,500," so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of the above acts and the act approved May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," relative to their administration and for the administration of agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, including the employment of clerks, assistants, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, freight and express charges, official traveling expenses, office fixtures, supplies, apparatus, telegraph and telephone service, gas, electric current, and rent outside of the District of Columbia, $81,500.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator why that increase is granted

Mr. GRONNA. The increase is to take care of certain matters in the dependencies. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] can explain the need for it better than I can. Some of it goes to the island of Guam, I believe, but I think most of it goes to the Virgin Islands. I will turn to the estimates.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not understand that most of it goes to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. GRONNA. I refer to the increase.

Mr. KENYON. The appropriation was raised last year to enlarge the experiment station in the Virgin Islands. I do not remember now whether it was $5,000 or $10,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). 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 Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 68, line 24, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the States Relations Service from "$4,640,980" to "$4,660,980."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 25, to increase the total appropriation for the States Relations Service from "$4,837,300" to "$4,857,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 3, before the word "draftsman," to strike out "one," and in line 11, before the word "mechanician," to strike out "one," so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Public Roads: Chief of bureau, $6,000; purchasing agent, $2,500; draftsman or clerk, $1,920; clerks or editorial clerks—1 $1,600, 1 $1,200; clerks or photographers—1 $1,440, 1 $1,200, 1 $1,000; clerk or instrument maker, $1,200; clerk or skilled laborer, $1,000; instrument maker, $1,800; model maker, $1,800; clerks—1 $1,900, 4 of class 4, 7 of class 3, 3 at $1,500 each, 6 of class 2, 9 at $1,320 each, 7 of class 1, 4 at $1,100 each, 2 at $1,000 each; mechanician, $1,680; mechanics—1 $2,100, 1 $1,800, 1 $1,500, 1 $1,200; skilled laborer, $1,200; skilled laborer or mechanic, $840; laboratory aid, $960; telephone operator, $720; mimeograph operator, $840; 2 laborers at $900 each; messengers or laborers—2 at $840 each, 2 at $660 each, 4 at $600 each; 4 messengers, laborers, or laboratory helpers at $720 each; fireman, $720; messenger boys—3 at $600 each, 8 at $480 each; 11 charwomen at $240 each; in all, $114,460.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, is not the word "one" necessary there? It says in the case of the first amendment "draftsman or clerk," and I notice that a number of them read in the same way.

Mr. GRONNA. That was a mistake of the printing office. We just struck out the word "one."

Mr. SMOOT. I presume it will amount to the same thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 70, line 11, to increase the appropriation for inquiries in regard to systems of road management and economic studies of highway construction, operation, maintenance, etc., from "$50,000" to "$61,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 9, to increase the appropriation for investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice, etc., from "$62,440" to "$72,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the $72,000 appropriated for investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation belongs under the Bureau of Public Roads? This appropriation and the one at the bottom of page 71 and the one at the top of page 72 are all printed under that heading in the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. In the totals, too.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; and they are in the totals.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that it seems that these items have been carried under the heading "Bureau of Public Roads."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the director of the bureau supervise this work in farm irrigation?

Mr. GRONNA. I presume he does.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is he supposed to know about it?

Mr. GRONNA. It would take quite a while to tell the Senator what he is supposed to know about it. The Senator was present last year when the Agricultural bill was taken up, and he will remember how very much the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was interested in this very item. He considered it very valuable and of very great importance. I confess that I do not know as much about it as other Senators do, but it is not a new item. It has been carried in the bill for a number of years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I realize it is not a new item.

Mr. McNARY. I think the criticism of the Senator from New York goes to the propriety of carrying it under this head.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. I want to know who supervises this work.

Mr. McNARY. It comes under the Bureau of Public Roads. That may be unfortunate. It is for arid lands, where water is

not available. We often impound water in large reservoirs in the mountains. It is for the purpose of discovering water veins and bringing them to the surface and irrigating dry lands. It is an increase of $9,560 over the House appropriation. A wonderful work is being done in some of the semiarid States, and it was thought that it should be continued. Possibly it is unfortunate that it comes under this head, but it would be more unfortunate, in my judgment, knowing something of western conditions, if this item should be decreased or omitted from the bill. But I repeat that I think the objection of the Senator from New York is as to its location in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. All this money is spent under the Bureau of Public Roads. It is only another example of the duplication of work that is going on. I do not think Senators know that we have 27 engineering divisions in our Government instead of having one. I hope the reorganization commission will rectify some of it, but I do not know how long, even if it is rectified, it will remain so. Somebody on the Committee on Agriculture thought they wanted a little more money for the utilization of water on farms in farm irrigation, and this is about the only place they could put it in this bill, and therefore it went in under the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah, who certainly is conversant with western irrigation projects, if he thinks the chief engineer of the Reclamation Service should do this work on farms rather than the Bureau of Farm Management in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. SMOOT. This subject ought to be under the Interior Department. All of it ought to be appropriated for under that department and all of it ought to be done by one engineering board.

Mr. McNARY. That may be true, but it is not so handled.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it is not, and that is why I am complaining about it.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator want to stop a good and meritorious work simply because it is not classified as he thinks it should be?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I want to take it out of this place and put it where it belongs, not having two different bureaus, with different employees, making different reports about the same project. The Senator from New York is perfectly right in asking the question as to why this is under the Public Roads Bureau. It never ought to be there. It ought to be under the Interior Department, and the appropriations ought to be made under that department, and they should be increased, if necessary, to cover the work; but the work should be done under the control of one department.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, perhaps both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Utah are right, that it ought to be done in the Department of the Interior; but it is not done there. This is an increase of only $9,560 over the bill as passed by the House, and I want to read what the department has to say with reference to this item:

The States are also contributing funds and cooperating with the department, and this fact is indicative of the practical value of these investigations to the States which have to depend largely upon irrigation for the production of foodstuffs. The Department of Agriculture is the only Federal agency engaged in research work in irrigation practices and methods. Studies of the movement of soil moisture so far made have revealed the fact that there is a great dearth of information regarding this subject. These investigations, the results of which are of such great practical value to the irrigation farmer, should be resumed and extended. In the past several years an investigation of the flow of water in various forms of irrigation conduits has been made to determine the friction losses, the results of which have had valuable application to irrigation systems. These studies so far have covered irrigation canals, wood pipe, and concrete pipe, and should be enlarged to include various kinds of metal pipes and flumes. Problems in the handling of silt-laden irrigation water and the removal of silt deposits should be investigated, and greater attention should be given to the proper design and economical operation of pumping plants.

I think that is a justification for it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can go now to the public-document room and get reports from the Reclamation Service, from the Forest Service, and from the Geological Survey, and in those reports will be found statements that they are making just such examinations as are recorded here. Who is there from the West who does not know that the Forest Service have had men taking the flow of the streams every day in the month for years and years past? Who is there who does not know that the question of the friction caused in a water power pipe line is not being considered by the Reclamation Service, and also now by the Water Power Commission?

Mr. GRONNA. This is for the whole country.

Mr. SMOOT. So are the other appropriatoins for the whole country. It can only apply, however, where there is irrigation.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator where he wants it placed in the bill, then, if it is in the wrong place?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not in the proper bill. But I am not going to propose a change now. I hope, however, that some time or other we will have a complete reorganization and prevent the granting of appropriations to three or four different departments to do exactly the same work. It is too costly. If the Senator ran his farm or his bank or his business that way, he would go broke; and there is no difference between the business of a Senator of the United States and the Government of the United States, except as to the size and the resources. I want to say that the way we are going now, Mr. President, in dividing up the work that ought to be done by one department into four or five, perhaps the Government will go broke in the end.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask the Senator from Utah, is there any means available for this in the reclamation fund? What is the purpose of that fund? It is to bring water on the land, and not to study these farm problems, which properly come under farm management.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, every reclamation project is gone into thoroughly before it is ever recommended by the Reclamation Service. They stay upon every stream, they gauge it for years and years. I can go into the Reclamation Service to-day and find a record of the flow of every stream they have ever recommended for reclamation projects for the last 20 years.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah shows again that he is not familiar with the purpose of this amendment. I think I know as much about one subject as he does, and that is reclamation, and how it is practiced in the West; and I say to the Senator with absolute confidence and certainty that there is no work done by the Reclamation Service comparable to this work outlined here, which carries $72,000.

Mr. BORAH. What is this work?

Mr. SMOOT. To determine the flow of water.

Mr. McNARY. Let the Senator from Utah tell the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I have yielded to higher and more experienced authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply desire to say, Mr. President, that the chairman of the committee read a statement from an official of the Government what this appropriation was for and what was to be done with it, and that showed that it was for ascertaining the flow of water in the streams; and I say that not only does the Reclamation Service collect that information and have it at the disposal of every citizen of the United States who may ask for it, but so has the Forest Service and so has the Geological Survey.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Reclamation Service collect this data outside of the arid region?

Mr. SMOOT. This is only for irrigation purposes. It says:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation.

So it could be only where there was irrigation.

Mr. BORAH. There is no motion to transfer it, is there?

Mr. SMOOT. No; not at all.

Mr. McNARY. Farm irrigation, as it is practiced, includes grouping of farms into units known as irrigation districts. That is one kind of farm irrigation about which these studies are made. This item includes farm irrigation on the farm as a unit, where the water can not be brought upon it through reservoirs or conduits, but must be had through springs or through the piping of water from the direct flow of rivers and streams or the boring of wells. It is a different proposition, not comprehended in any way under the general scheme of reclamation by the Secretary of the Interior or his subordinates, and is properly a function of the Department of Agriculture, in my judgment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the sundry civil appropriation bill which has just passed this body there was an appropriation made specifically for boring wells in the arid States of the West. The first appropriation made for that purpose was in the State of Nevada, and the appropriations have grown from that time, so that it covers all of the intermountain States—that is, the semiarid States of the West. The money is being used for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 11, to insert:

For supervising the preparation, distribution, and use of picric acid, trinitrotoluol, trojan powder, and such other surplus war explosives as may be made available for use in clearing stumps and stones from agricultural land, independently or in cooperation with agricultural colleges and other agencies, and for investigating and reporting upon the results obtained from the use of the explosives, $15,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill why the word "preparation," in line 12, was inserted?

Mr. GRONNA. This item was inserted at the request of the Senators from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. As I understand it, there are large quantities of explosives owned by the Government——

Mr. THOMAS. That is the reason why I am making the inquiry. What is the need of the Department of Agriculture preparing as well as distributing and using?

Mr. GRONNA. They have to be prepared especially for this purpose. As I understand it, they will be used for blowing out stumps in what we call the cut-over land in those States, and possibly for blasting rock.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not objecting to the appropriation, but the word "preparation" seems to me to be broad enough to include the manufacture of these explosives, which, of course, is beyond the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department, or it ought to be. The distribution and use of picric acid is all right. The preparation of the acid is the equivalent of its manufacture, or it can be so construed, and it will be so construed if you give the department half a chance.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GRONNA. I will read from the department's report, if the Senator will permit me:

The War Department has a surplus of approximately 12,500,000 pounds of picric acid, which is available for distribution by the Department of Agriculture. This explosive is suitable for land-clearing operations, in that it is both effective and safe to handle.

Mr. THOMAS. I am entirely in favor of the amendment so far as the purpose goes. I shall not make any objection, but I think the word "preparation" ought to be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move to strike out that word?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I move to strike out the word "preparation," in line 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee. It will be agreed to in the absence of objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I must object to that. I desire to be heard on it before it is passed upon, and wish to express briefly my objections.

That, I think, is a very important item. I happen to know something about it. I know that the Bureau of Roads has been conducting very important investigations along the line of those provided for in the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator understands that I propose to strike out only one word?

Mr. MYERS. I understand, the word "preparation"; but I assume that the bureau has gotten up the amendment and worded it as it thinks will fit its needs, and as the Bureau of Public Roads has had considerable experience along this line and knows what its needs are for the future it seems to me it would be unwise to interfere with the wording of the amendment. I do not know just how they desire to prepare the explosives, but if they think there is some preparation necessary for the investigations it seems to me it would be wise not to limit them. I do not want the amendment to be adopted unanimously without objection. I wish to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to strike out the word "preparation."

Mr. MYERS. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 72, line 19, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads from "$329,500" to "$365,060."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 20, to increase the total appropriation for Bureau of Public Roads from "$443,960" to "$479,520."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 10, before the words "custodian of supplies," to strike out "one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 11, to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$40,000," so as to read:

That not less than $40,000 shall be used for a study of the methods of prevention of losses by deterioration, decay, and freezing of fruits and vegetables in storage and in transit in refrigerator cars, heater cars, and ocean vessels, including demonstrations of such methods, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 6, after the word "received," to strike out "in interstate commerce"; after line 8 to insert "or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom"; and in line 13, after the word "certificates," to insert "covering interstate shipments," so as to read:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products, when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates covering interstate shipments issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, $175,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the chairman of the committee believe that that amendment ought to be agreed to, striking out the words "in interstate commerce"? In other words, would it not have to be in interstate commerce before we would have any power over it?

Mr. GRONNA. There are times when shipments are made only within the States.

Mr. SMOOT. Within the State it would be intrastate commerce.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator think we have any right to do that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me suggest to the Senator from Utah that it is not an exercise of power or of right. It is simply an investigation on the part of agents of the department. We are not attempting to interfere with the commerce, except to give a certificate as to the condition in which the product may be. We are not confining the activities of the agents of the Department of Agriculture to interstate or intrastate work, so far as that is concerned. I do not think there is any question of power involved.

Mr. SMOOT. The only question in my mind was whether there was a power involved or employed.

Mr. GRONNA. I can read what the department has to say about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that it is not proper. All I say is that if there is a power or even an implied power involved, then it would be wrong to strike out the words.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I suggest to the Senator that in the amendment in line 13, on the same page, relating to certificates which are authorized to be issued, the committee have amended it so that it only covers interstate shipments?

Mr. SMOOT. I think that amendment clears up the one under consideration.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a full explanation if the Senator wants to have it read.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the succeeding amendment will clear it up, although I should like to have the Senator read the explanation and see what it is.

Mr. GRONNA. I read from the report of the committee as follows:

The language of this paragraph has been amended by striking out the words "in interstate commerce," in lines 6 and 7, and inserting the words "or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom," in line 9, and the words "covering interstate shipments," after the word "certificates," in line 13.

The words "in interstate commerce" are recommended to be omitted and "covering interstate shipments" added for the following reasons:

(1) The food products inspection service is permissive and in no way regulatory or mandatory. On this account it in no way interferes with the rights of the citizens of any State. Inspections are made only upon application by interested parties, who gladly pay for the service in order to secure a disinterested statement of the true quality and condition of the product in dispute. No one is compelled to request inspections. Those who have no need for such a service or who do not seek it are not required to accept it.

(2) The fundamental purposes of the inspection service are to facilitate the distribution and marketing of farm produce and to the settlement of disputes as to the quality and condition of the produce and hastening the release of cars used in transporting it. When the service is restricted to interstate shipments, these purposes can be accomplished only in a partial way.

(3) When the service is once established in a market, practically no additional expense is necessary to make inspections of intrastate shipments. The present restriction decreases the fees received and proportionately increases the cost per car inspected.

(4) This service was intended for the protection of all producers who ship their products to distant markets and desire to have the benefit of a reliable disinterested report on their condition upon arrival at market. By restricting inspections to interstate shipments many producers are denied a highly useful service for which they are willing to pay. The reason for such discrimination is not obvious when no such limitation is applied to most of the other activities of the department, through which valuable services are rendered to producers and others.

The insertion of the words "or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom" is desired in the interest of efficiency and convenience. Many inspections can be made at small towns at short distances from large central markets. A service of this character would be a great accommodation to shippers, although in most cases it might not be desirable formally to designate such points as important central markets at which inspections could be made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will permit me, after reading the full paragraph of the bill and noticing the amendment in line

13 of the same paragraph, and taking the two together, it seems to me it is all right.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is the very point to which I wished to call the attention of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. No matter what question arises, that takes care of it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, turning back for a moment to the amendment on page 74, line 11, there is a proviso that not less than $40,000 of the previous appropriation shall be used for the study of the methods and prevention of loss by deterioration, decay, or freezing in fruits, vegetables, and so forth, in storage and in transit. On page 24 there is an appropriation for the investigation and improvement of fruits, the study of the behavior of fruits during the processes of transportation, marketing, and while in commercial storage, $83,200. That would seem on the face of it to be a duplication of appropriations for practically the same purpose. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to that fact. If it is intentional that they should be duplicated, of course, that is a different matter.

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to explain it, as the increase was made at his request.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Colorado is not questioning the increase. He is calling attention to what he thinks is a duplication. I did not clearly catch his statement, however.

Mr. THOMAS. The proviso beginning on line 11, page 74, seems to cover, although in different phraseology, the same purpose for which the appropriation is made on page 24, beginning with line 4, extending down to line 16.

Mr. GRONNA. The item on page 24 is for the investigation and improvement of fruit, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. Is that the item to which the Senator refers?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and then it is followed by the words "studies of the behavior of fruit during the processes of transportation, marketing, and while in commercial storage." The language is different, but the purpose seems to be the same.

Mr. GRONNA. It is for this particular purpose, as I understand it. On the Pacific coast a carload of fruit is loaded, we will say at Seattle. As I understand it, a great deal of that fruit is lost either through chilling or freezing. The appropriation is to be used purposely to study and find out what kind of cars, what kind of lining of cars, and what kind of equipment should be used in shipping the fruit from the West over the Rocky Mountains to the East.

Mr. THOMAS. The purpose may be a good one, and I am not quarreling with that, but I do not think we should make a duplicate appropriation for the same purpose and cover it under a different phraseology.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the provision on page 24, I think, was changed when the word "transportation" came out?

Mr. THOMAS. It was changed by the transposition of the word "transportation" to another place in the sentence.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not remember just what the language was as changed.

Mr. THOMAS. I can give it to the Senator from memory. The word "transportation" was stricken out where it now appears and then inserted after the word "storage" so as to read, "while in commercial storage and transportation."

Mr. WARREN. No; the words inserted were "also the effect of transportation," after the words "commercial storage."

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it applies to a different proposition. It is for a specific purpose. The language on page 74 is more of an enumeration, specifying the particular things that they have in mind to guard against. It may be that the general language might be construed of course to cover it, but there is a great deal of that in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. The word "behavior" on page 24 as applied to fruits and vegetables of course is susceptible of wide application.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is true.

Mr. THOMAS. But it is certainly wide enough to include any of the specific purposes for which the $40,000 appropriation is made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is either wide or narrow, if anyone wishes to place a narrow construction on it.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but the department never puts a very narrow construction upon an appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I agree with the Senator in that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to point out something in the structure of this bill which, I think, is exceedingly faulty. The Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates is not supposed to be a scientific bureau; it is not supposed to carry on scientific investigations. It was established by Congress to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing, and so forth, of farm products, and to collect, publish, and distribute by telegraph, mail, and otherwise timely information on the market supply and demand. It is a statistical bureau. Now we find, however, that on page 74 the bureau is directed to go outside of its sphere as originally intended and to make studies of chemical reactions of fruits and vegetables while in transportation. That duty belongs to the Bureau of Plant Industry, and this appropriation should not be here—it should be under the Plant Industry Bureau—for it is the Plant Industry Bureau that employs the chemists and the laboratory experts and the so-called scientists, all of whom are called "doctor"; but the men under the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates are statisticians; they are reporters of market conditions. They are not supposed to go into laboratories and inspect a rotten apple to find out how it became rotten in transit. That is a chemical undertaking, and should be under the Plant Industry Bureau. We are building up here another bureau of scientific investigation under the heading "Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates," although we already have a bureau of scientific investigation in the department as it is.

I think it very unfortunate that the other House appropriated $326,000 under this heading. It should go under the other heading. Certainly to increase the appropriation $40,000 and simply employ a new group of scientists to investigate the very matter that, according to the Senator from Colorado, is being investigated by another branch of the service is a foolish waste of money. I have no objection whatsoever to the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. I hardly think the Senator from New York will criticize the whole paragraph because the paragraph is very plain. It reads:

> For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products—

Of course, it would be proper to criticize the proviso.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The proviso is what I am criticizing.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator, I think, referred to the whole paragraph. Of course, the Senator knows that this is a very important provision?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes.

Mr. GRONNA. It has to do with the furnishing of crop and market reports, especially as to vegetables. While we are discussing this question, for the good of the order—for that seems to be what it is—I was about, if the Senator from New York is through, to read a letter which I received this morning from one of my constituents. It is a criticism of the work done by the Bureau of Markets, and calls attention to the fact that only certain stations are designated for the purpose of inspection. My correspondent calls attention to certain towns in Illinois. I desire to have the letter read, because it bears directly upon the subject, and I ask that the Secretary read the letter, because he reads so much better than I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *February 18, 1921.*

Senator GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In our business of shipping potatoes, of which we ship between 500 to 1,000 cars each season, we run across many people who take advantage of the market and refuse potatoes on arrival if the market is less than when they purchased them. Then, again, there are others who refuse potatoes because they think they can buy them at a reduction.

Under the Bureau of Markets there has been established what is known as the inspection bureau, which keeps inspectors at the larger trade centers, and which will send inspectors out from these trade centers to inspect potatoes at various points they name. They put out a list of what they call "designated points," to which inspectors will be sent from their regular established office in trade centers.

We do a very large business in the State of Illinois. We run across considerable trouble there. Last fall we had a car refused at Lincoln, Ill., a station about 25 miles north of Springfield, directly intermediate between Springfield and Chicago. The inspection bureau would send a man to Springfield but not to Lincoln, although to reach Springfield he had to go through Lincoln. To go to Chicago he had to go through Lincoln from Springfield.

To-day we have three cars that we have had refused at Decatur. Decatur, by the way, is one of the largest potato markets in the United States. We wired an inspector to go to Decatur from Chicago to inspect these cars. We are advised, as we were last fall, that Decatur is not a designated point, therefore they can not send an inspector; but they would send the same inspector through Decatur to Springfield, a distance of 45 miles farther. To-day we are doing as we did last fall—diverting the cars from Decatur to Springfield, at an expense of about $40 per car.

The object of this letter is to call your attention to the ridiculous ruling of the Bureau of Markets. There is no reason why they should send a man to one point in Illinois and not to another. It is ridiculous that we should have to send a car from Decatur to Springfield to have it inspected. It can not possibly make a difference in the service as long as they have to send an inspector from Chicago.

I feel justified in calling your attention to this and request that you use your best efforts to apply intermediate points between the inspector's office and the designated markets as places where inspections may be made, and that inspections be applied much as freight rates are. For instance, the rate to Chicago on a car of potatoes by the Chicago & Northwestern is 48 cents per hundred. This is a terminal rate, but the same rate applies not only to Chicago but to all intermediate points between Chicago and St. Paul. The same action should be taken as regards inspections, and the rule should be made, and made promptly, to serve shippers justly and equitably, that inspectors may be sent from Chicago to Springfield or any intermediate points, where the time for the inspector to be away from his office would not exceed the time necessary to go from Chicago to Springfield.

Now that the potato movement is in full swing, we would urge that you take this up immediately and see if we can not have some remedy.

Yours, respectfully,

O. J. BARNES CO.
By O. J. BARNES, *President.*

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, again for the purposes of the RECORD—I do not mean to detain the Senate unduly—let me call the attention of the Senate to a provision on page 75. Let us remember that we are appropriating money for the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, but we find there this proviso:

That of the sum thus appropriated $30,000 may be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades and classes of cotton.

Surely that belongs under the Bureau of Plant Industry; it has no business here. We are building up another bureau of plant industry under the heading of "Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator surely is mistaken as to that, for the reason that the item is for the purpose of determining the relative value in the market of the different grades of cotton. It should not come under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry." The same cotton plant produces different grades of cotton, arising from the fact that the cotton is gathered at different times and that which remains in the field any length of time has a different color from that which is promptly harvested. It is desired to make tests, so as to ascertain whether or not the tensile strength of the cotton, which may be somewhat discolored, its bleaching qualities, and its market value are not equal to those of the cotton of the better quality. So this item pertains exactly to the Bureau of Markets, and has nothing to do, as the Senator seems to intimate, with developing a plant that will produce different grades. It has to do with the market value of the article, as expressed in the different grades, some of us believing that there was no appreciable difference on account of the accident of color or of foreign matter in the cotton, as to its tensile strength, its bleaching qualities, and its cloth-making qualities.

I should like to say to the Senator that we had a preliminary investigation of some of the grades in connection with which the dealers had made quite a difference, but as tested out by the Government it was demonstrated that in tensile strength, in bleaching qualities, and in yarn-making and cloth-making qualities the alleged inferior cotton was equal to what were claimed to be higher grades, for which there was a better price obtained.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator from South Carolina is right, then there are some items under the head of the Bureau of Plant Industry that ought not to be there.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not know as to that; I have not investigated that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am trying to get similar items under one head——

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I understand; but I merely wanted to correct the Senator as to the cotton items.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And to protest against the duplication of work and the needless spreading around of the different pieces of work.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to page 24. There we direct the Bureau of Plant Industry to study the behavior of fruits in process of transportation. Of course, if they are in process of transportation they are on the way to market. Therefore, according to the Senator's contention, that work should be done by the Bureau of Markets, because it affects the market value of the fruit.

Again, on lines 20 and 21 of the same page, we provide that the Bureau of Plant Industry shall study the behavior of vegetables in the process of transportation and marketing. Either those two items should be placed under the heading "Bureau of Markets" or the two items which I have pointed out, on pages 74 and 75, should be put under the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As to the item on page 24:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, studies of the behavior of fruits during the process of transportation, marketing, and while in commercial storage—

The first part of that paragraph, the Senator from New York must admit, rightfully comes under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry." If I understood the Senator from Oregon correctly, he stated that certain diseases were sometimes made manifest in the processes of shipment, and it was to study, as I understood him to say, the appearance of that fungus, the brown and black rot that occurred in this fruit. I want to give my understanding of this, for the Senator from New York is a member of the committee, and I am also a member of it. The point made by the Senator from Oregon was that there is no dispute about the first part of the paragraph to which the Senator from New York refers, on page 24, belonging to the work of that bureau.

Mr. WADSWORTH. None at all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Oregon called the committee's attention to the fact that certain fungous diseases made themselves apparent during the time of shipment, and that he desired to have the Bureau of Plant Industry clothed with the power of investigating the reasons for it and all that was necessary to find out just what might be done to prevent the appearance of that disease in transportation.

The language may be somewhat unfortunate, but I understand that to be the object, and it seemed to me that this was a very pertinent place for it to appear. As to its being a duplication of the other work, I do not see any analogy whatever. Just what lines did the Senator say were a duplication on pages 24 and 75?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The direct duplication is between page 24 and page 74; but there is another item on the bottom of page 75, which, while not duplicated elsewhere, seems to me to provide for work which ought to be done by a scientific bureau. We have a number of scientific bureaus in the Department of Agriculture, but now we find that the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates is gradually absorbing scientific investigational functions.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is no scientific work whatever connected with the testing of bleaching qualities. That is a mechanical process. There is no scientific work at all on an electric device for testing the tensile strength of the fiber. It is just like weighing a pound of meat or a pound of butter. You have your instrument; you put upon it yarns of so many counts, and have the weights put upon it, and it automatically registers the breaking point; so that all you have to do is to get the scientists to make the standard, and then the test is made, and there is no science in it. It is simply testing the intrinsic commercial value of the material and the work of giving us that information belongs entirely to the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is perfectly correct as to the item on the bottom of page 75, but not correct as to the item on page 74. That, I think, is an out-and-out duplication of work.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Utah point out to me where he thinks there is a duplication? I should like to say that I think duplications in our departments ought to be corrected wherever possible, and for that reason I am asking him to point out in what particulars he thinks these two items are duplications.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will read the proviso beginning on line 11, page 74, down to and including line 15, and then read the provision on page 24, beginning with line 4 and including line 8, as amended, I think he will see that there is no question but that there is a duplication there; and, furthermore, I think the objections of the Senator from New York apply to these provisions. There will be built up in the Bureau of Markets a scientific personnel in these two cases. It will be exactly that. It can not help but be that if the work is to be done. If the Bureau of Markets do not give any more correct information upon these items than the Senator from South Carolina thinks they have given on the cotton crop, I do not think we ought to rely upon them at all, and I think if we did we would be running into an alley with nothing but a blank wall at the end of the alley.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not desire to take up the time of the Senate, but I want to say for the RECORD that in reading this paragraph on page 74 I can not understand how anyone can question the fact that that work belongs to the Bureau of Markets, for it says that no less than $40,000 shall be used for the study of methods of prevention of losses.

Mr. SMOOT. By what?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. By deterioration and decay. It does not enter into any scientific field. Suppose you are shipping a carload of watermelons and you find that by piling them up on each other, not crating them, they break down and are ruined. You have not scientifically investigated anything. You have investigated the mechanical process by which this loss was incurred. Therefore, if you can find some carriage that will prevent it, you have prevented the loss.

Mr. SMOOT. Suppose it were a case of grapefruit or a case of apples, and they were not piled up on each other and the dimensions of that case were regulated by law. Suppose the law said that it must be just so long and so wide and so high. The only way to find the cause of deterioration or decay would be to make a chemical analysis, and they would have to have a specialist for that purpose; and that is what this provides for.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Oh, no.

Mr. SMOOT. But it says here—

Methods of prevention of losses by deterioration, decay, and freezing of fruits and vegetables in storage and in transit in refrigerator cars, heater cars, and ocean vessels.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think that is entirely pertinent to the work of the Bureau of Markets, in so far as they can find what has been the cause by virtue of improper crating, by virtue of improper refrigerating, and all of the incidents that would help the producer or the shipper to know what were the causes. I think that comes clearly within the purview of the work of this bureau, and I think there is no duplication of work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 75, line 22, before the word "may," to strike out "$25,860" and insert "$30,000," so as to read:

For investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use of standards for the different grades, qualities, and conditions of cotton, and for investigating the ginning, grading, stapling, baling, marking, compressing, and tare of cotton, $38,400: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated $30,000 may be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades and classes of cotton in order to determine their spinning value and for demonstrating the results of such tests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 15, after the word "agencies," to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$350,000," so as to read:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, stocks, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of live stock and live-stock products on farms, in cooperation with the States Relations Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 15, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That not less than $100,000 shall be used for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, including the purchase of such books and periodicals as may be necessary in connection with this work.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the proposed amendment is one of the most desirable, one of the most needed, and one which will prove perhaps the most beneficial of any proposition which this measure contains.

Heretofore the information which has been gathered and disseminated by the Agricultural Department has informed consumer of the probable extent and amount of the crops, but it has not given any reciprocal information to the producer, who gropes in the dark, so to speak, as regards markets, the demand for products here, there, and yonder, and the probable effect upon his produce of corresponding production in other parts of the world.

This is something for which the public money can be well expended. Inasmuch as I have been prone to object to a great many of the appropriations in this and preceding Agricultural bills—objections which I think are well founded—it is a source of pleasure for me to be able to give my unqualified approbation to an object such as is here sought to be subserved. I am satisfied that it will be productive of immense benefit, and I certainly would not complain if the amount appropriated for the purpose were much in excess of what is stated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator from Colorado as to the wisdom of securing this information, but here, again, we are duplicating the work that is done by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, for which we appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars; and in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee on the sundry civil appropriation bill we found that they were doing the exact work and collecting the information that we anticipated the Tariff Commission were collecting, and it was shown that the Tariff Commission came to that bureau and secured the information upon which they based some of their figures and reports. The very information asked for by this amendment is already collected and can be secured from that bureau, and it is a mere duplication of work.

I know that the work ought to be done; I know that this information ought to be in the possession of the Government; but if the testimony that has been given to the Committee on Appropriations is to be relied upon that information is being collected from all parts of the world to-day by our commercial attachés. If it is not being collected, what are they doing, and why are we spending the hundreds of thousands of dollars in salaries paid to them and expenses for the purpose of collecting all information that affects our foreign trade?

I do not know whether the chairman of the committee has had his attention called to that matter or not.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, Mr. President; I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I remember very well when that matter was taken up; but the Senator, I believe, will agree with me that the amount appropriated in the other appropriation bill is for manufactured products.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe I am safe in saying that 90 per cent of that money is not used for agricultural products.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say what it is used for, but it is not for that purpose; it is for all purposes.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not say it is for that purpose, but I do say that not to exceed 10 per cent of it is used for any such purposes as we are providing for here.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not deny that they claimed that this information that they were collecting affected all of the foreign trade of the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator. I am not in disagreement as to what is claimed for it; but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has explained this paragraph much better than I can, and I am very glad to have his approval of it. The committee thought that they really had done good service in being able to work out this proposition.

The Senator from Utah knows that there was a large estimate for this particular work; that is, for the Bureau of Markets the estimate was $590,741. The House allowed $250,000 only. The Senate committee increased that $100,000 and inserted this particular provision, and I am very glad to have the absolute approval of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and also to have the partial approval of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I said in my opening statement that this information ought to be collected, but if the testimony before the Appropriations Committee was correct we have this information. The Senator from North Dakota was present, I think, when it was testified before the committee that the information which we thought the Tariff Commission was collecting as to this foreign business was really being collected by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. GRONNA. I am sure the Senator will admit, because he is always fair and reasonable, that, if we do have it, the language in this provision is so broad that there will be no necessity for the expenditure of any money for obtaining that part of it. There will be no duplication.

Mr. SMOOT. There certainly will be duplication and extra expense, if we send men to foreign countries and at the expense which it takes to send them there, and pay them, together with what has to be paid for their keep when away from Washington, to collect this information. If they are going to collect any they ought to be there to collect it all, and that is what we have the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for. I have not any doubt but what this money will be spent, even if it is necessary to send them on a junketing trip, before the end of the fiscal year 1922.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does it not involve to some extent rather strengthening our representation on the International Institute of Agriculture? There is an agency for gathering information as to the world supply of various products, the prices, conditions, and that sort of thing.

Mr. SMOOT. We make another appropriation for that. That is an institute which has headquarters in Rome, and Mr. Lubin was there for years, but he is now dead, so we have to send somebody else there.

Mr. FLETCHER. Now we are simply paying the salary of one man in that position.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am very much interested in the Department of Commerce, which has commercial attachés to furnish information to the people of this country. I do not agree with the Senator from Utah that they gather the information provided for under this provision. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota, who is a member of the committee, who recalls that tradesmen of the United States, members of the chambers of commerce, urged appropriations in order that they might get this information, so that they would know what could be furnished, how it would be furnished, and all about it, but nothing as to farm products.

Mr. SMOOT. All foreign commerce, farm and everything else. If we go on this way we might just as well give notice to all of the departments of the Government, "If the Appropriations Committee will not give you what you want, come to the Committee on Agriculture, and you can get it." I do not think that would be proper; I do not think it would be right.

Mr. President, in what I have said to-day I have an object in view. I think that when the next Secretary of Agriculture is inducted into office he ought to go through the appropriation bill before making estimates for the next year—that is, I mean for the fiscal year following the one for which this bill provides—and ought to take everything out of it that leads to a duplication of work done in other departments. I am going to ask the new Secretary of Agriculture that that be done, and then let all of the departments understand that they can only secure an appropriation from one committee, and let it be understood that it must be in one appropriation and for one specific purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senator will carry out that theory with respect to Army appropriations, because the Appropriations Committee to-day is spending money for the Army, and so is the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Absolutely; and the Senator knows that. Many a time, if we did not have a member of the Military Affairs Committee as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, there would be brought into this Chamber duplication after duplication, as the Senator from New York knows. We have tried to work together, and tried to eliminate those duplications, as far as the Military Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee are concerned.

Mr. GORE. I want to suggest to the Senator from Utah that he offer an amendment to this bill requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress a report at the next regular session embodying that information.

Mr. SMOOT. I think more than likely when the time arrives for the making of the next appropriation bill the commission on reorganization may have made some kind of a report, and I express the hope that the Senate will support the recommendations of that commission wherever they eliminate duplication of work in any of the departments of the Government. That is all that commission will undertake to do, and before a recommendation is ever made to Congress the members of that commission have to make a study of it. They have to go into the details of it. They have to themselves know whether it is a duplication of work, and if I had my way that commission would work in full accord with the head of every department of our Government. But whenever it is found to be a fact that there is duplication of work in any form whatever, then that ought to be eliminated from the Government appropriations.

Mr. GORE. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that we had better undertake to eliminate this service and lop off these powers pretty early in the next administration before the pride of power on the part of the heads of departments attaches.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a very wise suggestion on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma, because past experience has demonstrated that after they get in and really find out how many employees they have they will keep every single one of them. They are just as tenacious about keeping their employees and their authority as an individual would be if he owned an interest in a great corporation and desired it to be not only as large as it was but to increase every year.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] taking this matter up with the Secretary of Agriculture and providing against a duplication of work in any bill that may be presented to the next Congress. I am in favor of that. I do hope that the amendment to this bill offered by the committee, which has been supported so ably by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], will be adopted, because this work ought to be done. The present provision in the law which has been referred to does not extend to this character of work, and I trust this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think the statement of the Senator from Utah as to what he intends to do shows a mighty good purpose. I want to suggest that in doing that the Secretary of Agriculture should go outside of his department and get about three men who are not interested in the work of the department, as departmental work, and have them suggest a reframing of this bill, because he will never do away with these duplications if he leaves it largely to the chiefs of the bureaus, as he will have to do unless he goes outside of the department.

But this is what I rose to call attention to. The Committee on Agriculture has condemned this provision on page 76, the first part of the paragraph, for collecting and filing and getting estimates, and so forth. The Committee on Agriculture itself has condemned that provision and the Senate has indorsed that condemnation. We passed a resolution the other day directing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate and ascertain the amount of wheat and cotton and things like that on hand throughout the country, and the reason for it was that the estimates and reports and the work of the department are not reliable—are not worth anything, and if it had been discussed by those in favor of the resolution before the Senate as they discussed it with me, they would have denounced in unmeasured terms the work of the department. They said it was not reliable, could not be depended upon, was not worth anything, and therefore it was necessary for the Agricultural Committee to investigate it. Yet here we are appropriating $350,000 for doing that work. We will probably have another resolution of investigation at the end of the year to find out the amount of these things on hand.

I do not share to a certain extent the opinion of the work of the department in this respect the Committee on Agriculture apparently had and that the Senate apparently had, but I do doubt its correctness and reliability.

Mr. McNARY. I want to say to the Senator from Washington that his inference is too broad. I do not know any member of the Committee on Agriculture who has criticized these departments or duplicated the reports they have sent in. If any members of the committee have done so, it has been as individuals. This item has been carried for a number of years, and been extended by reason of the provision found in line 15. The question someone raised here the other day, speaking as a Senator, was that he wanted the Agricultural Committee to investigate the sources upon which these estimates were made. But no member of the Agricultural Committee, or the committee itself, has ever duplicated the work of this department or any of the departments connected with and doing this great service to American farmers.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I may have made the statement a little too broad. I believe that resolution was not referred to the Committee on Agriculture. But, Mr. President, I find members of the Committee on Agriculture are supporting that resolution on the floor of the Senate. There was not one of them who questioned the desirability of having this investigation made, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] stated to me that this work of the department, and these reports they were getting out, and the information they had, were not reliable at all. I agree with him. I do not think they were, and I do not think we will get any more reliable information by the investigation of the committee, as far as that is concerned.

I am not opposing this proposition. I just wanted to call attention to the resolution of investigation, and I presume we will have another one at the end of the coming fiscal year, condemning the information furnished by the department under this appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is another occasion when a Member of the Senate is not well informed on the matter to which he speaks. Those of us who have been affected, and have investigated, find that the statistics affecting one particular thing are gotten up by every department, and come in different phases, and the Senator was speaking about my offering a resolution and inveighing against the Bureau of Markets. That was only a part of the source of information. The Bureau of the Census was the particular one I had reference to. The Census Bureau is charged with gathering the statistics as to the supply and distribution of wheat and other grain, and of cotton.

I asked for their sources of information as to the world's supply and the American supply. They gave me their estimates and the sources of their information. The Bureau of Markets comes along and makes an estimate of the supply, but not of the distribution, and the two are more or less conflicting. Both of them, I believe, were incorrect. The sources of information might have been satisfactory to them but were not to me. I do not believe they were satisfactory to the members of the Agricultural Committee, although I do not know.

I have nothing to say about this particular department, because they were not charged under the law with gathering the figures as to the supply and distribution of any particular crop in a statistical way, but the Bureau of the Census was, and it was their method and the result of that method that I called into question, and incidentally the Bureau of Markets only in so far as they pertained to it.

I thought the other day when the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] was discussing the matter that he had an idea that the Bureau of Markets were the ones who gathered the information and disseminated it, when as a matter of fact it is the Bureau of the Census. I said the other day, and repeat now, that we ought not to have duplications along such lines of work but should have one department to do a specific work and hold them responsible for that specific work.

In conclusion I wish to say, as to the criticism of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] about duplication of work, that whatever pertains to the agricultural interests of the country ought to be carried in an agricultural bill, and if some of the departments duplicate the work that rightfully belongs to the Department of Agriculture, that other department ought to be cut out and there should not be a restriction of the work of the Department of Agriculture. The thing he criticizes is about us demanding that, if we are to give to the world the products of this country, then we should know what are the market conditions that the producers of the country have to meet. It is restricted to agricultural products, the production and the effect of the supply in the world of those things that we have to meet in competition, and therefore rightfully belongs in this bill. If there is any criticism as to duplication, let it go out of the other department that is duplicating the work of the Agricultural Department and leave the Department of Agriculture equipped to serve the farmer.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What the Senator says confirms me in the belief that I did know what I was talking about. The Bureau of Markets is called the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. That does not confine it to potatoes or corn or barley or rye or oats. That includes wheat and includes cotton. They have been getting out their reports. I have seen what is called the Crop Reporter coming out from time to time. It purports to give estimates, and so forth, and I have not any doubt that it is all compiled under the language of the bill. The language of the bill is just as broad as it could be made for the collecting of such information.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Washington will allow me, they give out estimates, but that is not the question that I was complaining of most, nor was it the basis, particularly, of the resolution that I offered. The Bureau of the Census is one that gives out an official report of the supply and distribution of the standard crops in this country. I have in my desk their annual report. The Bureau of Markets is practically in its beginning. The Census Bureau has been established for years and years.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The other reports are just as official as the reports gotten out by the Bureau of the Census. They are both provided for by law. The language has been carried in the bill for some time.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. They do not pertain to the same subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They may cover the subject. Here is the way it reads:

> For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-stock estimates—

If that does not cover wheat and cotton and all that sort of thing and estimates for them provided by law and make the reports just as official as any reports of the Bureau of the Census, I can not understand language or the effect of legislative provisions. It continues:

> acreage, yield, grades, stocks, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of live stock and live-stock products on farms.

I do not complain if the Senator has no confidence in the reports. What I complain of is that we will appropriate two or three hundred thousand dollars for getting the reports, and then probably spend one or two hundred thousand dollars for the Committee on Agriculture to go around over the country and show that the reports are no good.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I did not have a word to say about the particular item that the Senator has read. They estimate how much, and that is all right, but the Bureau of the Census is charged not only with estimating how much we make but how much we consume, how much the world consumes of that article, what stock is left over after one consumption year to be carried into the next consumption year, and then as to the world's supply of a like product and how much of that is carried over, including American production. This only pertains to our domestic crop as to production, estimate of production, and so forth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If that is correct, then we ought to do away with the item entirely and let the Bureau of the Census furnish the information, or else we ought to take away the right of the Census Bureau to do that and let the other organization do it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Just how far they duplicate is a matter that the Senate ought to correct. I agree thoroughly with that. I think the Department of Agriculture ought to get the ginners' report for cotton, the thrashers' report for wheat, and then give out the bulletins stating how much has been produced, how much consumed, how much exported, and how much of the world production of like things have been imported into this country, consumed abroad and here, and what is the probable supply, in order to enable farmers of the country to govern themselves in the production of the crop. I do claim that that duplication ought to be cut out. The Census Department ought to quit this work or the Department of Agriculture ought to quit it. I agree thoroughly with the Senator in that respect, but I claim that the Census Bureau has not given us a satisfactory account.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the reason why it ought to be cut out.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am not quarreling with that. I am stating that there has been, in my opinion, a disastrous result, either from this duplication or a lack of money or something else, in getting the proper figures and putting them in proper shape.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, lack of information about the various provisions in the Agricultural appropriation bill, I think, is responsible for the attacks that are being made upon them by various Senators. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] does not seem to understand that the matter of gathering certain statistics of farm products is different from the reports of the amount of cotton ginned. The Bureau of Markets looks out for places in the country where certain products are demanded and for places in the country where certain farm products are grown. The Bureau of Crop Estimates estimates the number of acres planted in certain crops, grain or cotton, and it estimates the size of the crop according to the information that it obtains. The Census Bureau reports the amount of cotton coming into the market that has been produced by the cotton farmer, hauled to the gin, separated from the seed, and the lint packed into a bale. The ginner's report accounts for this cotton. That is what we had in mind the other day when we supported the resolution to gather the information about the amount of cotton on hand in the United States, all kinds of cotton, unspinnable cotton, linters, and spinnable cotton.

The Senator from Washington has this matter all confused in his mind when he reads the provision about the Bureau of Crop Estimates and the Bureau of Markets. They are two separate departments. One gives information as to the marketing of the products and the other estimates the amount of acres planted and the size of the crop to be produced, and I repeat all this is separate and distinct from the gathering of reports as to cotton ginned. I hope that some time during the discussion on the bill we will get the matter clear in the mind of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to call the Senator's attention to a fact that he apparently does not know, and that is that the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates is one bureau, and that the one bureau not only looks after markets but the making of crop estimates.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator is mistaken about that. The Bureau of Markets may be connected with the Bureau of Crop Estimates, but there is a bureau that looks after the estimating of crops separate and distinct from the Bureau of Markets itself.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee why the appropriation is made for the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates as one bureau? Why does he not designate it as two bureaus if there are two bureaus?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Washington that the chairman of the committee did not draw the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask the chairman of the committee if there are two bureaus.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Esterbrook, if I may name the man——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not care anything about the names of the men. I want to know where the appropriation is in the bill for the Chief of the Bureau of Crop Estimates.

Mr. McNARY. Page 72, line 22.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is for the Chief of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. I want to know where the appropriation is for two bureaus under this head of Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. That is what I want to know, and why it is not called bureaus if there are two bureaus.

Mr. GRONNA. There is a division. One is a division and the other is a bureau.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, well, that is a different proposition. There is only one bureau.

Mr. GRONNA. There is a division, if the Senator will permit me to answer. If not, of course he can go on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to have the Senator answer me. I want to know.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will give me time, I will answer him.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am asking the Senator if there is one bureau or if there are two bureaus?

Mr. GRONNA. There is one bureau known as the Bureau of Statistics. There are two divisions, the Division of Crop Estimates and the Division of Markets.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the Senator from Alabama will listen to this explanation. The chairman of the committee says there is only one bureau.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I said.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But there is a division which does the work of crop estimates.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, there may be two divisions or four divisions or five divisions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Their work is entirely different.

Mr. HEFLIN. It is a matter of construction.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator said there were two bureaus.

Mr. HEFLIN. I may be mistaken about the two bureaus, but there is another division in there that has to do with crop estimates, separate and distinct from the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not dispute that, but it is all under one bureau and under one head.

Mr. HEFLIN. I believe that the Senator is about to get this matter straight in his mind.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, it is all agreed that there is one bureau and two divisions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Good.

Mr. HARRISON. So the Senator from Washington is right and the Senator from Alabama is right.

I want to read the provision which the Committee on Agriculture has unanimously reported and which, it seems, every Senator on the floor is in favor of, merely to call the attention of the Senate to it before we finally vote upon it:

Provided, That not less than $100,000 shall be used for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government.

We are trying here to help the American producer to obtain data and information to enable him to sell his goods, wares, and products in foreign countries; in other words, to help promote, in our export trade, the sale of our agricultural products. I am a little amused that some Senators should favor this provision under the peculiar circumstances which have developed at this session of Congress. I can understand how we may save $100,000 in the event certain contingencies arise. If the so-called emergency tariff bill should become a law and a sufficient number should be corralled in the Senate and in the other House to override the President's veto, for which Senators on the other side of the aisle are praying, we would not need make this appropriation, because if that bill should become a law other countries would set up such methods of reprisal that we would not have any export trade and we could not ship anything to them. For instance, if that bill should become a law, placing a duty on wheat of 40 cents per bushel, and thereby making Canada mad with us and causing the Canadians, then, to place an embargo on the goods which our farmers may raise in this country for export to Canada and sale there, we would not need to go into Canada to collect any data and disseminate them among the agricultural producers of the country in the hope that they could sell anything in Canada, because if we are going to place an embargo, as we propose to do in that bill, of 40 cents a bushel on wheat imported from Canada into the United States, naturally, if we read correctly what the newspapers say, Canada will place an embargo against our shipments, not only of agricultural products but of manufactured products into Canada. The same thing would apply touching farm products being exported to Argentina, to countries in Europe, and to other countries. Therefore, if the so-called emergency tariff bill should become a law, we could save this $100,000; it then would not be needed at all, because the collection of data for the American producers to enable them to send their farm products to foreign markets for sale would not be necessary.

Of course, we all believe that the emergency tariff bill is a failure. I understand the conditions bear out that statement; that Senators on the other side of the Chamber have already given up all hope of it ever becoming a law. A few weeks ago Senators on the other side of the Chamber got very enthusiastic and persistent and insistent about passing the bill in a few days. First, they tried to have a day set for a vote on it.

Then, when they could not do that they tried to cram down our throats a cloture rule for the second time in the history of the United States Senate and to pass the bill right through. However, they could not get a two-thirds majority, and the effort to secure cloture failed; but eventually the bill did pass. One week from to-day the bill passed the Senate of the United States. It is now in the hands of the Senator—I think I am correct in giving the names of the conferees—from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who showed so much enthusiasm for the bill, who was so persistent in forcing it through the Senate, who believed in it so whole-heartedly and sincerely; of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and other Senators, whose names I do not at the moment recall, and who have been in conference on the bill since last Wednesday—seven days ago. The end of Congress is approaching, only a few more days remaining. Those Senators have known all the time that unless the bill got to the President within a certain date—10 days before adjournment—he might kill it by a pocket veto; that it had to get to him by a certain time in order, if he should veto it, that the Senate and House might try to pass it over his veto. But they are afraid that the Senate and the House might pass the bill over the President's veto. So the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from North Dakota—I think they are the conferees on the part of the Senate—for a week have sat in conference, holding the bill away from the Senate and the House, keeping us from taking action on it, in order that the President might either approve it or veto it.

Mr. WARREN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. HARRISON. I shall conclude in a moment.

So if the emergency tariff bill should become a law there will be no need for this $100,000 appropriation; but if it should not become a law, then it would be a wise measure, and the appropriation should be voted.

Now I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that he is bringing news to this side of the Senate when he says we do not want the emergency tariff bill to be passed. I am inclined to doubt his authority as to that, because of his observation to the effect that we shall not need to protect our foreign markets if the bill be passed. I have heard that same cry whenever we have passed a protectionist tariff bill; it is not new at all. It has always been said, "We can not trade with other countries unless we buy of them and let them have free access to our markets," and so forth. That is not very persuasive after all these years, when we have been fortunate enough to be able to accumulate sufficient money and credit to carry on a World War involving the expenditure of these billions of dollars.

Mr. HARRISON. But the party of the Senator from Wyoming never had the audacity to impose such high tariff rates as are proposed in the emergency tariff bill. That bill, for instance, proposes a duty of 40 cents a bushel on wheat, and the Senator's party has never before thought of imposing a duty of over 20 cents a bushel on wheat. On wool—and the Senator is well versed on the question of wool—we find that in the Payne-Aldrich bill there was only a duty of 11 or 12 cents a pound on wool and not 45 cents a pound as is proposed in the emergency tariff bill.

Mr. WARREN. That is true, but in the arrangement of proportions a different tariff is called for.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is bound to admit that while one rate may be a matter of protection the other one operates as an embargo. I will not take up the time of the Senate by reading the quotations, but I have here articles from Argentina and Canada and other countries which show that they are going to retaliate by placing an embargo against the products and goods and wares shipped from this country into theirs if we pass the emergency tariff bill.

Mr. WARREN. No one who knows the Senator from Mississippi believes that he is cowardly enough to think that a tariff to last for a few months will put us in that position.

Mr. HARRISON. I sincerely hope not.

Mr. WARREN. He has too much courage for that. I am willing to admire the readiness with which he enters into these political matters whenever we talk about tariffs, and so forth, but when the time comes we shall have that all out as to our not being able to sell, and we shall have the same old threat.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator think that this matter is remaining in conference too long, it having been there a week, notwithstanding the fact that it was proposed so enthusiastically and persistently a short time ago to cram it down our throats by a cloture rule here.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator himself has served for many weeks on conference committees in connection with legislative matters. I know that I have been very many times. We are in conference now on three different bills, and we have been in conference for several days and nights. There is not any outcome yet, but I think we shall have one.

Mr. HARRISON. If the other side are not going to give us another chance to vote on the emergency tariff bill, very well. I merely thought I would call the attention of the Senate to these glaring features; that is all.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 77, line 8, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates from "$1,339,560" to "$1,439,560."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 8, to insert:

That hereafter the powers conferred and the duties imposed by law on the Bureau of Statistics and the Bureau of Crop Estimates of the Department of Agriculture shall be exercised and performed by the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 22, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That any moneys received from or in connection with the sale of cotton purchased for the preparation of practical forms of the official cotton standards and condemned as unsuitable for such use may be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for the purchase of other cotton for such use.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 17, to increase the appropriation for administration of the United States warehouse act from "$65,000" to "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for completion of wool work, on page 79, after line 9, to insert:

And to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918, which said regulations are hereby legalized, ratified, and confirmed as fully to all intents and purposes as if the same had by prior act of Congress been specifically authorized and directed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates from "$2,939,444" to "$3,074,444."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 15, after the word "purposes" to strike out "$115,400" and insert "$125,000," so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of April 26, 1910, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded Paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," $125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 17, to increase the total appropriation for enforcement of the insecticide act from "$146,910" to "$156,510."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 19, to increase the appropriation for cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams from "$125,000" to "$625,000," so as to read:

Cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams: For cooperation with any State or group of States in the protection from fire of the forested watersheds of navigable streams under the provisions of section 2 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," $625,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on this item. I do not think the bill contains a more deserving or more meritorious provision than this one. I shall attempt to condense what I have to say into a few words so that I shall not weary the Senators present.

The estimate of the Department of Agriculture as to the amount necessary to perform efficiently the work required was $1,000,000. In the House the amount was decreased to $125,000, a sum comparable to that which was used last year. When the matter came before the attention of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I offered an amendment increasing the appropriation $500,000, making the total appropriation $625,000, which was adopted by the committee.

Mr. President, I think it is generally conceded that the prevention of forest fires is the most important test of forestry to-day. It is going to be impossible to initiate and carry into execution a reforestation policy that does not embrace the subject of forest-fire prevention. It will be observed that this item contemplates cooperation with the several States; and it is to that subject and that particular phase that I want to address myself at this time.

During the past fiscal year the Forest Service cooperated with 25 States in the protection of approximately 150,000,000 acres of State and privately owned land from forest fires. As against the Federal appropriation of $100,000, the expenditures of the cooperating States aggregated $860,000, making a total of nearly $1,000,000, and the expenditures of private forest owners within these States aggregated about $700,000. The Federal Government thus furnished but $100,000 for the protection from fire of the State and private forests of the country out of a total expenditure for this purpose of $1,660,000. The States themselves spent over eight times as much as the Federal Government for the protection of this splendid resource.

By the terms of the law the expenditure in any State may not exceed the State expenditures for the same purpose. In fact, Federal expenditures were uniformly very much less than State expenditures. The Federal Government's maximum expenditure during the fiscal year in any one State was $10,432, in Maine, as against an expenditure by the State of $116,844. It spent $5,150 in New York as against a State expenditure of $132,528, $25,450 in Montana as compared with a State expenditure of $51,549, and $6,067 in Minnesota as compared with a State expenditure of $104,096, and in my own State the Government spent $6,306 as compared with a State expenditure of $28,787.

In the case of every cooperating State appeals for additional aid were made and had to be rejected because Government funds would go no further. This fund is expended only in accordance with a specific plan for fire protection which meets with the approval of the Forest Service, and the actual use of the money is checked up in the field by inspectors from the Forest Service. The money is spent exclusively for personal services, for patrolmen, lookout watchmen, and rangers in accordance with the fire-protection plan of the State concerned.

The 25 States with which the Forest Service has cooperated contain 65,000,000 acres of forest land which are still largely unprotected. There are 14 additional States, with which there has been no cooperation hitherto, which contain important forest areas aggregating 110,000,000 acres now almost wholly unprotected. In the 39 States, all told, where the prevention of forest fires is an essential public activity, there are approximately 325,000,000 acres of timbered and cut-over lands requiring protection from fire as a first essential to a continuous supply of timber for the United States. The estimates submitted by a large number of States show that this land can not be protected on an average for less than 2½ cents per acre yearly, or an aggregate of $8,125,000. As against this requirement the sums available from all sources, public and private, aggregated during the last fiscal year about $1,625,000; and in this the Federal Government was represented by an appropriation of but $125,000.

The private expenditures for the protection of forest lands are increasing from year to year; and can be largely increased if public agencies take the lead in organizing forest protection over large areas and then encouraging private owners to participate in its cost on a just basis.

The protection of forest lands from fire is an activity whose cost should be shared by the public and the private landowner. The private owner has a direct interest in the protection of his property, particularly lands containing merchantable timber. But the private owner can not equitably assume the full burden of protecting his property from the forest-fire hazard which goes far beyond the immediate boundaries of his land and to

which the whole community contributes. It is not only the duty of the public to assume a share of the protection of forest lands from fire corresponding broadly to the fire hazard which is of general or regional origin; but the public has a very large interest in maintaining the productivity of forest lands as a means of perpetuating one of our basic natural resources. This interest is shared alike by the local public, represented in the State, and by the Nation at large. Our densely populated agricultural and industrial States are dependent upon other States for their supply of timber. They have a very direct economic interest in maintaining the supply of timber being grown elsewhere on the areas logically adapted to that purpose.

It is therefore just and desirable that the National Government should share in the cost of fire protection, not relieving the owner of the land or the State from their responsibilities but sharing the enterprise with them, and by its participation encouraging them to do a great deal more than they otherwise would.

An expenditure of $625,000 by the Government is about one-third of the cost of protecting these forest lands from destructive fires. It is considerably less than the States are now appropriating for this purpose, and will undoubtedly be much less than the State appropriations for the purpose during the next fiscal year. The benefit of this appropriation is not merely the additional funds which are available and which make it possible to extend fire protection over much larger areas, but Federal participation enables the Federal Government, as in the construction of public roads, to fix the standards and to maintain the work done with State funds as well as with its own at high efficiency. The money asked for will be spent in the 25 States which have previously qualified for Federal cooperation and in as many of the 14 additional States having important forest areas as meet Federal qualifications. In no case will Federal expenditures exceed those of the State itself, and in no case will Federal money be spent in a State unless the Forest Service is satisfied that the State laws and administrative system are adequate to get good results in the protection of forest areas through the investment of Federal funds.

This appropriation does not mean that the Federal Government relieves the owner of valuable timber from protecting his property. In the allotments to the States the chief emphasis is placed upon using the Federal funds so as to extend the protection organization of the State to culled, logged-off, and other denuded areas which contain little or no timber of present commercial value and whose owners have the least incentive to incur the cost of protection. These are the very areas whose protection is of the utmost importance in the general public interest, because upon them must we depend for our supply of timber after the present virgin forests are exhausted.

Mr. President, we have used up three-fourths of our original forests, and the supply of timber remaining is becoming less and less adequate for the requirements of the country, both in quantity and in location. Sixty-one per cent of what is left lies west of the Great Plains, whereas the bulk of lumber and paper consumption is east of the Great Plains. I might state here that over 50 per cent of the standing timber to-day is found in the three Pacific Coast States and 61 per cent is found in that great western country lying west of the Mississippi River. Our eastern forested States one after another have been cut out, and ceased to be important producers of timber because their virgin forests have been but very partially and inadequately replaced by second growth after logging. With the exhaustion of these old sources of lumber, paper, and other forest products and with the increasing distance which lumber must be hauled from the sawmill to the consumer, much of it now across the width of the continent, there is a growing scarcity of forest products, which in no great length of time will become critical. Markets may fluctuate one way or another owing to financial and other temporary conditions, but behind it lies a steady decrease in the supply of timber, which has a very vital bearing upon our national housing situation, our national paper situation, and many industries which use lumber in manufactures; and I might say, Mr. President, that the statistics show that one in every twenty persons in this country finds his livelihood in occupations directly connected with lumbering or in industries that are associated therewith.

The greatest cause of this situation is forest fires. We have enough land unfit for agriculture to grow all the timber which this country requires; but a large part of it has been made idle through destructive methods of logging and particularly through repeated forest fires. There are 81,000,000 acres of such land to-day that are unproductive, as far as timber crops of economic value are concerned; and forest fires are largely responsible for their condition. We still have upward of 200,000,000 acres of forest land which has been cut over, but contains cull or second-growth timber or is partially stocked with young trees. The small timber and young growth on this enormous area is a forest asset of the utmost value. A considerable part of this area lies in thickly populated States within a stone's throw of large centers of timber consumption. And yet enormous acreages of such young forest are being destroyed by fire every year.

The private owner can be relied upon, by and large, to protect timber areas which have present commercial value; but these enormous stretches of young forest growth which will not mature without protection and of devastated land which can not be restored to forests without keeping fires out can be protected only by aggressive public action. The protection of these 315,000,000 acres adequately represents the greatest single forestry problem in the country, and of itself will go a long way toward assuring a future supply of timber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert in the RECORD a list of States showing cooperative expenditures for the fiscal year 1920 from Federal appropriations and appropriations by the States for protecting forested watersheds of navigable streams from fire.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Cooperative expenditures, fiscal year 1920, from Federal appropriations and by the States for protecting forested watersheds of navigable streams from fire.

State.	Federal.	State.	Total.
Maine	$10,432.25	$116,844.11	$127,276.36
New Hampshire	6,073.02	24,739.15	30,812.17
Vermont	1,978.00	5,879.46	7,857.46
Massachusetts	3,840.75	39,333.60	43,174.35
Rhode Island	294.00	1,762.45	2,056.45
Connecticut	932.25	4,839.27	5,771.52
New York	5,150.37	132,528.56	137,678.93
New Jersey	2,120.41	21,703.83	23,824.24
Pennsylvania	4,024.24	56,768.61	60,792.85
Maryland	1,790.55	4,585.84	6,376.39
Virginia	4,650.00	6,886.23	11,536.23
West Virginia	5,085.00	10,654.01	15,739.01
North Carolina	1,851.04	3,011.13	4,862.17
Kentucky	1,739.50	1,705.00	3,444.50
Louisiana	1,365.50	2,821.35	4,186.85
Texas	2,361.31	4,350.27	6,711.58
Michigan	2,110.00	60,586.46	62,696.46
Wisconsin	3,518.57	21,942.28	25,460.85
Minnesota	6,067.34	104,096.03	110,163.37
South Dakota	94.00	3,501.00	3,595.00
Montana	254.50	51,549.50	51,804.00
Idaho	5,415.50	92,524.37	97,939.87
Washington	5,206.00	48,951.34	54,157.34
Oregon	6,306.23	28,787.86	35,094.09
California	1,995.96	10,196.53	12,192.49
Administration and inspection	8,181.57	.....	8,181.57
Total	92,837.86	860,548.24	953,386.10
Unexpended balance	7,162.14	.....	.....
Appropriation	100,000.00	.....	.....

Mr. McNARY. I also ask permission to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement of additional States which should undertake forest-fire protection with Federal cooperation, but which to-day are not cooperating with the Government.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

Additional States which should undertake forest-fire prevention with Federal cooperation:

South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as a final word, much could be said upon the newsprint paper shortage, which is a serious problem to-day, and a committee of which I was a member undertook last year to study and prescribe a remedy; and much could be said about the threat of a great timber shortage in this country. I am not going to speak upon that general subject, but have limited my remarks to that phase which concerns cooperation of the States in the prevention of fires.

It may be said that this increase from $125,000 to $625,000 is a very large increase. In comparison with the expenditures of the States doing the same kind of work it is indeed a very modest increase, and is only one-half the sum asked by the department. Further, Mr. President, this is not a direct tax upon the Treasury of the country. None of this money, in fact, is directly appropriated for the splendid purpose for which it is intended, for the reason that the work of the Forest Service shows a very large profit each year, and this sum of money simply comes out of that fund.

To-day I was supplied by the Bureau of Forestry with a statement showing that the income derived from the forests in

the last year—that is, the Government forests—was $4,793,482, whereas the total expense of protecting this great valuable natural resource was $1,773,409, leaving a profit of $3,000,000 to the Government. I sincerely hope, Mr. President, on behalf of the people who are interested in the protection of forests, that the Senate will agree with the action of the Senate committee.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

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

Mr. McNARY. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the splendid speech of the junior Senator from Oregon, and I am thoroughly convinced as to the merits of the proposition which he presents. I want to ask the Senator if this amount is as much as the department estimated would be necessary to do this work?

Mr. McNARY. The department estimated, I am pleased to tell the Senator from Alabama, $1,000,000. The House allowed $125,000. I asked the Senate committee to add a half million, so that the total amount is $625,000 against an estimate of a million dollars made by the department.

Mr. HEFLIN. It strikes me that if the Government derives more than $3,000,000 profit from its national forests, the Government ought to expend whatever amount of money is necessary to protect these forests from destruction by fire. I feel like voting not only for the proposition carried in the bill but, if the other amount is really needed, I think that it ought to be granted. We ought to provide whatever is necessary to protect our national forests from destruction by fire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 17, to insert:

Field station, Woodward, Okla.: For the establishment in connection with the Woodward, Okla., field station of a live-stock department, through which experiments and demonstrations in live-stock breeding, growing, and feeding, including both beef and dairy animals, may be made, $10,000.

Mr. GORE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted at the conclusion of the words just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the words "ten thousand dollars" insert a comma and the words "of which said sum the Secretary is hereby authorized to use not exceeding $3,000 for the purpose of building additional sheds, stalls, and pens for the protection and care of said animals."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, has any estimate been made for that appropriation?

Mr. GORE. The amendment I offered, I will say to the Senator, does not increase the amount reported by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I am asking in regard to the committee amendment.

Mr. GORE. This appropriation was made last year; but no provision was made for the construction of sheds, and so forth, and this is simply to continue it. It was not deemed advisable, as I am informed, to embark on the plan without the necessary sheds for the protection of the animals. There is a dry-farming station there, and this is supplemental to that.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think that quite answers the question. The question is whether an estimate has been made for the appropriation carried by this amendment.

Mr. GORE. I could not answer that question. The chairman of the committee probably can.

Mr. THOMAS. I was asking the chairman.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not remember whether there was anything said about the buildings. The amount carried in the bill was estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 23, after the name "Alabama," to insert "and other States," so as to read:

Control and prevention of spread of the Mexican bean beetle: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the recent introduction and rapid multiplication of the Mexican bean beetle in the State of Alabama, and other States, and to provide means for the study, experimentation in eradication, and for the control and prevention of the spread of this insect in that State and to other States, in cooperation with the State of Alabama and other States concerned and with individuals affected, including the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $100,000, of which sum $25,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 14, to insert:

Purchase of farm loan bonds: The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized from time to time during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1921 and 1922, respectively, to purchase at par and accrued interest, with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, from any Federal land bank, farm loan bonds issued by such bank.

Such purchases shall not exceed the sum of $100,000,000 in either of such fiscal years, shall be made only upon the recommendation in writing of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and the bonds so purchased shall bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

Any Federal land bank may at any time purchase, at par and accrued interest, for the purpose of redemption or resale, any bonds so purchased from it and held in the Treasury.

The bonds of any Federal land bank purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury and held in the Treasury under the provisions of this act, three years from the date of purchase shall, upon 30 days' notice from the Secretary of the Treasury, be redeemed or repurchased by such bank at par and accrued interest.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course that language, in the same amount, is carried in another bill which has passed the Senate and which is now in conference. The conferees have met, and the conferees on the part of the House have stated they were unable to accept it without submitting it back to the House as legislation. It has gone back to the House, and it will come out within one or two days. I take it for granted that we do not expect to carry the same legislation in two bills, and in more than the amount here stated.

Mr. GRONNA. If the item is agreed to in the legislative bill, of course it will come out of this bill.

Mr. WARREN. Then I understand if the bill comes out of conference containing that provision, on notification of the conferees to the Senator from North Dakota, this item will be taken out?

Mr. GRONNA. It will be eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if this amendment is subject to a point of order I shall make one against it. I make it on the ground that no estimate has been made for the item; also, that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. SWANSON. Before the point of order is ruled on, I want to suggest that the rule says that where an item in an appropriation bill has been reported by a standing committee of the Senate it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. It is general legislation.

Mr. SWANSON. It simply carries out the present law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is entirely new matter, and the point of order is sustained.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 10, to insert:

Purchase of seed grain for drought-stricken areas: That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1921, to make advances or loans to farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the United States, where he shall find that special need for such assistance exists, for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes when necessary, to procure such seed and sell same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each farmer to use the seed thus obtained by him for the production of grain. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed the sum of $300. All such advances or loans shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000,000 immediately available.

SEC. 2. That any person who shall knowingly make any false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee having charge of the bill if this amendment is a duplication of the bill passed a few days ago?

Mr. GRONNA. It is exactly the same language that was in the bill that was passed last Monday.

Mr. THOMAS. If that bill is accepted by the House, this will go out?

Mr. GRONNA. This provision will go out if that passes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The total for the estimate is changed on lines 14 and 15. After the numerals insert the following words:

and an authorization for the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase farm loan bonds, $100,000,000, during the fiscal year 1921, and $100,000,000 during the fiscal year 1922.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the consideration of committee amendments, except those passed over. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over is on page 7, passed over at the instance of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. In the changing of the totals on lines 20 and 21 the amendments were passed over relating to general expenses of the Weather Bureau.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I offer to be inserted at that point. The Senator from Utah has approved the amendment, and I know of no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, after line 3, insert the following paragraph:

For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, including the pay of additional employees when necessary, $11,450: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire how the printing has been done in the past.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe it has been done by the Weather Bureau. The Senator from Utah is quite familiar with this matter. I have the estimate here. It is rather lengthy, but I shall have it read. I think perhaps that will give the information desired. I will ask the Secretary to read what the department has to say with regard to it.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

This item was eliminated through a point of order when the bill was under consideration in the House. The point of order was raised by Mr. KIESS, as he regarded a change in the language of the item necessary to avoid conflict with the provisions of section 11 of the legislative, executive, and judicial act approved March 1, 1919.

The Weather Bureau plant is admitted to be indispensable to the work of the bureau, and it is essential that the appropriation carried by the item be restored. A slight change in the language of the proviso will meet the wishes of the Joint Committee on Printing and also make the proviso conform to that passed by the House as an amendment of Representative Barnhart, then chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, during a debate on the bill for 1915. The amendment was agreed to by the Senate with the words "in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture" added. It is this added language that is now suggested omitted. The proposed language of the proviso is as follows:

"*Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau."

In view of the authority conferred upon the Joint Committee on Printing by the provisions of section 11, it is believed that the omission of the words mentioned will in no way restrict the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Weather Bureau in the supervision and administrative control of this plant, nor will it in fact increase the powers of the Joint Committee on Printing, which are now very specifically defined in section 11 and other laws.

From conferences with members of the Joint Committee on Printing, it is the understanding of the department that the modified provision is not objectionable to them. Therefore, the restoration of this item in the following language is recommended, to be inserted on page 7, between lines 3 and 4:

"For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, including the pay of additional employees, when necessary, $14,450: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau."

The amount submitted is the same as was included in the estimates, but $3,000 in excess of the item as reported to the House. The increase of $3,000 is needed for the purchase of supplies, equipment, and repairs, due to expanded costs. There has been no increase in this subappropriation for six years.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment be read.

The Assistant Secretary again read the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The totals will be changed to correspond with the amendment just agreed to. The next committee amendment passed over will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 16, under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry, salaries," the amount passed over was where the committee proposes to insert in line 7, after the numerals "$3,000," the following:

One administrative assistant in seed and plant distribution, $3,000.

The amount was reduced by the Senate from $3,000 to $2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the increased salary for Mr. Jones.

Mr. GRONNA. The present law allows a salary of $2,500. This would provide an increase of $500.

Mr. SMOOT. With a great deal less responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amount has already been reduced to $2,500 by the action of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. So I understood.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the record will show that I asked, before the final vote was taken, that the matter be passed over, and I understood the chairman of the committee that it would be passed over and taken up later, before a final vote was had upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the chair was not here at the time. He knows only what the RECORD shows.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the RECORD will show that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that the Senator may have a chance to have a vote upon it, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the reduction was agreed to may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote rejecting the amendment of the committee inserting "$3,000" at the end of the clause is reconsidered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the action of the committee ought to be sustained, because the matter was gone into thoroughly. I have said all I care to say about the work of this officer. Evidence of the estimate which the committee places upon him is recorded in the action taken by the committee, and I sincerely hope that $3,000 will be retained, as well as the official.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from South Carolina has said, that for a number of years the seed appropriation has gone out of the bill in the Senate almost every year. There has been only one exception that I remember for six or seven years. When the appropriation for the purchase of free seed went out, the appropriation for Mr. Jones went out with it. It as uniformly returned to the bill in conference.

Of course, the conferees were powerless to increase the salary of Mr. Jones. He is an old, faithful, efficient, and, I may add, a very obliging employee of the Government. I think many Senators will bear testimony to his character and reputation in that respect. It has been impossible to increase his pay under the parliamentary situation in which we have found ourselves year after year. It is possible that the seed appropriation may return in conference. I hope not. But we have arranged it so that Mr. Jones will remain in office in any event, charged with other duties of less responsibility. I hope the slight increase in his compensation will be made as a reward for his long and faithful service.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to say just one word more. I appreciate fully the contention made on the floor of the Senate about the great number of employees who may not be essential and the contention against the raising of salaries. There is little encouragement to an employee of the Government who is faithfully serving the Government, giving efficient service, using thrift and all the ability that he has to render that service, and who then receives no recognition at the hands of those who have charge of the affairs of the Government.

The Department of Agriculture complain that in their scientific work they can not keep the efficient scientific men who are rendering such splendid service, because the Government can not and will not meet the competition of private interests, whereas the interests of the Government are paramount to any private interests. Here is one man who has proven himself capable and efficient, tried for years and never found wanting, and we have the opportunity of giving him the pitiful sum of $3,000 a year, and yet there is a question as to the wisdom of that proceeding. It is small encouragement for men to give efficient work when those who have met the requirements that have been placed upon them efficiently have this kind of treatment at our hands.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to add merely one word. I am not going to say anything about Mr. Jones. We have many hundreds and thousands of employees who are just as loyal as Mr. Jones. He has been drawing $2,500 a year for years and years. Among the duties devolving upon him was the distribution of valuable seeds, millions of packages of seeds. I have no doubt that the seed provision is going to remain out of the bill if the bill becomes a law at this session of Congress.

Now, we are taking away from Mr. Jones at least three-fourths of the responsibility that was placed on him previously, and increasing his salary $500—I should say increasing his salary $260, because with the salary of $2,500 he gets a $240 bonus, making $2,740. The increase of salary now is to $3,000, which, of course, under the law, would carry no bonus, and therefore the increase is $260 instead of $500, as stated.

So we have been treating this employee like we have been treating everybody else in the Government service. I can not see any reason why, now that this immense amount of work has been taken away from him, three-quarters of all of the responsibilities that the man has had, his salary should be increased. It is for that reason that I hope that the $3,000, as reported by the committee, will be reduced to $2,500.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah will let this go to conference. If I am appointed a member of the conference committee, I will assure the Senator that if the congressional seeds provision does not go back into the bill, the salary of Mr. Jones will not be increased over $2,500, but if

it does go back, which we hope it will not, then I hope we can have the $3,000 provision remain in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. With that understanding, I shall not object.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that "$3,000" be substituted for "$2,500."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is to reduce the amount to $2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. I withdraw that motion, with the understanding contained in the statement just made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Then the question will be upon agreeing to the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the question now pending.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 47, at the foot of the page, the committee proposed to strike out "$38,000" and insert "$30,000," for enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," and so forth.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected. We labored under a misapprehension. I have a letter from the department which I will ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection and the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY,
Washington, February 15, 1921.

For the fiscal year 1921 the Agricultural appropriation bill carried an item under appropriation for the Bureau of Chemistry of $40,000 for the enforcement of the tea act of March 2, 1897, which was less than was asked for at the time of the transfer of the tea law to this department. However, by strict economy and reorganization of this work under the Bureau of Chemistry, and with excellent cooperation from the Customs Service of the Treasury Department, this work has been carried on satisfactorily and efficiently, so that in making up the estimates for the fiscal year 1922, notwithstanding the higher cost of everything connected with the service, we were able to place our estimates at the same figures, $40,000, but recommended that the lump sum be reduced about $3,500 by shifting one clerk at $1,500 per annum, one at $1,400 per annum, and a messenger at $600 per annum to the statutory roll of the bureau, thus reducing the lump sum to $36,500.

The Appropriations Committee of the House transferred one clerk at $1,400 per annum and the messenger at $600 per annum to the statutory roll of the bureau, but did not transfer the clerk at $1,500 per annum, but recommended that the lump sum for the enforcement of the tea act be $38,000, which would have taken care of the clerk at $1,500 per annum. These items as reported from the committee passed the House, but the Senate Agricultural Committee reported the bill out with the item for the enforcement of the tea act reduced to $30,000, exclusive of the two positions transferred to the statutory roll, or at a net decrease of $8,000, or 24 per cent.

If this reduction prevails, it will be absolutely impossible to enforce this act as Congress intended it should be enforced at the time of its passage, and as it has been enforced up to the present time.

Without the full enforcement of this law, the consumer can not be protected from impure and unwholesome tea, as the act provides, and uniformity of inspection of all teas entering the United States can not be continued. This latter condition, if allowed to occur, would bring about unfair competition among importers of teas, because teas below the physical standards of "purity, quality, and fitness for consumption" as fixed by the law, would gain entrance and go into competition with teas equal to the fixed standards, which would work to the detriment of the honest importer who lived up to the standards.

A policing measure of this kind to give full protection to the consumer as well as to the tea merchant must be enforced in its entirety, and any lack of enforcement in any direction nullifies the purposes for which the act was drawn, namely, to protect the consumer from impure and unwholesome teas.

The amount of money absolutely necessary to pay the salaries of the tea-examining force, exclusive of the two men on the statutory roll, which force can not be reduced without destroying the proper functioning of the service, is $28,950. The difference between this amount and the amount proposed by the Senate bill is $1,050, which would not cover the cost of fixing the Government standards, much less take care of the seven tea-examining offices, the drawing of samples, which must be taken from every line and grade and every shipment of tea, and for the traveling expenses of the inspectors and the maintenance of the United States Board of Tea Appeals.

It can be readily seen from these estimates that the reduction proposed in the bill now before the Senate can not spell anything but ruin to a law that protects the consumer from a food product that is one of the easiest to sophisticate and which, before the law was passed, was the most sophisticated and adulterated of any food product entering the United States; in fact, the United States was known as the dumping ground for all trashy and spurious teas.

Respectfully,

GEO. F. MITCHELL,
Supervising Tea Examiner.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to further amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As he will remember, I introduced an amendment to establish an experimental forestry station at Asheville, N. C. I understand the committee rejected the amendment, so far as it concerned the establishment of such a station at one particular place, but that the committee increased the appropriation under the head of "Silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations" by a sufficient amount to enable the department, if it saw proper, to establish the station at such place as it should determine.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that that is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. HARRISON. When we had the matter under consideration we had the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina before the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. We have not yet finished the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the committee amendments had been concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. On behalf of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 54, line 17, after the word "Agriculture," it is proposed to insert the following:

to develop the best methods and means of dealing with and spraying against the coddling moth and.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer another amendment.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 54, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

For investigations of insects affecting greenhouse florists' stock and other ornamental plants, $20,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Does that amendment increase the amount of the appropriation for the investigation of insects?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; that increases the amount by $20,000. I have very voluminous estimates for it, which I shall not take the time of the Senate to read, but it is a very important proposition, I will say to the Senator from Utah. I am sure he will not object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer another amendment.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 70, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert:

For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials, for continuing laboratory and field experiments, and for studies and investigations in road design, independently or in cooperation with the State highway departments and other agencies, $148,200, payable out of the administrative fund provided by the Federal aid road act of July 11, 1916, as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. Was that estimated for?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; and I will say for the information of the Senate that the member of the Appropriations Committee in the other House who had the bill in charge, Mr. SYDNEY ANDERSON, brought this amendment over to me and said that it should go into the bill. I think it went out on a point of order or in some such way in the other House. We are spending $400,000,000 for the construction of roads, and it seems to me that we ought to allow a sufficient amount to the Bureau of Roads to enable them to ascertain what sort of material ought to be used in road construction. I think it is a very important amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Why can not a part of that large appropriation be used for the purpose?

Mr. GRONNA. This does not enlarge the appropriation, I will say to the Senator from Colorado. It only permits taking out of the appropriation this amount.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from North Dakota said that we had appropriated several hundred million dollars for the building of roads. My question was why a part of that appropriation could not be used, and legitimately used, for this identical purpose?

Mr. GRONNA. As I understand, it can not be taken from that particular fund.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, perhaps it would be interesting to the Senate to know that when the first appropriation was made for this purpose, a number of years ago, it was $10,000. Senators who have gone out to Chevy Chase will remember that a little wooden house, a road experimental station, was constructed in that vicinity. A part of the first appropriation was

spent for the building of that box house. Each year since we have had an appropriation for the purpose, until it has now reached the aggregate of $148,000. I do not know what work that would cover, but I remember that one of the Senators from Colorado—not the present senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], however—was very much interested in the subject. The appropriation to which I have referred was the beginning of the proposition, and, I repeat, the appropriation has now grown to $148,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It involves merely the correction of a word.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 90, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "by" and insert the word "be."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. On behalf of the committee, I offer another amendment.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 90, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the President be, and is hereby, authorized and requested to extend invitations to foreign Governments to be represented by delegates in a world's dairy congress to be held in the United States in 1922: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to create any pecuniary obligation on the part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say that this is a matter which was overlooked by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I can not object to the amendment, but it will be followed by an appropriation to entertain the delegates while here.

Mr. SMOOT. As has uniformly been the case in the past.

Mr. THOMAS. As always is the case. Such invitations are accompanied by an express announcement that they will not cost anything, and then we are accused of inhospitality if we do not make the cost as much as the entertainment requires.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that this amendment is asked for by the President of the United States in a message which is contained in Document No. 347, of which I have a copy.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if we are through with the committee amendments——

Mr. GRONNA. There is one more committee amendment to be offered.

Mr. NEW. Then, I shall withhold my amendment until the committee amendments shall have been concluded.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am requested by the chairman of the committee to present the amendment which I send to the desk to be inserted as a new section of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

To enable the joint committee of the two Houses on short-time rural credits, constituted and appointed in pursuance of Public, No. 234, Sixty-sixth Congress, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, to continue and complete its labors and report, $5,000.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee while I suggest an amendment. On page 7, in line 19, I move that the figures "$81,020" be amended to read "$181,020."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$81,020," and insert "$181,020," so as to read:

For the maintenance of stations, for observing, measuring, and investigating atmospheric phenomena, including salaries, travel, and other expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $181,020.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to enable the Weather Bureau to perform a necessary function for the aeronautical service, both in relation to the Army and to the Post Office Department. It is necessary for that service to be supplied with accurate reports of weather conditions, and the Weather Bureau naturally can supply them better and more cheaply than can any other agency. While the amendment apparently involves an increase of $100,000 in the expense of conducting this service, as a matter of fact it involves no increase at all, for if the work is not performed by the Weather Bureau it will have to be performed by the Army and by the Post Office Department; so that the money will be expended whether by one agency or the other. It is merely a question of whether it shall be spent by two services, the Army and the Post Office Department, or whether it shall be spent and the service performed by the Weather Bureau, which can carry on the work to much better effect and advantage than can the other services.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, why will not the three services do the same work and follow out the duplications which are apparent in so many other branches of the Government service? Does not the Senator think that the Army and the Post Office Department will do the same work, no matter whether we give this appropriation or not?

Mr. NEW. No; not if the work is done by the Weather Bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. I will watch the result with a great deal of apprehension. If the Post Office Department has the money for the work and the Army has the money for it, they are going to do the work, no matter whether the Weather Bureau does it or not.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator's amendment shall be adopted, then will the work be done by one agency and be paid for only once by that one?

Mr. NEW. I think so; that is, at least, the purpose of the amendment and of the paragraph in the bill which covers the matter.

Mr. HEFLIN. The work will be done by one department, and paid for by one department, where it is now being paid for and being performed by two?

Mr. NEW. The work that will be done by the Weather Bureau under my amendment will be done by the Army and by the Post Office Department in case the amendment is not adopted. It can be done better by the Weather Bureau, and much more satisfactorily and accurately than if done by the other two services.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Indiana that the Department of Agriculture sent in an estimate for $281,000. The present law carries $81,000 for this purpose, the same as the amount in the pending bill. As one of the members of the committee, I should have no objection to allowing the amendment to go to conference, increasing the amount as reported by $100,000. I can not see that it will be an increase in appropriations if the work is not to be done by any other department, and as the Senator has assured that it will not be so done, I should be very glad to let the amendment go to conference, and we shall do the best we can to retain it.

Mr. NEW. Very well.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 53, and invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to the proposed amendment.

On page 53, line 22, I move to strike out "$110,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$160,000."

The reason for that is that unless the appropriation carried in the bill is increased to that extent an important portion of the work intended to be accomplished by that provision in the bill will not be done. I have here a letter on the subject from Dr. Howard, the chief of the bureau, in which he says:

I thought that possibly you might desire to know that a mistake has evidently been made. The failure of the Senate committee to include in its report this increase as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture might be due to the fact that the increase of $10,000 was asked to the stored-products item of the bill for truck-crop and stored-product insect investigations, making a total of $40,000 for this subappropriation, which is identical in amount with the increase requested for the sweet-potato weevil work. Furthermore, the House committee might be under the impression that, inasmuch as it has recommended that $15,000 be immediately available, this covers the amount desired. Without this amount of $40,000 additional for sweet-potato weevil work, we will be in a very bad way for next year, as the $15,000 to be made immediately available would scarcely more than cover our operations for the present fiscal year in eradicating this pest from northern Florida and that small portion of Georgia where it is now practically under control, owing to our efforts.

They have practically controlled the trouble in Georgia, but they have not reached it in Florida. It was through the efforts of the department in connection with this insect which destroys the sweet potato that it was eradicated in Georgia. Now they want to carry on the work in Florida, and they can not do it unless this appropriation is increased.

It is therefore suggested that in the act making appropriations for the Department of griculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, page 53, line 22, $110,000 be struck out and $150,000 be substituted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that I am in thorough sympathy with the Senator in

getting liberal appropriations to eradicate these insects; but the estimate is only $120,000, and we could not go above the estimate.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, perhaps, just as Dr. Howard says, the Senator confuses this estimate with some others. For instance, under two other subappropriation heads the amount estimated for was some $50,000, and it was, perhaps, supposed that that was intended to cover this section, but it does not cover it. My impression is that the estimate for this item is $160,000 or $150,000. The committee took care of the other subappropriation items but they did not take care of this provision. They might have thought that the $15,000 being immediately available would be sufficient, but that will be expended before this year is out.

Mr. GRONNA. The Book of Estimates shows an estimate of only $120,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does not the $120,000 apply to the one item of sweet-potato insects?

Mr. GRONNA. It applies to the paragraph on page 53, beginning with line 19, which reads as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting truck crops, including insects affecting the potato, sugar beet, cabbage, onion, tomato, beans, peas, etc., and insects affecting stored products.

The House allowed $110,000, and then the item reads:

Of which sum $15,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then the estimate is for $120,000?

Mr. GRONNA. One hundred and twenty thousand dollars. I have no objection to increasing that to $120,000 and letting it go to conference.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then I can not ask to go beyond the estimate. I will ask that the amendment be changed from $110,000 to $120,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 53, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$110,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "$120,000."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I only want to say that my information is that the department has done very valuable work in my own State toward eradicating this trouble, and this is clearly one of the cases in which the appropriation made a year ago has brought valuable results.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I do so at the suggestion of the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 42, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

For the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in cooperation with the University of California, $25,000.

Mr. McNARY. The reason for supporting this amendment is set forth very strongly by the chief forester, and I ask permission that his statement may be read, unless the chairman desires to dispose of the amendment otherwise.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this was not estimated for. I have no objection to having the statement of the chief forester read, but I regret to say that I can not approve it, as one member of the committee, and I hope it will not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make the point of order?

Mr. GRONNA. I should be very glad to submit it to a vote.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I should like to say a word on this subject.

Mr. THOMAS. I will make the point of order against the amendment, if it is not estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado make the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. If it is not estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I move to strike out lines 12, 13, 14, and 15, on page 50, which is the item that was the subject of some discussion this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 50, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 15, both inclusive, which read as follows:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply and methods of obtaining potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, $86,840.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have letters from the Director of the Geological Survey and the Director of the Bureau of Mines, both of whom concur in the views expressed here this morning to the effect that this is a mere duplication of the work of those two branches of the Government.

Mr. Smith's letter is as follows:

I regard the work of the Bureau of Soils under the item "For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other fertilizers" as duplicating work being done by the United States Geological Survey under current law. Since 1912 appropriations made for the Geological Survey have provided for "researches with a view of determining geological conditions favorable to the presence of deposits of potash salts," and the search has been made in the deserts of the West for potash minerals, including potash nitrate. Such exploration for supplies of mineral raw materials is essentially geologic and the recognized province of the Geological Survey, irrespective of what use is made of the raw materials. For 10 years this is the position I have held in every conference with representatives of the Bureau of Soils, and, while cooperating with them, I have regretted this duplication of effort.

The investigation of methods of mining potash minerals, their manufacture, and especially the recovery of potash as by-products in metallurgical processes, is a subject outside the work of the Geological Survey, except the annual collection of the statistics of production. Since 1910 the technological investigations of mineral products have come under the Bureau of Mines, and with the technologic work of that bureau on potash the survey's geologic work on the same subject has been coordinated without duplication.

Yours, very cordially,

GEO. OTIS SMITH, *Director.*

So, Mr. President, the first part—that is, the part in the bill as it came from the House—is a straight duplication of the work of the Geological Survey. The part which originated with the Senate committee—the methods of obtaining the potash from the minerals in connection with which it is found—is a part of the work of the Bureau of Mines, as disclosed by the following letter from the Director of the Bureau of Mines:

In answer to your telephone call, in which you state that the Agricultural appropriation bill carried a clause "for exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply and method for obtaining potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, $86,840," and inquiring if this came within the work of the Bureau of Mines:

The organic act of the Bureau of Mines charges it "with the province and duty to conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning mining and the preparation, treatment, and utilization of mineral substances."

Further, in the act providing for the establishing and maintenance of mining experiment stations, it was stated that they were "for the purposes of making investigations and disseminating information * * * in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries * * * preventing unnecessary waste of resources, and otherwise contributing to the advancement of these industries." Accordingly, the Bureau of Mines has carried out considerable work in the mining, treatment, and utilization of the so-called nonmetallic minerals, which include potash, nitrates, phosphates, and other natural fertilizers. In addition, the bureau is planning to enlarge this work, having already placed in the hands of the mining committees of Congress for their consideration a bill to increase the appropriation to the Bureau of Mines for this very purpose, and such bill is now being considered by the Mines and Mining Committee of the House.

The bureau has been working on the recovery of potash and alumina from low-grade alunite at its Salt Lake station, and at the present time a branch of the nonmetallic work which has just been established at Tuscaloosa, Ala., will carry on investigations in connection with raw materials, both as regard potash and phosphate rock. In addition, during the war the Bureau of Mines was actively engaged in the metallurgical end of the manufacture of nitrates, this work being under Dr. C. L. Parson, then chief chemist of the bureau. Also, the Bureau of Mines, through its connection with the Anaconda Commission, detailed an engineer to study and report on the manufacture of phosphates and sulphuric acid, and this work has been partially published in a bureau bulletin.

Finally, the work of inspection and conservation of the mining operations on Government land, including phosphates and sodium minerals, under act of February 25, 1920, has been placed in the Bureau of Mines for administration.

The Geological Survey has carried out a great deal of work in connection with the geology, occurrence, and resources of these nonmetallic minerals, and functions closely with the Bureau of Mines without duplication.

Accordingly, it is my belief that the clause which provides for carrying on this work by the Agricultural Department does duplicate and overlap the work delegated to and now being carried out, so far as funds permit, by the Bureau of Mines.

Cordially, yours,

E. A. HOLBROOK,
Acting Director.

Accordingly it does not seem to me that there is any justification whatever for this item.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I can understand clearly how the two departments to which the Senator refers do the work to which he has called attention, but that is incidental to their work. It is almost like the coking of coal. Incidental to that there are certain by-products, but the Agricultural Department is charged with the specific duty of promoting agriculture, and I submit that one of the most important functions that it can discharge is to locate all possible sources of fertilizers and to give to the agricultural interests of this country that information. My interpretation of this clause would be that they are not restricted to the mineral sources alone but that they may go to any and every source that would tend to increase the supply of these necessary ingredients and inform the agricultural public of that fact.

It may be possible that in some respects the work of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines may be in extension

of or may be helpful to the work of the Agricultural Department. But they are hunting minerals, and they are hunting them for general purposes, and for all purposes for which potash may be used, for which phosphorus may be used, or for which nitrates may be used. But the specific and definite purpose with which this department is charged is to find the sources of supply for agriculture, and if these departments can aid them in this work, well and good; but we should not strike from an Agricultural appropriation bill an appropriation which gives to the Department of Agriculture the duty and power to investigate and find the sources of a thing upon which agriculture depends.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if there is to be an appropriation made, if we will not allow even incidental and unavoidable duplication, that the appropriation should be taken from these two departments and that work left with the Agricultural Department. But that can not be done, because the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Soils are charged with hunting out the minerals and the soil, perhaps, of this country for the benefit of the general public. Incidentally, they find potash, and that is for the use of the general public. They find nitrates, and that is for the use of the general public. But this department is charged with searching for these minerals and other organic and inorganic substances for the purpose of making fertilizer, and the two are in distinct fields, only where one incidentally laps unavoidably the other. The purpose of that department is not to hunt fertilizer. That is only incidental.

The purpose of this is to search for the source, not only in the mineral field, in the inorganic field, but in the organic field, and I submit that we should not abate this appropriation, when we charge them with one of the prime elements upon which agriculture rests. I concede that there might be an incidental overlapping. I suppose that would occur in any department charged with a general duty and another with a specific or definite duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator is quite willing to amend it so as to exclude mineral sources, I shall not have the slightest objection to it. If he will make it "sources of natural fertilizer other than mineral," then he would have the situation just as he wants it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Perhaps the Senator would be more willing to agree with my standpoint if he would take into cognizance the fact that two years ago there was discovered a sort of potash in this country. I do not know just which one of the several departments promulgated that fact. The potash was bought by farmers all through the country and applied to the crops with disastrous results, so much so that some crops were a total loss. Upon investigation it was found that it was rich in potash content, but also had a percentage of borax, which, when applied to the soil, absolutely killed the plants.

The Bureau of Mines were hunting potash. They had found potash. The bureau of the Agricultural Department wanted a potash suited for agriculture. In some of the industries throughout the country that potash might have been all-sufficient; the borax might not have been deleterious. But when we bought the potash in good faith, tobacco, corn, and cotton were starved.

Have you charged in your law that when they develop and find this potash, and publish abroad that they have a rich potash content available for the farm, they are to go into it and prepare it as a fertilizer? It is quite a different proposition. When the Bureau of Mines discovers a source of potash, under this the Department of Agriculture can go and test to find whether it is a sulphate or a muriate, or whether it contains deleterious chemicals which make it unfit for fertilizer.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from South Carolina is not unacquainted with the geological conditions under which these deposits are found. These nonmetallic substances are always found associated, and they are made useful for commercial purposes by a process of refining. That is the case with phosphates, that is the case with potash, that is the case with nitrates. That is a different thing altogether from discovering the source. To make these sources available by manufacture for the purpose desired is quite a different thing, not covered by this item of the appropriation bill at all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the Senator will notice that the language says for exploration and investigation of the sources of and supply of fertilizer, not of chemicals, not of minerals, which in themselves may be ultimately reduced and adapted for fertilizer purposes, but they are charged with the specific duty of finding amongst the chemicals that the Bureau of Soils and the Bureau of Mines finds, which ones are adapted to fertilizer purposes. Therefore it is a distinct field in which this department is called upon to work, and I think it would be a disaster for us to strike from the bill this provision, which guards and guarantees, through investigation, the people who must depend upon commercial fertilizers for the production of crops.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to add just one word. It is true that the explorations made by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey for the purpose of discovering these minerals are to discover them for any use to which they may be put, not especially for the use in fertilizer. But if the argument of the Senator from South Carolina is correct, we ought to put a provision in the Army bill authorizing the Army to make explorations with a view to finding nitrates and potash for use in the manufacture of powder and other explosives.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think we do that identical thing, and that is part of the Army process. It is part of the building up of the Army.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Up to the present time the Army has not conducted any explorations for the purpose of finding sources of supply.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It had the chemists, who were all ready to take the sources and do what we propose these people shall do, find out what of the chemicals discovered are fit for explosives, and that is what we are doing, providing that they shall explore and find out, through investigation, what is fit for agriculture. I do not know what other language you could use which would protect the people of this country in the use of artificial fertilizers.

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

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 75, line 2, strike out "$390,160" and insert in lieu thereof "$750,000," so that it will read:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of live stock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, $750,000.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in an effort to try to make the appropriation in accordance with the recommendation of the department. I know of no more important undertaking of the Department of Agriculture, or one that is fraught with greater possibilities for benefit, than that covered by this particular paragraph, which provides for information to be furnished to the agricultural interests of the country upon market conditions.

The most serious problem of our producers of fruits and of vegetables is the one of markets. Many of the States, even, have established marketing bureaus, because it has been realized that there was such great necessity along this line. Under the policy which has already been inaugurated by the Federal Government, a great deal of good has been accomplished, and at this particular time to curtail the appropriation would very much hamper the department in furnishing information to the agricultural interests of the country regarding marketing conditions. The department estimated that $750,000 would be necessary to carry on this important work, but for some reason the House thought proper to cut it down to $390,000, and now the Senate committee recommends only that amount.

I know it is getting late in the day, Mr. President, and I shall not attempt to discuss the question at length, but I am fully convinced that there is great merit in the recommendation of the department that the appropriation should be $750,000, and I have therefore moved that it be amended so as to grant the amount requested by the department.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk as a new section to be added at the end of the bill. I think the chairman of the committee will be willing to accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Add a new section at the end of the bill, as follows:

SEC. —. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed hereafter to submit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a report showing what investigations devolved upon the Department of Agriculture have been completed during the preceding fiscal year, and also showing what

services, if any, devolved upon the department are being performed or duplicated, in whole or in part, by any other department, bureau, or agency of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on page 41, line 18, I move to strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 41, line 18, strike out "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000," in the item "for the investigation of methods for wood distillation and for the preservative treatment of timber," and so forth.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this is an increase of $150,000 for the forest-products laboratory. Besides the forest-products laboratory which is located at Madison, Wis., there are four offices maintained in lumber-producing States, and there is also a small testing laboratory at Seattle, in Washington.

There is not a State in the Union where lumber is produced that has not as deep an interest in the maintenance at its fullest capacity for experimentation of the laboratory located at Madison, Wis., as have the people of Wisconsin and their Representatives. I have received many letters from lumbermen, not only in the State of Wisconsin but over the country, asking that the appropriation might be brought to the amount of the estimate of the department.

The work that is being done there in the elimination of waste is a perfect marvel. I know it was a great surprise to me, and I doubt if many Senators upon the floor know, that 75 per cent of a tree is absolutely wasted before it is converted into wrought lumber and put in the yard. Only 25 per cent of it is saved. Between 40 and 60 per cent of the material that goes from the lumber yard to be manufactured into furniture is wasted and lost.

In the matter of handles for tools made from hickory, two tons of that wood—and it is rather a precious wood, being used up very rapidly—when made into the finished product result in only 400 pounds of finished material. It is unnecessary that this waste should go on. It is wrong that it should go on.

I do not wish to take the time of the Senate. I believe the amendment will carry without any speech from me in support of it, but if Senators are interested I have many facts and arguments that I would be glad to submit in support of it. I am very anxious to see it added to the bill. I do not wish to see expenditures made from the Treasury at this time that can not be justified, but every dollar invested under the amendment which I have proposed will be paid back an hundredfold, a thousandfold, to the people of the country.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the matter to which he has referred is by no means of merely local interest. I have received a large number of letters from lumbermen in my State. Ohio is not a great lumbering State, but the lumbermen there are interested in this proposition. If the Senator will permit me, I will read what one of them said in a letter to me:

WINCHESTER LUMBER CO.,
Winchester, Ohio, February 21, 1921.

Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is our belief, in common with the majority of the wood-using industries of the United States, that the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has been of great service to the wood-working industries, because it serves our need by promoting conservation of our basic raw material.

We note that Congress plans to dispose of the appropriation bills before March 4. We note also that the Secretary of Agriculture has decided to ask Congress for only $400,000 for the laboratory for the coming year in place of the $500,000 originally asked for by the Chief of the Forest Service. It is possible that this appropriation may again be cut in the House or the Senate unless its Members are made to appreciate the value and need of research in forest products, both from the standpoint of the industries themselves and general public welfare.

We believe that an appropriation of $500,000 for the Forest Products Laboratory would be money well expended, and we are taking the liberty of calling this matter to your attention, with the thought that you will be glad to lend the appropriation bill your support and personal influence. We would appreciate your letting us know what action you may be able to take in this matter.

Yours, very truly,

WINCHESTER LUMBER CO.
H. H. MEDELIN.

Our people are in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I hope that it will be agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to add to what the Senator from Ohio has said, that we have been profiting out in the State of Montana by the operations of the experiment station at Madison, and the work in connection with it has been called to my attention.

Our mountains are covered with a dense growth of small pine, generally known as lodge-pole pine, which rarely attains a size greater than 12 or 18 inches in diameter, and is of practically no value for timber purposes. It was then thought that it ought to be made available in some form for wood pulp, but the abundance of pitch in the timber forbade its use for that purpose.

The station at Madison has been conducting extensive experiments for the purpose of devising some plan by which this vast amount of timber can be utilized for the production of wood pulp. They have made very excellent progress, and the experimentations promise the highest degree of success. It would be a boon to the country if the paper supply could be augmented by that great source, and it is not at all improbable that it will be made wholly so by the operations of this valuable plant of the Government at Madison.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to add just this word to what has been said. At Bogalusa, La., there is what Louisianians claim to be the largest sawmill on earth. The principal stock is held by some people in Buffalo, N. Y., known as the Bogalusa Lumber Co. It has been going forward very rapidly in the most progressive manner. The general manager is Mr. W. H. Sullivan. Recently they decided to add an $8,000,000 addition to their pulp-manufacturing plant. Mr. Sullivan has several times called to my attention the invaluable service rendered to his enterprise and to the lumber industry in Louisiana by the laboratory at Madison, Wis. He has appealed to me to assist in securing an increased appropriation for this purpose.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Montana, that it would be a most wise addition to the bill. In my own State we are denuding the forests of timber very rapidly. We are trying to grow new forests. I do not know that the amendment would apply particularly to the loblolly pine that we are growing in the new forests, but I believe it would, because that pine, which grows very rapidly, is used largely for pulp, and the Madison wood products laboratory is finding new uses of lumber for pulp.

It is also training the people of Louisiana how to convert into paper pulp all the limbs and the refuse material. They are pretty nearly as good about that down there as they are in Chicago, where it is said they lose nothing of the hog but the squeal. Down in my State, as the result of the work of the Wisconsin Products Laboratory, some of the mills are losing literally nothing but the bark. They are also exhibiting great results there from the investigation of the stumps. The stumps of the pine trees contain very valuable products in the way of pitch, tar, turpentine, and resin, and other things that are immensely valuable. It is a very difficult problem for us now to get enough out of the stumps to make it pay to take them from the soil. It costs from $30 to $40 an acre to get rid of the stumps, and the Wisconsin laboratory is rapidly showing us how to get rid of them with profit.

I do not believe we could do more wisely than to agree to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not inclined to take further time of the Senate.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 90, after line 8, insert:

That the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations and the United States Council of the World's Poultry Congress and other organizations, be, and he hereby is, authorized on behalf of the United States to make suitable exhibits at the World's Poultry Congress of the International Association of Poultry Instructors and Investigators to be held at The Hague, Holland, September 6 to 13, 1921, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, for the preparation, assembling, transportation, maintenance, and demonstration of the exhibits, which exhibits, upon their return to the United States, shall be the property of the United States and remain under the control of the Department of Agriculture. And the Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized to select and, out of the appropriation authorized hereunder, defray the expenses of three delegates who are officials or employees of the Department of Agriculture to attend the said congress and of investigating and reporting in connection with said congress on poultry conditions and methods of poultry production and marketing.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the hour is getting late, and there is no objection to the amendment so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the chairman in charge of the bill whether any estimate was made for the appropriation?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not believe there was an estimate made for it, but I was about to say that so far as the committee is concerned we are willing to let it go to conference.

Mr. THOMAS. If no estimate has been made for it, I wish to submit a point of order against it.

Mr. CALDER. I will not press the amendment, as I believe no estimate has been made.

Mr. THOMAS. I make the point of order against it if there has been no estimate for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There having been no estimate, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I move to add at an appropriate place in the bill the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Insert in the proper place in the bill the following:

That the sum of $30,000 is hereby appropriated, to be immediately available for expenditure and to continue available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a forest experiment station at such place in the State of Arizona as he may select, for the purpose of conducting in Arizona and adjacent States silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with State, county, and municipal agencies, educational institutions, business organizations, and individuals, in order to determine the best methods for the management of forest lands.

Mr. ASHURST. In support of the amendment I will state that I introduced it as a separate bill and sent a copy to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. GRONNA] who in turn transmitted my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. I also sent a copy to the department and have received the following letter from the Secretary, which I will read. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 2, 1921.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I have your letter of January 29 inclosing a copy of the bill introduced by you for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in Arizona. A letter of the same date was also received from Senator GRONNA, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which your bill was referred, asking for a report from this department on it. I take pleasure in inclosing for your information a copy of my reply to Senator GRONNA, from which you will see that the department recognizes the urgent need for the establishment of such a station and recommends the passage of the bill which you have introduced.

May I also take advantage of this opportunity to express my appreciation of your interest in the matter and the hope that you will be successful in securing favorable action?

Very sincerely, yours,

E. T. MEREDITH, *Secretary.*

The Secretary transmitted a copy of his letter to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], pointing out at some length the advisability, indeed, the necessity, of establishing the experiment station. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall have to be consistent. I made a point of order against a similar amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] a few moments ago, and I shall have to make one against this if no estimate was made for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Was there an estimate?

Mr. ASHURST. I have read the letter from the Department of Agriculture, and being frank with the Senate I doubt if that is an estimate under the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not an estimate. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall be very brief. I offer another amendment, which I ask to have read.

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

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the proper place in the bill the following:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to reimburse landowners residing on Yuma project, Arizona-California, for all moneys they have heretofore paid into the United States Reclamation Service for the operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system of said project.

That there is also hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be placed to the credit of the United States Reclamation Service and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of paying the operation and maintenance costs of said Colorado River front work and levee system on said Yuma project, Arizona-California, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and an additional sum of $100,000 per annum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the operation and maintenance of said Colorado River front work and levee system, it being hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to assume the obligation of caring for said river front work and levee system on said Yuma project, Arizona-California, and not to have the same charged to said project as any part of constructing or maintaining the reclamation work of said Yuma project, Arizona-California.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, a word in explanation of the amendment. The Reclamation Service constructed in Arizona-California a reclamation project near Yuma. Some forty-five or fifty thousand acres of land are irrigated there under this reclamation project. The third largest river in the United States, the Colorado River, which drains about 245,000 square miles, debouches into the point where the irrigated farms are. The result is that the water users there for many years past have been charged the enormous expense incurred by the Reclamation Service in revetting the banks and controlling that river. I am sure that ultimately, if not at this time, the Congress will declare that the farmers there—few in number, comparatively—should not and ought to be required to pay the expense of holding within a fixed channel a river which is not only interstate but which is international in character, and is, as I have said, the third largest river in the United States.

It will shock the conscience of a humane man to say that a few farmers must hold within its channel at that point the third largest river of our country, one that in July rises and whose cutting edge destroys many farms. That is my reason for offering the amendment to this bill. I offer the amendment, and hope that no Senator will make a point of order against it, although I know it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator withhold his point of order until I put into the RECORD some figures?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. The water which comes down each year, the run-off which passes Yuma, where these farms are located, amounts to an average of 19,000,000 acre-feet; in other words, it is enough to cover 19,000,000 acres with water 1 foot deep.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with the argument of the Senator from Arizona; I think that the Government of the United States has imposed upon it the duty of protecting that section of the country from river inundations; but I do not think this is the way to get at it, and particularly as there has been no estimate of the amounts of money expended or of the extent to which attempted revetment of the river by private enterprise has gone. I am therefore compelled to make the point of order against the amendment, there being no estimate for the expenditure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall thank the Chair and the Senate for indulging me long enough to offer another amendment. I ask the Secretary to recur to page 23, line 20, of the bill. Commencing with line 17, on that page, the language reads as follows:

For investigations in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, $70,000.

I propose an amendment to increase the numerals in line 20 from $70,000 to $94,420.

I was recently traveling through the West, not in my own State but in another State, and some of the citizens appealed to me to assist their Senators, if possible, in securing an investigation of a valley there the soil of which would be very fertile, and if water could be placed upon it would produce abundant crops. The citizens directed a letter to the Reclamation Service, but the reply was to the effect that the service did not have adequate funds with which to make an investigation as to the suitability or the feasibility of a reclamation project at that point. In Arizona I was recently appealed to by the citizens of the town of Winslow, which is on the Little Colorado River, with vast tracts of land adjacent, upon which practically no crops are grown, which is wholly a desert, and yet with the Little Colorado River running through it. So the Representative of Arizona in Congress, Mr. HAYDEN, telegraphed or wrote to the Chief of the Reclamation Service and simply asked him to send some person from the Reclamation Service to investigate the soil and water supply in order to ascertain the suitability or the feasibility of a project at that point. The Reclamation Office replied to Mr. HAYDEN to the effect that they had no funds with which they could make such an investigation.

The estimate of the department for this item is $94,420. It will simply give the Reclamation Service an adequate fund with which that service may examine into the feasibility or the suitability of reclamation projects at a particular point. No more worthy appropriation could be made, as citizens of our country are entitled to have some governmental agency tell them offi-

cially from a scientific standpoint whether or not a project could successfully be established at a particular point.

When we speak of irrigation we must not forget that there are 18,000,000 acres in the United States now under irrigation, but only 2,000,000 acres are irrigated by the Government, whilst 16,000,000 acres are irrigated by private enterprise, and I can not at the moment conceive of an appropriation more worthy or more beneficial to the country than one that will provide adequate moneys to the department to enable it to ascertain whether or not the physical features here or there are such as to encourage farmers and home builders in indulging any further hope for a Government project.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. I merely wished to ask the Senator from Arizona a question.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. This is a very meritorious amendment, undoubtedly, but the present law carries $52,380, I believe. The House increased that amount and made it $70,000.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; the House fixed the sum at $70,000.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say that the committee did not go into this particular case in any minute detail, but I have no objection to letting the amendment go to conference, inasmuch as it proposes to appropriate the amount estimated for.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator. The amendment is not subject to a point of order, as it was estimated for by the department.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this is the bill that provides for the construction of public roads, and it is very proper that the Bureau of Road Construction should be under the Agricultural Department, and that provisions respecting appropriations and policies in connection with road building should be incorporated in this bill. There is pending in the Senate a bill to which a majorty of the Senate have already recorded themselves as favorable. I believe on the motion to suspend the rule to make in order as an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill the road bill appropriating $100,000,000 to carry on road construction in the United States the vote was 42 yeas to 33 nays, so that there was a majority of 9 in favor of that bill. The same bill has already passed the House by a vote of 230 to 30.

Of course, the Post Office appropriation bill was not as appropriate a measure to carry a piece of legislation such as the road bill which passed the House as is the Agricultural appropriation bill. It is undenied, I imagine, at least it is not a controverted proposition, that the road bill as passed by the House should be considered at this time in connection with a general appropriation bill for agricultural and road-construction purposes. Since the Senate has already declared itself as favorable to the road bill, even under the peculiar circumstances of having to vote to suspend the rules to place it on an appropriation bill, certainly no Senator would object or would make a point of order, and thereby prevent the placing of this piece of legislation providing $100,000,000 for road construction on a general appropriation bill for agricultural purposes.

So I am going to offer as an amendment to the pending bill, a bill which has already passed by such a tremendous vote the House of Representatives, which has already been sanctioned by a majority of 9 in the Senate, 42 Members of the Senate saying that even the rules of the Senate should be suspended in order that this proposed legislation might be passed. I sincerely hope that no point of order will be made against it, and that no objection will be made to it, because not only what I have narrated is true, but on the 4th of March this Congress will adjourn; there are many bills on the calendar; we are trying to expedite the passage of all the general supply bills, and practically no other legislation will come up from now until the 4th of March, there being only a very few working days remaining. So unless we incorporate in the pending appropriation bill the very important piece of legislation to which I have referred, appropriating $100,000,000 to carry on this general road construction policy, the bill which was passed by the House will die on the 4th of March. I am sure the Senate does not desire that the measure shall die during this Congress which will necessitate our going to work at the next session and passing it through both House and Senate at that time. So I offer as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill, the road bill which has been championed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and which has already received the indorsement of the Senate by a majority of 9 votes.

The amendment proposed by Mr. HARRISON is, in line 18, page 72, to insert:

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.

SEC. 2. 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.

SEC. 3. 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.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the amounts expended hereunder.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall have to disappoint my friend from Mississippi. It is true that there was a vote on the motion to suspend the rules so as to make in order the measure which the Senator from Mississippi now presents, and on that motion the bill commanded a majority, but not two-thirds. It is a disagreeable duty, of course, to perform when such a vast sum as $100,000,000 is so near and with a point of order becomes so far. I think, however, that the country will get along and road building will continue under existing appropriations if this measure goes over until the next Congress, when a Republican Senate and a Republican House may pass it, and not only get all the prestige out of it, if there be any, but may also refer to the fact that it would have passed the Senate but for the objection of a Democrat. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 59, line 25, after the numerals "$2,000," it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the line, and on page 60, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "$1,800" where they first appear and to insert in lieu thereof, on page 59, line 23, after the numerals "$3,000," the following:

One chief cinematographer, $2,500.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this place was estimated for. The amendment provides a different title for the man who makes all the important moving pictures for the Department of Agriculture. At present he is paid under the title of "assistant in document section, $1,800." This amendment provides that he shall get $2,500.

I know of no better recommendation for this man than to read just a brief statement of the Chief of the Division of Publications when he appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture. He said:

As I have said, gentlemen, he is an excellent motion-picture photographer, and he is a man who could unquestionably demand a very much higher salary outside of the department. Incidentally, he was pretty severely injured last year in getting some pictures for the department and was laid up for a considerable length of time. I feel that it is particularly important that we pay this man more money

if we are going to retain his services. We can not hope to keep him for the money we now can pay him and we could not replace him for twice the salary he is now getting. I regard the promotion * * * for this man as * * * most important.

Mr. President, I know this man. I know that he has made several important inventions and given them to the Government, and I believe that the Government would do well to give him this increase of $700 per annum. I am afraid that if we do not, outside moving-picture concerns will take him, and the Government will lose a good man and have difficulty in replacing him.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suppose the object of changing this man's title is to increase his salary. If we do this with one man, I think we will have to do it with all engaged in this business, and there are a great many of them in the Government service at the present time. I should think, for example, we would want to increase the salary of the photographer who takes pictures for the O'Connor Stock Co.

I noticed the other day in the paper an advertisemment of the O'Connor Stock Co. I never had heard of that stock company before, and I read the advertisement down, and I found that the performance was to be held in the conference room of the Post Office Building. A couple of years ago I called attention to the fact that we had a theater down here, and that we ought to use the space for employees of the Government, but that that whole space was set aside for a theater in the Post Office Building down on Pennsylvania Avenue; and immediately after I called the attention of the Senate to it the name of the theater was changed to the "conference room." I see now that the O'Connor Stock Co. is to be playing at the conference room of the Post Office Building, Eleventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. It says what they are going to be interested in and what the play is to be.

I think the time has come when this ought to stop. I received, I think, three letters last week from employees of the Government complaining bitterly because they were called, after they had worked in some cases and in some cases during their work, to go and attend social functions in the departments. I do not know where we are drifting, and I want to know if this item was estimated for at $2,500.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will say to the Senator that it was estimated for at $2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. This man is drawing $1,800 now?

Mr. GRONNA. He is drawing $1,800 now; yes. The committee did not see fit to approve the recommendation, and I hope it will not prevail.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, was there not an estimate for a general increase of salaries at this time?

Mr. GRONNA. There was an estimate for a general increase, but it was not allowed.

Mr. WARREN. It was estimated, however?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. They estimated for increases all the way through?

Mr. GRONNA. In a great many instances they did, I think.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this man has nothing whatever to do with the O'Connor Stock Co., to which the Senator from Utah has referred. I will say to the Senate that there is no more efficient man in the Government employ than this man. Last year he was borrowed by the Navy Department to take overhead pictures from aircraft of the fleet in the Chesapeake. The plane from which he was taking pictures fell, and he was nearly killed, and was laid up for three months in the hospital. Subsequently, when he recovered his health, he was sent to Minneapolis to take pictures in flour mills there for the Department of Agriculture. There, again, through an explosion, he was very nearly killed.

Mr. President, I repeat that there is no more efficient public servant than this man, and I say to the Senate that if they fail to increase his pay in all probability they will lose him, and then they will have an estimate next year for $5,000 for a man to fill his place.

I hope the Senate will agree to my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 46 of the bill, to which I call the attention of the chairman of the committee. It is advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Meredith. It is, on line 20, after the word "sirup," to add the words "and sugar," so that it will read:

For the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and sugar and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups—

And so forth.

I do not wish to make any speech. I ask to have published as a part of my remarks the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is addressed to Chairman GRONNA, on the 18th instant, and it says, in substance, that—

It is not the intention to divert to the study of sugar production any funds which are needed for the development and improvement of methods of producing table sirups. The amendment proposed will merely permit the Bureau of Chemistry to apply in the most effective manner the information and knowledge gained as a result of its investigation—

And so forth.

I will ask the chairman if he has investigated the matter?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, so far as I can, I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. RANSDELL. It does not add a cent of expense.

Mr. SMOOT. It will next year.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask to have the letter to which I refer published in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1921.

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GRONNA: I desire to suggest, for your consideration, the insertion of the words "and sugar" in line 20, page 46, of the Agricultural appropriation bill as reported to the Senate, so that the provision (lines 19 and 20) will read:

"For the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and sugar and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups * * *."

The proposed change will greatly facilitate the work of the Bureau of Chemistry in applying to processes of sugar production the information gained in connection with the study of the production of table sirups, of which cane sirup has been the principal subject of investigation. The production of cane sirup and of cane sugar are very closely related, inasmuch as the clarification of the juice is the principal feature of both these processes, and the Bureau of Chemistry has found that much of the information acquired in connection with the production of cane sirup can be very readily applied with profit to the production of sugar. The insertion of the words "and sugar," as suggested, will give that bureau greater freedom in applying this knowledge, without interfering in any way with the work on cane sirup. It is not the intention to divert to the study of sugar production any funds which are needed for the development and improvement of methods of producing table sirups. The amendment proposed will merely permit the Bureau of Chemistry to apply, in the most effective manner, the information and knowledge gained as a result of its investigation. The application of this information to the production of sugar is, of course, merely incidental and subsidiary to the study of the production of cane sirup and table sirups in general.

Very truly, yours,

E. T. MEREDITH, *Secretary.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, for the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], who is unavoidably absent, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase and acquire the lands occupied by the department's experiment vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif., now maintained under contracts with the owners of said lands: *Provided*, That the land purchased for the Fresno vineyard shall not exceed 20 acres at a cost not to exceed $12,000 and for the Oakville vineyard not to exceed 20 acres at a cost not to exceed $15,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there has been no estimate for that appropriation, and I make the point of order against it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator will see that no appropriation is made.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; $12,000 and $15,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is simply an authorization to buy.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the same thing.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, no. There is no appropriation made, so that that point of order, I take it, would not lie.

Mr. SMOOT. Then it is general legislation on an appropriation bill, and not reported by a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it has been authorized to be reported by the Senate Agricultural Committee as a separate bill, though not as an amendment to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think a thing can be purchased without paying for it in some way. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 48, I move to strike out lines 1 to 7, as follows:

For investigating the grading, weighing, handling, transportation, and uses of naval stores, the preparation of definite type samples thereof, and for the demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, in cooperation with individuals and companies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $10,000.

That item was put in the bill a number of years ago, for one year. It has been running now for several years, and I can not see that there is any use whatever in the appropriation. The last time when the question arose it was said: "Well, let it go in for one more year." It went in that year and I think it ought to go out now.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not think this has been a useless appropriation at all. I think the department has been doing very good work under it. They now have rosin, for instance, classified, and they have naval stores standardized in a way, and they are doing first-rate work under this appropriation. I think it is quite an important appropriation. The industry of naval stores, including rosin and turpentine, is a very considerable one. The appropriation is small, and I think it ought to be continued.

Mr. SMOOT. Three years ago, at the time the question came up, it was asked that it should go in for that year, and at that time the committee did not report it out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it was not limited to one year at that time. I presented the original provision.

Mr. SMOOT. It was limited because all the appropriations were limited for one year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But it was not limited according to the suggestion of the Senator. As he says, all appropriations are made for one year.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but on the floor of the Senate, when the question arose as to whether it should be put into the bill, they said: "Well, let it go in for one more year," and that was three years ago.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That may be true, but it is an important appropriation. The industry is a very large one. The appropriation has been used to do excellent work; the men interested are very numerous; the amount of our exports of naval stores is very large; the standardization and the other work that is being done by the Department of Agriculture is helping our foreign commerce, and is of value to the producers.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I want to tell the Senator what this work is. I am afraid he does not know. They have recently discovered a new way of making rosin out of turpentine stumps, and the colors shift and change, and they tell the value of the rosin by the colors. They have people working on these standards of various colors. They have standardized it a good deal like they have cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. Just exactly.

Mr. HARRISON. The work has not been finished yet. It has been estimated for. I do not know when it will be finished, but it is rendering valuable service to a big industry in this country, and the appropriation should be made.

Mr. SMOOT. My information is that the work is completed, and that they have prepared these samples showing the colors. They are about 3 inches in circumference and show the colors of all the different grades.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the information of the Senator is inaccurate.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I got my information pretty straight.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I received mine directly from the head of the naval stores organization at Savannah, Ga., and I am assured by them that the work is still progressing and is still necessary.

Mr. FLETCHER. Not only that, but the item covers the question of the use of naval stores. It can never be done in one year.

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

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments to be proposed? If not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There was one amendment which the chairman of the committee said he would offer again.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true; but it was with reference to the preparing and packing of fish and sea food of all kinds. The Senator from Utah has some information showing that it is really a duplication, and I said to the Senator from Utah that I would not press the amendment. The Senator from Utah promised that he would have the information inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. So that the record may be complete, I ask that a letter I received from the Secretary of Commerce, dated February 23, 1921, sent to me this morning, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 23, 1921.

MY DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the debate on the Agriculture appropriation bill, reported on pages 3616 to 3619 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22. In order to clear some points which appear to have been in doubt I am inclosing herewith a copy of a letter recently sent to Mr. SYDNEY ANDERSON, of the House Committee on Appropriations, in response to an inquiry from him. This letter states briefly the character of the work which the Bureau of Fisheries has been conducting for a number of years in the preparation of fishery products for food.

I may state that in a conference held in my office on December 21, with the Secretary of Agriculture and several officials of his department, Dr. Alsberg stated that the work of the character described was properly the function of the Bureau of Fisheries, and that the Bureau of Chemistry was willing to withdraw from investigations of the character indicated. He volunteered to make a statement to that effect to the Appropriations Committee.

Very truly, yours,

J. W. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. REED SMOOT,
United States Senate.

FEBRUARY 18, 1921.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of February 14, you are informed that the problems of preservation and utilization of the products of the fisheries have been recognized as functions of the Bureau of Fisheries from its inception and have received attention dating back to its very early history when the demand and need for such work was not so fully appreciated as now. For example, in the report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries for 1882, pages 44 to 45, is to be found an outline or plan for investigation of the fisheries of the United States, then about to be undertaken, which included "VI. Preparation, care of, and manufacture of fishery products. Here were to be considered the methods and the various devices for utilizing fish after they are caught, with statistics of capital and men employed, etc.: (a) Preservation of live fish; (b) refrigeration; (c) sun drying; (d) smoke drying; (e) pickling; (f) hermetically canning; (g) fur dressing; (h) whalebone preparation; (i) isinglass manufacture; (k) ambergris manufacture; (l) fish-guano manufacture; (m) oil rendering, etc." Section 5, in three volumes, of the monumental work "Fisheries and Fishery Industries of the United States, 1884–1887," contains considerable descriptive matter and illustrations of the methods of preservation and utilization of fishery products.

An examination of the subject matter contained in the publications referred to in the inclosed memorandum will serve to illustrate some phases of the bureau's work in this field in past years.

In recent years there has been an increasing demand for research work in fisheries technology for effecting improvements in the methods of preservation, distribution, and utilization of fishery products, including by-products. The bureau has endeavored to meet this demand as fully as the limited appropriations would permit. It has in Washington a fishery-products laboratory, excellently equipped, for investigations in the preservation of fish by canning, freezing in air and in brine, smoking, and drying, a constant temperature room for testing the keeping qualities of preserved products, and a research laboratory for such necessary incidental physical and chemical tests as may be required. In southern California it has a temporary laboratory well equipped for the solution of the practical problems of the fisheries of that region, particularly those problems common to that region which can be more efficiently handled at the center of operations.

The bureau has recently completed an investigation on the preservation of fish by salting in which certain improvements in commercial practices have been made, particularly in the salting of fish at high temperatures and therefore in warm climates, and has had practical application made of the results. This work was done in part in Washington, D. C., and several States on the Atlantic seaboard, particularly Florida, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and Massachusetts.

Its plant for freezing in brine was the first of its kind to be imported into this country and has been employed to demonstrate this method of brine freezing fish to the trade and trials given of freezing fruits and vegetables and meats, poultry, etc., for the benefit of investigators in the Bureaus of Plant and Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture. In fact, it is understood that one of these bureaus has since arranged to employ this method in its particular field of operation. The bureau's investigations in this field have been interfered with during the current fiscal year for lack of adequate funds and technologists. It now appears that this condition will be remedied with respect to the next fiscal year.

In southern California extended investigations have been made for the purpose of developing methods of canning fish for which satisfactory methods were lacking, in effecting improvements in common practice, and in solving the practical problems of the canners. Special attention has been devoted to the canning of mackerel, barracuda, bonito, pilchard, sea bass, smelt, tuna, and yellowtail, and to the recovery of fry-bath oil, means of avoiding objectionable flavor in bonito, and the like. This work has been centered chiefly at San Pedro.

The bureau's work in the utilization of the by-products of the fisheries has been particularly fortunate. It has been instrumental in greatly extending the production of fish meal for use as a stock feed within the last few years, in the establishment of fisheries for sharks and other unutilized aquatic animals, in the use of the hides for tanning into leather, the saving of dried fins for the oriental trade, in determining the special properties of particular fish oils, the more extended use of fish waste and waste fish, and the like. This work has been done in Washington and the field.

Among its other activities, mention may be made of its investigations as to the causes of reddening of salt fish, study of the causative organisms and possibilities of preventing the heavy losses resulting from this source of infection. This work has been done chiefly in New England. Mention may also be made of the investigations concerning the feasibility of deriving from marine algæ a gelatin suitable for use in the preservation of fish, which was conducted in Massachusetts.

It is scarcely practicable to cover the bureau's work in this field within the scope of a letter, but there are being mailed to you a copy of Bureau of Fisheries Document 892, "Fishery Industries of the United States," a report summarizing on pages 9 to 17 some of the work done in the calendar year 1919; a copy of Document 896, "Prog-

ress in Biological Inquiries," on page 27 of which you will find additional information on the reddening of salt fish, and page 29 reference to the deriving of jelly from seaweeds.

As the particular phases of the work mentioned in your letter present only parts of its activities, it is difficult to furnish a statement for the specific items because of their interrelations and overlapping other activities. It is hoped the following statement will serve your purpose:

Items for fiscal year ended June 30, 1920.

Investigations of the fishery-products laboratory in Washington and necessary work in field connected therewith, including maintenance of laboratory	$3,165.79
Practical application of methods evolved in salting of fish	326.04
Utilization of the waste products of the fisheries	1,130.07
Preservation of fishes and standardization of methods in southern California	3,389.37
Investigations in reddening of salt fish, dehydration of fish, and derivation of jelly from seaweeds (approximately)	700.00

In closing I may state that the work of the Bureau of Fisheries for the fishing industry is comparable to the work of the agricultural bureaus mentioned in their respective fields, that it is working in close touch with them, cooperating where cooperation is for the best interests of the people whom they are intended to serve, and avoiding duplication of work.

Very truly, yours, J. W. ALEXANDER,
Secretary.

Hon. SYDNEY ANDERSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment originally offered by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 46, after line 6, insert:

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of these products, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, $20,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it is probably a part of the function of the Bureau of Fisheries, under the Department of Commerce, to investigate the sources of fish-food supplies, new varieties of fish, and that sort of thing; but it is no part of the functions of that department to investigate the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, and oysters; and I think that ought to be done by the Department of Agriculture. Fish is an important food supply of the country. The Department of Commerce undertakes to investigate and ascertain the varieties of fish which may be used for food. A few years ago Secretary Redfield did discover that the tilefish had come back into the ocean, and he exploited that, and people began to use the tilefish a good deal, and I think changed the name of it so as to make it a little more palatable. At any rate, the work of the department had to do with discovering new edible fish; but it did not have to do with informing the people themselves, who catch the fish in the lakes and in the rivers and in the seas, and who get the oysters and shrimp, how to pack, how to preserve, and how to take care of those fish, and how to ship them. That is work for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I read the letter from the Secretary?

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator reads that, I understand he is going to oppose this item on the ground that the work is already being done?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator overlooks the real point and value of the item. It is to employ two men to do what one man can do.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think perhaps I can save the time required in reading the letter. I talked with Dr. Alsberg over the phone to-day, and he said this is very important work, but it can probably be transferred to the Bureau of Fisheries, and that he had no objection if that were done, if provision was made for its support in another bureau, and I understand from the Senator from Utah that it is taken care of in another appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have here the bulletins showing the work that has been done. I will not take the time to read the letter, but the Secretary says it is a duplication of work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. KENYON, Mr. McNARY, Mr. GORE, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 15935, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15935) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF DAUPHINE STREET, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am authorized by the Committee on Military Affairs to report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5030) authorizing the city of New Orleans, La., to extend Dauphine Street, in said city, across the United States military reservation known as the Jackson Barracks. This is a bill in which the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is interested and to which there is no opposition. I ask unanimous consent for its passage.

Mr. RANSDELL. It merely authorizes the extension of Dauphine Street, in New Orleans, through a military reservation in that city. The bill was drawn by the Secretary of War, recommended by him, and is now favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, be, and it hereby is, authorized to extend Dauphine Street, in said city, across and through the property of the United States known as the military reservation of Jackson Barracks, said extension to be of the same width and a continuation of the same lines as said street at its juncture with Delery Street upon the easterly side of said reservation, upon condition that said street shall be improved and maintained by said city of New Orleans as a public street and without cost to the United States: *Provided, however*, That there is hereby expressly reserved to the United States the right to construct and maintain over, under, and across that said street water, gas, and sewer mains, electric lights, and telephone wires and cables, and any other requisite utilities which the use of said military reservation may require.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 24, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *February 23, 1921.*

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

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

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for every new born day, for every new born soul, for every new born idea that brings us and the world in closer communion with Thee, that we may enter the kingdom of heaven and be indeed Thy children, led by Thy wisdom, by Thy power, and by Thy love into a larger, purer, nobler, and sweeter life; that we may be all for Thee, with Thy spirit our guide and Thy council our thought; that the world may be better that we have lived and wrought. Give us Thy best convictions that we may do ever well here and now and evermore. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

REGULATING SHIPMENT OF COLD-STORAGE FOODS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 9521.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, pending the request I would like to make the point of order of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order of no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

Anthony	Benson	Burdick	Casey
Bacharach	Bland, Mo.	Byrnes, S. C.	Clark, Fla.
Baer	Boies	Byrns, Tenn.	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Britten	Caldwell	Classon
Bell	Brumbaugh	Candler	Coady

Costello	Hamilton	Mann, S. C.	Rubey
Crowther	Hardy, Tex.	Mead	Rucker
Curry, Calif.	Harreld	Merritt	Sanders, La.
Davey	Hersman	Minahan, N. J.	Sanders, N. Y.
Donovan	Hill	Monahan, Wis.	Sanford
Dooling	Howard	Moon	Scully
Doremus	Hulings	Mooney	Sears
Doughton	Hull, Tenn.	Morin	Small
Dunn	Igoe	Mudd	Smith, Mich.
Eagan	James, Mich.	Nicholls	Smith, N. Y.
Eagle	Jefferis	Patterson, jr.	Steagall
Ellsworth	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pell	Steele
Evans, Nebr.	Johnston, N. Y.	Perlman	Stiness
Evans, Nev.	Kahn	Phelan	Sullivan
Ferris	Kennedy, Iowa	Porter	Swope
Flood	Kinkaid	Rainey, Ala.	Tague
Focht	Kitchin	Rainey, Henry T.	Thomas
Frear	Kleczka	Rainey, John W.	Upshaw
Gallagher	Lonergan	Ramsey	Vare
Ganly	Longworth	Randall, Calif.	Vestal
Garner	McCulloch	Randall, Wis.	Voigt
Garrett	McGlennon	Reavis	Watkins
Goldfogle	McKenzie	Reber	Webster
Goodwin, Ark.	McKinlry	Reed, W. Va.	Wheeler
Graham, Ill.	MacGregor	Riddick	Wilson, Ill.
Graham, Pa.	Magee	Riordan	Wise
Hamill	Maher	Rowan	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

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

The motion was agreed to.

NATIONAL LOANS TO BELGIUM (S. DOC. NO. 413).

The SPEAKER. Last evening the point of no quorum was raised which prevented the Chair from laying before the House a message from the President, which came yesterday afternoon, and which he now presents.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I herewith call your attention to an agreement with Belgium made by the British and French Premiers and myself, which is embodied in the following letter:

JUNE 16, 1919.

M. HYMANS,
Ministre des Affaires Etrangeres, Hotel Lotti, Paris.

SIR: The Reparation Clauses of the draft Treaty of Peace with Germany obligate Germany to make reimbursement of all sums which Belgium has borrowed from the Allied and Associated Governments up to November 11, 1918, on account of the violation by Germany of the Treaty of 1839. As evidence of such an obligation Germany is to make a special issue of bonds to be delivered to the Reparation Commission.

Each of the undersigned will recommend to the appropriate governmental agency of his Government that upon the delivery to the Reparation Commission of such bonds his Government accept an amount thereof corresponding to the sums which Belgium has borrowed from his Government since the war and up to November 11, 1918, together with interest at 5 per cent unless already included in such sums, in satisfaction of Belgium's obligation on account of such loans, which obligation of Belgium's shall thereupon be canceled.

We are, dear Mr. Minister,
Very truly, yours,

G. CLEMENCEAU.
WOODROW WILSON.
D. LLOYD-GEORGE.

In recommending to you that Congress take appropriate action with regard to this agreement, certain facts should be brought to your attention.

The neutrality of Belgium was guaranteed by the Treaty of London of 1839. In considering the reparation to be made by Germany it was agreed that the action of Germany in grossly violating this Treaty by an attack on Belgium, obligated the German Government under international law to repay to Belgium the costs of war. On this principle the Treaty of Versailles (Art. 232) provided that in accordance with Germany's pledges already given as to the complete restoration for Belgium, Germany should undertake, in addition to the compensation for material damage, to make reimbursement of all sums which Belgium had borrowed from the Allied and Associated Governments up to November 11, 1918, together with interest at 5 per cent per annum on such sums. This obligation was to be discharged by a special issue of bearer bonds to an equivalent amount payable in gold marks on May 1, 1926, or at the option of the German Government on the 1st of May in any year up to 1926.

For various reasons the undertaking defined in the above letter was not embodied in the Treaty. Belgium's obligations to the United States for advances made up to the date of the Armistice amounted to approximately $171,000,000, and to England and France they amounted, I am informed, to about £164,700,000. In view of the special circumstances in which Belgium became involved in the war and the attitude of this country toward Belgium, it was felt that the United States might well agree to make the same agreement respecting pre-Armistice loans to Belgium as England and France offered to do.

Advances made by the Treasury to the Belgian Government from the beginning of the war to the Armistice amounted to $171,780,000. This principal sum, however, includes advances of $499,400 made to enable the Belgians to pay the interest due November 15, 1917, and $1,571,468.42 to enable the payment of the interest due May 15, 1918. The interest on the advances has been paid up to April 15, 1919, the interest due from May 15, 1918, to that date having been paid out of the Treasury loans for which the United States holds Belgian obligations, which, however, were made after November 11, 1918, the date of the Armistice. This latter advance would not come within the terms of the Agreement above mentioned. If, therefore, the United States accepts payment of Belgian obligations given before the Armistice by receiving a corresponding amount of German obligations, it would seem that it should receive German obligations amounting to $171,780,000 with interest from April 15, 1919.

Although it is understood that England and France will take their share of the German bonds when received by Belgium, I am informed that the Reparation Commission has not as yet finally determined the details of the issuance of the necessary bonds by the German Government. A recommendation at this time that suitable legislative action should be taken may appear somewhat premature, but in view of the approaching termination of my Administration I have brought this matter to your attention, hoping that suitable action may be taken at the appropriate time.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
22 February, 1921.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed.

REGULATING SHIPMENT OF COLD-STORAGE FOODS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the cold storage bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A 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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has used 28 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of this bill. That there is necessity for this legislation there is not a doubt in my mind. The cold-storage industry in this country is a growing one; it is a very essential one, and being an essential one to the health of the people regulation of cold-storage places is highly important, in that we may be assured when articles of food pass through them that same is not deleterious to health. Cold-storage institutions have also become engines of power. That power can be used to manipulate the markets of the country in any product that passes through these institutions, and I have not a doubt that that power has been so used. There are certain great interests in this country that are dependent upon cold-storage facilities for their control of the market of the meat supplies of the Nation, and I have not a doubt that they are bringing all the power of their influence possible to forestall this legislation. I refer to the Big Five packing institutions. The legislation should be enacted. There is hypercritical criticism being raised against it, but the underlying principles are sound. I shall vote with great pleasure for this legislation. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. [Applause.]

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, this conference report involves matters of great importance and well deserves the most serious consideration of this Congress. It affects millions of our people and transactions involving millions of dollars. No legitimate cold storage bill can be enacted in this country that will do justice to the producers and the consumers that does not recognize the difference between articles placed in refrigeration for temporary current sales and those placed in cold storage to be placed on a delayed market. This bill recognizes that principle; but this bill, in my judgment, makes a monumental mistake in that it places the limit at 10 days.

This bill is so framed that cold-storage products placed in refrigeration in a distant part of the country can not be placed on the market at the opposite side of the country without being damned by being classified as "cold-storage" stuff. Yesterday

in argument it was contended that this provision would not injure the producer. In order to find out whether or not that is true I have secured the current market reports from New York. In yesterday's reports of the market in New York butter classified as "cold storage" was selling for 5 cents less than the fresh article. On the 13th day of January of this year eggs on the New York market of the same quality were sold at a difference of 8 cents a dozen, depending on whether or not they were cold storage or otherwise.

Now, gentlemen, it is utterly absurd to ask this country to adopt a cold-storage measure that condemns half of these foods that go into the current market as "cold-storage" products. What would be the practical operation of this 10-day limitation? Out in the Central West and on the Pacific slope this material is shipped to the East at a temperature of 33° to 43°. It is never frozen, and is absolutely in good condition when it reaches your market. Yet this bill requires it to be shipped, marked, and sold as "cold storage."

Mr. McARTHUR. Is it not true that we are getting large importations of Chinese eggs in this country that will enjoy a preferential status over the eggs shipped from the Pacific coast?

Mr. LEA of California. That is true.

Mr. McARTHUR. And if this bill becomes a law there will be no embargo against Chinese eggs that may be sold as fresh eggs on the market, while our Pacific coast eggs will be sold as cold-storage eggs?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes; if the Chinese eggs are not shipped in refrigerator vehicles. They can come in as fresh, while our 10-day shipments in refrigerator cars or vessels will be classed as cold storage.

Now, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to a very important feature, about which I am sure you have a wrong impression. Yesterday it was stated to you that the bill as it passed this House was practically the same in reference to marking as it is in this bill. That is not true. The bill that passed this House provided that it should not apply to articles being transported from one part of the country to another, and in order that there can be no doubt about that provision I want to call your attention to the bill as it originally passed this House. Section 3 provided that no article could be placed in the commerce of this country or could be offered for sale without being marked showing that it was cold storage, provided that it "is or has been in cold storage." Section 2 defined "cold storage" to mean "storage in a warehouse as defined herein." Subsection (f) defined a warehouse to mean any establishment, structure, or portion thereof, and so forth, "except a refrigerator vehicle."

In other words, this House passed a bill which did not include a refrigerator vehicle, and which required no marking in shipment in refrigerator vehicle within 30 days. The Senate passed a similar bill. And then the conferees, in defiance of what the Senate had done and in defiance of what this House had done, wrote into this bill the 10-day limitation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The House bill further safeguards it by saying "refrigerator vehicle used as such," but they could not take a refrigerator vehicle and use it temporarily for a warehouse?

Mr. LEA of California. Exactly. Our own conferees have written into this a 10-day limitation, which works injustice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not the point exactly this: That perishable products placed in a refrigerator car as far away from New York as 1,500 miles or farther, if 10 days or more in shipment, are bound to be branded as cold storage, marked down in price, and sold as inferior?

Mr. MADDEN. And that is not all. Anything that is placed in the chill room of a slaughterhouse is treated in that way.

Mr. LEA of California. That is true and important. You people of the Central West are affected, and if this bill becomes a law every pound of butter sent from your creameries is going to receive a less price on account of it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue three minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I have not the time to yield.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] be extended three minutes.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, make it 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. SNELL. I object, unless we can have more time than three minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the discussion of this matter be extended 20 minutes. It is a very important one. Evidently there is a lack of understanding of it by the membership of the House, as indicated by those who have spoken on the measure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks that the time be extended 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Who is going to control the time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. McCLINTIC. I think it ought to be controlled by those who are for the bill and those against the bill, so that we may have an opportunity to discuss this matter.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I do not object.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, practically all the time so far consumed has been by those in favor of the conference report.

Mr. HAUGEN. No.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is the case with the exception of about 10 minutes. The gentleman must have used in the neighborhood of 50 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, no. About 40 minutes have been used.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I want to know if those who are opposed to the bill will get time? Apparently those in favor of the bill are getting all the time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL]. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] going to yield the gentleman from California three minutes now?

Mr. HAUGEN. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. RAKER. Now, will the gentleman from California yield for a question? [Laughter.]

Mr. LEA of California. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman be satisfied with a conference report if in section 3 the time is extended to 30 days instead of 10?

Mr. LEA of California. That is the primary thing I ask, and if this House will vote down the conference report the bill will be thrown into conference. The Senate has already agreed to provisions that are substantially satisfactory, and there is not any reason why a conference report can not be promptly brought back that would improve this situation and secure action on this bill.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does the gentleman understand that this conference report provides that if fresh butter is put in a car and stays there 10 days it becomes classified as cold-storage food?

Mr. LEA of California. Absolutely so, and to a large extent the fresh butter from the Central West would likewise be condemned to the cold-storage class. Several days are required by the ordinary creamery before butter accumulates in sufficient quantities for carload shipments. According to this bill all of the shipment must bear the earliest date of butter placed in the car. Therefore when your butter from the Central West reaches the market it would commonly be in the cold-storage class.

I am informed that there are some interests in the East who have deliberately supported this 10-day proposition, thinking that they would gain an advantage over the western country thereby. I want to say that I do not know of any man in this House who would do that, and I know that there is not a man among the conferees that would think of taking that position for one moment. But nevertheless that is what this bill would accomplish.

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

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is it not a fact that that is the kind of marking that the people of the West are insisting on as to eggs?

Mr. LEA of California. We made no objection to marking in the original bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. It was insisted that every egg should be marked. Now, they are objecting because we give them 40 days.

Mr. LEA of California. You give only 10 days. I do not object to the marking of these foods that are dealt in for ordinary purposes of cold storage. I object to marking wholesome foods promptly placed on the current market.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What provision interests in the East have asked that this 10-day provision be placed in the bill?

Mr. LEA of California. I understand producers and dealers have done so.

Mr. SNELL. Can you say so with propriety? You have made the statement that interests in the East have tried to have that provision put in the bill.

Mr. LEA of California. I am not going into that phase of that matter now. I say there is not a man in this House who would do that.

Mr. SNELL. Then do not lay it to the East.

Mr. LEA of California. I am not censuring this House. I would not charge anybody in this House with doing that, but I want to call your attention to the fact that such is the operation of this bill as now framed.

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

Mr. LEA of California. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. In this bill as originally passed the House a refrigerator car was not defined as a cold-storage warehouse?

Mr. LEA of California. Not for purposes of marking. For the purpose of sanitary regulation, but not for the purpose of marking.

Mr. BLACK. Now, as agreed upon in conference the bill provides that this refrigerator car is held to be a warehouse, and therefore the goods have to be marked as cold-storage goods if they were in transit 10 days?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes. It takes from 15 to 17 days to transport them from the Pacific coast to the East.

Mr. BLACK. Then that would practically make them cold storage?

Mr. LEA of California. Yes; it would.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the first cold storage bill was introduced in the House on July 29, 1919, by myself. In preparing this bill I made investigations of the laws of the different States. Everybody will agree that we want a uniform cold storage bill. Out of the 48 States about one-fourth have cold storage acts, and most of them exempt their principal industry that goes into cold storage. For instance, the State of New York, one of the largest States in the Union, rents rooms which anyone can hire and there keep their products as long as they want to without any regulation. The State of Delaware exempts the fish industry, which is the principal industry of that State.

Now, this bill contains four elements: The marking, the time limit, the sanitary condition, and the reports that are made to the people. Those are the most important elements of this bill. Of course, the bill does not suit everybody.

When the bill was drafted we drafted three or four, and it was not the intention of myself or the committee to impose any hardships on anybody. But it is somewhat of a trouble to make a bill, because there are only two ways in which it can be done; first, by the use of the taxing power, which at present is a very unpopular one, and the other is by utilizing the interstate commerce provision of the Constitution. This bill does not seek to regulate the selling of any products of cold storage. It only affects goods while they are in interstate commerce, and Congress has no right to say or order that goods to be sold to the consumer shall be marked as "cold-storage" goods, as the very moment it leaves the control of the interstate commerce law it is out of the control of this law, so that the matter of condemning goods by putting the mark "cold storage" on them is not its true purpose or practical effect. That is not affected by the bill in any shape.

As to the matter of the time limit, it takes 12 months before the bill becomes really effective to anybody except the consumer. The man who stores goods in cold storage for 12 months, including the 10 days and the 30 days, and the man who holds the goods in cold storage can sell them to the consumer without marking them as cold-storage goods.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What becomes of the goods that have been kept in storage for the 12 months' period?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. They can not be sold if at the end of the 12 months they are still kept in storage.

Mr. SNELL. Is it the idea that these goods are deteriorated and therefore unfit for food?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. No. The idea is that anybody keeping goods will begin to sell them within 8 months or 10 months, before the 12 months is up. Under the present conditions they are keeping goods for an unlimited time, in some cases for as long as two or three years.

Mr. SNELL. Then, the idea is not that the goods after that are unfit for food?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The only idea is to force the goods out of storage in one season. It is the opinion of everyone connected with cold storage that 12 months will carry the products from a time of plenty through the time of scarcity, and will prevent the profiteer from carrying cold-storage goods until he can force prices to suit his wishes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, having had some experience in the cold-storage proposition, I desire to say just a word in regard to this bill. As far as I know none of the cold-storage companies are opposed to the passage of this bill. But as I look at the proposition, the only people who would be harmed in any way by it would be the producer and the ultimate consumer. When we pass a regulatory measure like this, I suppose it is for the definite purpose of conveying some knowledge to the consumer that will be of benefit to him when he purchases goods; and from the statement made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. HAUGEN] yesterday I take it that that is the principal desire of the committee in passing this legislation. I think this is purely a regulatory measure that will add to the price that the ultimate consumer will pay for his goods, but that it will not really convey any information to him that will be of definite use in determining the value of the goods he is purchasing. For instance, I think probably butter and eggs are sold under regulatory cold-storage rules or restrictions more than any other articles of food, unless it is meats. This bill starts with the assumption that length of time in storage is the only thing to be considered, while, as a matter of fact, the important question is the condition of the goods when they went into cold storage. The question of good or bad eggs or quality of eggs resolves itself more into a proposition of what was the condition of the eggs when they went into the cold storage and the time of the year when they went into the cold storage, rather than the one, three, or six months that they have been in cold storage. In this respect the bill absolutely overlooks the vital point. According to this bill, if you are going to carry it to the final analysis—that is, convey information to the ultimate consumer—what would be the result if a retail grocer had two baskets of eggs on his counter in the month of November, and he said one basket had been in storage 30 days and the other six months? The average consumer would take the eggs that had been in storage only 30 days, when, as a matter of fact if the eggs were equally fresh when they went in, the April eggs would be very much better as an article of food than the August or September eggs; and everyone who knows about this will bear me out in that statement. So by carrying into effect the actual wording and intent of this bill you injure rather than aid the ultimate consumer, whom you want to help.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUSTED. What does the gentleman think of the provision which forces the goods upon the market within 12 months from the time when they first go into storage?

Mr. SNELL. I will answer that question in just a minute. I want to finish up this other proposition. A great deal more depends upon the condition of the eggs when they went into cold storage than the mere length of time that they have been there. Of course, there is no question but that all eggs should come within the 12 months limit, but the mere proposition of whether eggs have been in cold storage 30, 60, or 90 days or 6 months has nothing whatever to do with it. But to carry out the provisions of this bill you must actually mark each egg, not case of eggs, with the time it has been in storage if you want even this information to reach the ultimate consumer, whether it is of value or not.

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

Mr. SNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Take the illustration of the two baskets of eggs. How is the consumer to know how long they have been in cold storage?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know how he can know, unless the grocer puts up a sign, "These eggs have been in cold storage 30

days," and another sign, "These eggs have been in cold storage six months."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Can we enact a law that will compel the retailer to disclose that?

Mr. SNELL. I do not think you can, and the point I want to make is this: That the marks do not really amount to anything, only as between the wholesaler and retailer. They are on the outside of the case of the eggs, and the consumer never sees it .

Mr. MONTAGUE. On the unbroken package?

Mr. SNELL. On the unbroken package, but very few consumers buy them in unbroken packages or see the package itself. When the retailer buys the eggs of the wholesaler, he knows the marks, buys on quality and regardless of when they went into storage.

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

Mr. SNELL. May I have two or three minutes more?

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman contend that the New York law has injured the people of New York?

Mr. SNELL. If you will yield me a little time, I will answer that.

Mr. HAUGEN. I will yield the gentleman time enough to answer that question. [Laughter.] I will yield two minutes to the gentleman. Does the gentleman think that the New York law has injured the people of New York, requiring, as it does, the marking of cold-storage articles with the day when the package enters into cold storage, and limiting the time to 12 months? This bill limits the time to 12 months and 10 days. Some States limit it to shorter periods, but this bill limits it to 12 months and 10 days.

Mr. SNELL. That does not affect us. I am not particularly concerned about the passage of this law. I am perfectly willing it should be passed; but I am talking about it as a matter of practical common sense, that is all. I think that it does not do any good to the ultimate consumer, and the reason that the committee has given for passing such regulatory acts as this is that they will benefit the ultimate consumer.

In regard to the question of my friend from New York [Mr. HUSTED] about the value of goods that have been in cold storage for 12 months, I know as a positive fact that the United States Government is selling several thousands packages of butter that have been in cold storage for nearly two years, and I know also that that butter is in fine condition at the present time, and will grade higher on any market than the average creamery butter of winter make that is coming on the market in this city at the present time. Now, what will become of that butter if this bill is passed? Of course, there is no sense in this section of the bill.

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

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Have you any idea that if that butter was sold it would reduce the price of butter?

Mr. SNELL. I will say that they have tried to put that butter on the market at practically any price, but there has been such a howl raised against cold-storage food that people, not knowing the condition of the butter or its real value, and knowing that it has been in cold storage for nearly two years, with all the talk against cold-storage articles, think it is unfit for food, while as a matter of fact I doubt if there are three gentlemen on the floor of this House who could tell that it was cold-storage butter if it were presented here at the present time. These regulatory acts go so far that they prejudice people against good food, and people have to pay more for it than they would under other conditions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. I am sorry I have not the time to discuss fully all the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill should be denominated "A bill to reduce the value of the products in the hands of the producer and increase the cost to the ultimate consumer." It ought not to pass. I do not think anybody will claim that you could preserve fresh meat without chilling it, and it sometimes happens that you have to put it in a chill room and keep it more than 10 days, and if you do, you will be selling cold-storage meat instead of fresh meat, and everybody that buys will have to pay more because of the added cost.

The presumption is that this bill is intended to help the producer and the consumer, but the truth is it does neither; it embarrasses both. The Agricultural Department authorities say that it is impossible to administer this law without an added cost of four or five million dollars a year to the Agricultural Department alone, and that is a condition that we ought to investigate before we pass laws of this sort, for the people pay that cost. It seems to me that when we pass a law to regulate food products we should be certain that we have not regulated them in such a way as to compel the buyer to pay more and the producer to get less. If this is intended to embarrass the packers, you are not embarrassing them at all; you are simply embarrassing the people that are raising the food supply and who pay the taxes into the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SWEET].

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I have not given the time to the consideration of this bill that is required on account of other matters, but I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yesterday, and I think he is right in his contention. On the other hand, I do not wish to be at variance with my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], for I am in favor of legislation of this character. But this morning I received a letter from W. A. Wentworth, secretary of the Iowa Creamery Secretaries' and Managers' Association, in which he says:

> It has come to my attention that the conference report on the cold storage bill may be adopted almost any day, and that this requires the branding of butter 10 days after the date of manufacture. If this is sold within 30 days, the brand may be removed.
>
> In view of the fact that transportation is rather questionable, in so far as prompt delivery to the market is concerned, and especially if the conditions of the past two summers are not improved, the Iowa creameries will be faced with the situation of having a very large share of their butter go onto the market labeled as cold-storage product, even in the flush season. There have been times when the railroads did not deliver Iowa butter to New York in less than two weeks, and many shipments are as much as 20 days on the road under the conditions last summer. It seems to me that such labeling would work an especial hardship on butter which is placed on the market during the winter, and which butter is practically as good as when it was manufactured. I can not help but view this as something which would further curtail the consumption of butter and assist, to some extent at least, the sale of butter competitors. We know that the market for these competitors is altogether too favorable from the viewpoint of the dairy industry, and also from the viewpoint of public health and child welfare.

I think the bill should be sent back to the conference committee for correction.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I heartily indorse the general purposes of this legislation, but it will work a hardship upon the producers and initial dealers of the country unless the bill reported by the conferees is amended so as to extend the fresh-storage period from 10 days to 30 days; in other words, unless it is provided, as it is in subsection (c) of section 2 of the Senate bill, that "cold storage * * * does not include chilling or precooling therein for not more than 30 days, for manufacture, sale, or transportation." There are thousands of produce dealers, dairy products dealers, and cooperative dairy associations in various towns throughout the country who buy poultry and dairy products direct from the farmers and the dairymen. Ordinarily it takes two or three weeks within which to assemble a carload of such products for shipment. In the summer season such products are ordinarily kept in coolers in order to keep them fresh and in good condition; then they are shipped in refrigerator cars, and frequently one or two additional weeks are consumed in transit. Consequently, under the 10-days provision, such products would have to be marked "cold storage," and would only be paid for as cold-storage products. In all the markets there is a material and well-recognized difference in price between fresh and cold-storage products. As the initial shippers would thus be compelled to sell the products as "cold-storage" products, they could in turn only pay the farmers and dairymen cold-storage prices, with the result that the producer would be the sufferer.

It is insisted by the conferees that this situation would be remedied by the provision in section 3 (a) (1)—

> that these words ("cold storage") may be removed immediately preceding a sale for consumption before the expiration of the 30 days following the date when such article of food was first placed in cold storage.

However, the large dealers in the cities, in purchasing from the produce dealers and dairy associations, would insist that they could only pay cold-storage prices, as the goods would be marked "cold storage," and that it was not at all certain that they would be able to reach the consumer within the 30 days. The provision referred to is clearly in the interest of the big middleman, who would get a rake-off to which he would not be entitled, and which fairly belonged to the farmer; in other words, the farmer would be compelled to sell at cold-storage

prices, and yet the consumer would be compelled to pay fresh prices, provided the product should reach the consumer within 30 days after being marked "cold storage." In this connection, I wish to further submit that the provision permitting the erasure of "cold storage" marks is a dangerous provision, as it would furnish unscrupulous dealers an easy avenue to defraud; if permitted to erase a "cold storage" mark on products that had been in cold storage less than 30 days, they could likewise erase marks on products that had been in cold storage for 6 or 12 months, and it would subsequently be practically impossible to detect the fraud. The conference report bill should be amended so as to conform to the Senate provision of 30 days' precooling period without the products being marked "cold storage" and the provision permitting erasure of cold storage marks should be entirely eliminated. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, in the main I am in favor of this legislation, but it occurs to me that the conferees have brought in a provision, the one now under discussion, that will work an injustice and a hardship to a good many people. I believe that the remedy can be had by an amendment which, if I am recognized for the purpose, I shall offer in a motion to recommit at the proper time, providing in section 2, subdivision (e), after the word "place," to strike out the words "including a car, vessel, or other vehicle," and at the end of paragraph (e), add the following:

Provided, That the term "cold-storage warehouse does not include a car, vessel, or other vehicle used in transit."

It seems to me that will meet the objection and make the bill fair and remove the injustice. There is no question but that a car loaded in the West with fresh produce and shipped to New York in many instances will not arrive in 10 days, and the persons shipping it will have to label it "cold storage." At the other end of the line the cold-storage tax may be removed and the produce sold as fresh goods at a better price, the retailer profiting by the transaction by virtue of the fact that he purchased for less and sold for more, as a result of the provisions of this bill. The original purpose of the bill was to benefit both the producer and the consumer. Certainly the conferees can and will correct the report by eliminating this objectionable provision and report the bill back to the House in time to pass the same before the close of this Congress.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is and for a long time has been a general and very proper demand for cold-storage legislation. Mr. HUTCHINSON, of New Jersey, introduced the first bill, for months the committee considered it, and the conference report is the result of their efforts. I have had considerable to do with the framing of bills during my service here, but this beats them all as far as complexity and difficulty are concerned. We wanted the bill, of course, to cover everything that should be covered and not to cover anything that ought not to be covered. We wanted everyone reached and regulated and controlled who ought to be, without disagreeable and onerous and unnecessary conditions. It was very difficult to write this bill just as we thought it ought to be written, but I believe it is in good shape now, and that arguments urged against it are without force.

"Cold storage" is, to an extent, a disagreeable phrase. Cold-storage goods are at some disadvantage in the market. People do not wish them if they can get fresh goods, and why? Because up to this time no one has been able to tell how long goods have been in cold storage—a few days, a few months, a few years—no one knows. This bill proposes a method by which the length of time can be stamped upon the goods so that everyone who has to do with them will know how long they have been in cold storage.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman will pardone me, but my time is very limited.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five minutes more time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Butter and eggs coming from a distance everyone knows must be stored for some time.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Some time must elapse in which to cover the time of gathering and storing and shipping. How much time? At present no one knows, but if a certificate is issued under Federal regulations to the effect that the butter and eggs are only 10 days old, it will be a recommendation in the mind of anyone who knows anything about business methods respecting them. It is a detriment now to have goods marked cold storage, because the mark signifies that they have been in cold storage, no one knows how long.

We are criticized for including the chilling rooms. It develops that goods are kept in chilling rooms 5 days, 30 days, 6 months, and moved from there perhaps to other chilling rooms. All of that time ought not to be included, according to the opinion of some gentlemen, in determining or limiting the period of cold storage. The committee were of the opinion when they listened to the testimony and knew the facts that it would not be proper or safe to eliminate the time that goods are kept in chilling rooms. If we were to eliminate it, it would offer opportunity for and be an invitation to a practical violation if not a nullifying of this law, so far as those products are concerned.

We are criticized for including refrigerator cars and vessels. If we exclude them, we take out the period of shipment—a few days, 10 days, 30 days, or a month—during which there would be no control whatever over the products, and it would open the door to all kinds of evasion and violation of the law. The only safe thing to do is to include them all, and it will work no hardship.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] yesterday raised an objection to the bill, and from the manner in which he presented it, and knowing him as well as we do, we were satisfied he was sincere, and it seemed to those who heard it for the first time to have force, but I believe it to be without force or virtue. He said in case a product can not reasonably be marked, or if "impracticable" to mark it, it must be marked as of the first day of the month in which it goes into cold storage, although he says it may have been in cold storage only one day. The fact is this bill expressly provides that if it has been in one day, or less than 10 days, or not more than 10 days, it does not have to be marked at all. He points out to his own satisfaction that the definition of what cold storage is does not apply to such a situation as he describes, but I wish to point out that the 10 days he refers to, which he says do not cover the proposition, are a part of the definition of cold storage, and apply to everything, to every line of this bill wherever the matter is mentioned, and therefore completely answers his objection.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Does not the bill say the first day of the month shall be presumed, for the purposes of this act, to be the day the goods were put in cold storage?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; in cold storage, after the expiration of 10 days.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, no.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. What is the description or definition of cold storage?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I know, but the bill says it shall be presumed, for the purposes of this act, to be in cold storage the first day of the month. That regulates the 10-day period.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have answered the gentleman's objection, but I shall speak further of it. There is a clause in the bill giving the Secretary of Agriculture power to deal with exceptional cases, where it is "impracticable" fully to mark goods. That may be in case of mixtures. There is another section which fully takes care of mixtures, and a case of it being impracticable to mark would not arise in the cases cited by the gentleman from Illinois yesterday at all. He has not grasped the situation. It would arise largely in the case of mixtures, where a man gathers a little to-day and a little to-morrow and along through the month and finally gets enough for a shipment, but does not know when he gathered particular amounts, or has not kept a record of them, so it is to be marked as of the first of the month. If he has kept a record of the portions composing the mixture, he is required to mark the mixture with the date of the portion that has been in cold storage the longest, but if none of them have been in 10 days there will be no necessity for marking any of them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the statement I made as to the articles was based on a question propounded to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN], in charge of the bill, and his answer. It was the articles he mentioned that I referred to. I do not know whether he was correct or not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I differ from the gentleman from Iowa in his answer to the gentleman from Illinois as to what articles this impracticability would be applied to. In my judgment it could not be applied to the articles he named.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. My time is very limited. What is it?

Mr. SNELL. How would you mark tinned cheese that is made up of several varieties, some held in cold storage and some in different storages?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There is, I believe, a provision in this bill in regard to cheese which may be kept in cold storage longer than anything else for the purpose of ripening. The bill passed the House September 30, 1919, a year and a half ago, so I have not now all its provisions in mind—can not recall all of them offhand.

Mr. SNELL. That would not apply to tinned cheese.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. So that the question would have no application to the bill.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman will excuse me——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman is taking too much of my time. I have answered it, saying that there is a provision in the bill which makes the question inapplicable.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There is another thing in regard to these mixtures. There is a mingling of goods which the gentlemen of the House perhaps do not understand. There was strenuous objection to the requiring of the marking "cold storage" of a new product that resulted by mixing and mingling. That objection came in the first instance from the makers of sausage, saying that sausage is a new product, fresh, and it should not be marked. But what is sausage made of? It is made from scrap material lying in cold storage for months, perhaps for years, which finally is taken out and converted into sausage. Made as it is, largely of old material, it is not a new product, and therefore should be marked "cold storage." This bill covers that because when anything has been in cold storage and put into a mixture it must be marked with the date when the first ingredient went into cold storage.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There has been a good deal of talk about the 10-day period, about being 10 days in cold storage. Does not section 3, under the heading (1), say that if it is not in there more than 30 days the words can be removed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; in the hands of a retailer sold to a consumer. Now, I insist, gentlemen, that this idea that the marking of an article as being of cold storage is detrimental; I insist when this law is in proper working order a mark showing a short period of storing will be a recommendation of the goods to the trade and to the consumer. Cold-storage goods now have a black eye; they are a drug on the market, because people do not know their age or condition, because there is no law regulating these things and cold-storage stuff is kept for years and then is put upon the market. This 10-day provision would be a guaranty to the dealer and the consumer that goods are just as fresh as they can be.

Now, we are asked why we are providing a limit of 12 months. One idea of cold storage is to provide the storage of goods during a time of plenty to carry them over to a time of scarcity. Limitation of time and regulation must be provided because the health of the people is involved. It should be limited to 12 months, so that there can be no hoarding, so that there can be no cornering of the market, so that the crops of one year will not be carried over in large quantities to another year.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And everybody who has examined the situation, as I understand it, believes that that is a good plan. The object of making this 12 months was that the products of the year must be turned over before the products of another year come upon the market. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know how much it will cost to administer this law?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not, but I think it is a very necessary law, and I believe it will be administered economically. And I will say to the gentleman from Illinois in regard to this chilling business that the packers have been interested in that and they objected to the requirement that goods in the chilling room should be considered as in cold storage, but when the entire matter was gone into they receded from their position, and their only objection now is that it will cost them more than they think they ought to pay in order to do the marking of goods in chilling rooms.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The authorities from the Agricultural Department say that it will cost $4,000,000 to administer this law, and, of course, the people will pay for it, farmers and everybody.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is many times the amount I have heard or believe will be necessary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Is the parliamentary situation such that a motion to recommit the conference report with instructions will be in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed the Senate has already agreed to the conference and consequently the motion to recommit would not be in order. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN) there were—ayes 51, noes 139.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. I also make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Much more than a quorum are present.

Mr. HAUGEN. I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa demands the yeas and nays. Thirty-six gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the conference report was rejected.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Was the motion to reconsider and to lay upon the table agreed to?

The SPEAKER. It was. The gentleman from Iowa asks that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment and send the bill to conference. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Senate has already agreed to the conference report and discharged the conferees. Can we ask a further conference?

The SPEAKER. Ask for a further conference. The Clerk will announce the conferees.

Mr. WALSH. Let us have the request in the RECORD. A parliamentary inquiry Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. What is the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman requests a further conference.

Mr. WALSH. Upon what?

The SPEAKER. That the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a further conference.

Mr. WALSH. I did not understand that there was a Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. There was one amendment, as the Chair remembers. The Chair appoints the following conferees.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make a motion to recommit and to instruct the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Chairs thinks that is in order. The gentleman moves to instruct the conferees with the following motion, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee moves to instruct the conferees to recede from the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment embodied in subsection (c) of section 2, and agree to the same, and with further instructions to amend section 3 (a) (1) by striking out the words:

"Except that these goods 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 it is removed in order to be sold."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion to recommit is not in order. You can not instruct the conferees on the part of the House to recede from an amendment that the House has already further insisted on disagreement with.

Mr. WINGO. I understand the gentleman's objection goes——

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like the gentleman from Illinois to state his point of order again.

Mr. WINGO. As I understood the motion it was directing the House conferees to recede from the disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The House has just disagreed to the Senate amendment. Now you can not instruct conferees to recede and instruct the conferees what they are to do. You can not recede from a portion of the amendment. I think what the gentleman has in mind is not in the Senate amendment at all.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the language the gentleman from Illinois refers to, as I now recall the reading of it, instructs the House conferees to recede to the disagreement and concur. Is that the language?

The SPEAKER. To recede from the disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same.

Mr. WINGO. To instruct the conferees to do that?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What his language should have been was to instruct the House conferees to agree to the Senate amendment. He is now instructing them to carry out the action of the House. The form is technically incorrect. The effect of it is just the same, namely, to instruct the conferees to agree to a Senate amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to modify my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can modify it.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. However, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees understand the purpose of the House, anyhow, and I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House have had further conference on the bill H. R. 15962, as instructed by the House, and have agreed to amendment No. 30, agreeing to $1,400,000 instead of $1,200,000. That is the only change made in the conference report, and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the conference report be dispensed with. It has already been read once.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to consider the deficiency appropriation conference report, and that the reading of the full conference report be dispensed with.

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, there is so much confusion I am not sure I understood the gentleman. I understood the gentleman to say that the only change from the conference report of yesterday is that they have carried out the instructions of the House on the prohibition enforcement amendment and have brought in the amendment the House directed yesterday?

Mr. GOOD. Absolutely. The conference report has already been made with that in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the conference report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on 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.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment disagreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 6: Page 3, line 9, insert: "For advertising notice of taxes in arrears July 1, 1920, as required to be given by act of March 19, 1890, to be reimbursed by a charge of 50 cents for each lot or piece of property advertised, $2,200: *Provided*, That hereafter no more than 1,000 copies of the pamphlet of taxes in arrears shall be printed, and a charge of not less than cost plus 10 per cent shall be made and collected from each person furnished with a copy of such pamphlet, the moneys to be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the revenues of the United States and the District of Columbia in the same proportions as appropriations for printing the pamphlet are paid from such revenues."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 6 is legislation. If the House conferees had had authority to agree to this item, they would have agreed to the Senate amendment. The amendment carries $2,200 for printing the advertising pamphlets wherein is advertised the sale of real estate in the District of Columbia on which the taxes have not been paid. These pamphlets are desired chiefly by those who attend these sales and purchase property at such sales. It was thought that these pamphlets, therefore, being largely for the benefit of the buyers, should be paid for by the buyers at not less than the actual cost of the pamphlets. Now, it is going to cost about $2,082 more than the appropriation or allotment of $4,500 for printing the pamphlets. I therefore move——

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under this provision only a thousand copies of this tax advertisement is to be printed, as I understand it?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Every wise man who owns real estate ought to know whether his property is advertised for taxes, because frequently, or occasionally, property is sold at a tax sale where the taxes have been paid. Under this provision they can not get this copy unless it comes within the thousand copies printed. Are there not more than a thousand copies used in the District of Columbia?

Mr. GOOD. Under the law the Commissioners of the District are now required to print 2,000 copies, and they always have more than a thousand copies that are not distributed. They are largely called for, first, by the men who attend these sales and who buy the property, and, second, by large owners of property and big real estate firms. The ordinary owner of property does not call for them.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Every real-estate owner who owns much real estate, if he is wise, looks to see if the property is advertised for tax sale.

Mr. GOOD. That would require over $100,000. The pamphlets are quite large, and it costs a great deal to print them. They are about 3 inches thick and cover several hundred pages. Of course, the Government would not pass one of these out to a man who owns a single lot.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Everywhere else in the country, I think, property for sale for taxes is advertised in the newspapers, so that everybody has a chance to get a copy there.

Mr. GOOD. I so understand.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Here it is proposed to limit the number of copies printed and make people pay for them. Frequently mistakes do occur about selling property where the taxes have been paid. I should think that my office would be derelict if it did not examine every year the property advertised for tax sale; not because of the property I own, however.

Mr. GOOD. The experience has been that it has not been called for to the extent of carrying out the law, and if we printed 2,000 copies, practically a thousand of them would go into the wastebasket.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 6.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: Page 5, line 20, insert:

"COURTS.

"Juvenile court: For transportation and traveling expenses to secure the return of absconding probationers, $150."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is legislation. About two years ago for the first time Congress appropriated money to pay for transportation and traveling expenses to secure the return of absconding probationers. This last year there was $250 appropriated for that purpose. While there was no law for it, that is the practice at the present time, and they will need to bring back three persons who have absented themselves, and they will need almost, as I recall, $100, and to cover other contingencies for the rest of the year they have estimated $50 additional.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARD. What will be the total amount allowed?

Mr. GOOD. Four hundred dollars, if this amendment is agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 14.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: Page 7, line 17, insert: "For board and care of all children committed to the guardianship of said board by the courts of the District, and for temporary care of children pending investigation or while being transferred from place to place, with authority to pay not more than $7,500 (in lieu of $1,500 heretofore

authorized) to institutions adjudged to be under sectarian control and not more than $400 for burial of children dying while under charge of the board, $15,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there are about 2,000 children in the District of Columbia that are under the care of the board of children's guardians. There is an appropriation for this year of $160,000 for that purpose. The law authorizes the expenditure of money for the care of these children, but there are words in the Senate amendment similar to those carried in the present law that make the amendment subject to a point of order. Under the wording of the amendment this money can be expended in paying for the care of these children who are committed to sectarian institutions. Many of these children are cared for in homes in near-by States, mostly in Virginia and Maryland and some in New Jersey, but some of them are in schools conducted by some sectarian institutions. That language has always been carried in the bill. The department asked for $23,000 deficiency. The Senate amendment carries $15,000 for that purpose. If any criticism can be made, it might be that the $15,000 will not be sufficient. If it had not been for the fact that the language in the amendment makes it subject to a point of order, the conferees would have agreed to it.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. That does not change the present law, which makes it unlawful to appropriate money to a sectarian institution direct?

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. SISSON. It simply authorizes the use of $15,000 by the board of children's guardians to care for these children?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that is correct.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARD. What is the history of the language on line 21, "in lieu of $15,000 heretofore authorized"?

Mr. GOOD. The current law placed a limitation of $1,500, and the Senate increased that amount by $6,000, and that is because they have found that in some of these institutions they can care for the children more economically than they can be cared for in private homes or other institutions. They are only using these institutions where the cost of caring for these children is less than they can be cared for elsewhere.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: Page 11, line 13, insert: "For transportation of diplomatic and consular officers, including the same objects specified under this head in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, $100,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is no law which authorizes the payment of transportation expenses of diplomatic and consular officers. There is an appropriation this year of $145,000 to pay such traveling expenses. That amount has already been expended. There is not a penny remaining to pay for transportation expenses of diplomatic and consular officers. The State Department made an estimate that went to the Senate for $200,000 for this purpose.

The Senate adopted an amendment carrying $100,000 for that service. I understand that by a Senate amendment the item which went out on the floor of the House for next year was restored, to the extent of $300,000 for next year. If the amount of the Senate bill, $100,000, is agreed to, they will have for this purpose for this year $245,000, with the prospect of $300,000 for next year. I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 25.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it not expected—or, at least, hoped—that there will be a considerable transportation of diplomatic and consular officers now in Europe, coming home between the 1st of March and the 1st of July, and some expense for others going from here abroad?

Mr. GOOD. I think so. I think the State Department recognized that fact when they asked for $200,000.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I see that it is apparently desired to postpone most of that good work until after July 1. I think it would be highly desirable to have it sooner.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman want to bring them all back?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think it would be highly desirable to make this appropriation of $200,000 for the remainder of this year and only $200,000 for the next fiscal year. I should be enthusiastic for that. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. Well, the committee thought it would be necessary to appropriate the $100,000, and therefore I move to recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 25.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment 25.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: Page 12, line 22, insert: "The limitation for the fiscal year 1921 as to the number of delivered sheets of customs stamps is increased from 276,000 to 520,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the sundry civil act carried an authorization to issue 276,000 sheets of customs stamps for this year. The Bureau of Printing and Engraving have already exceeded this amount, and have already issued 302,500 sheets. That is necessary because of the increased work in the Customs Service. I therefore move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 26 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment 26.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 28: Page 13, line 23, insert:

"PAYMENT TO WALSTON H. BROWN AND OTHERS.

"To pay Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., $65,792.53; to the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., $26,400.30; and to the estate of Henry A. V. Post, $50,359.35, as adjudged by the Court of Claims upon its findings of fact."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, these are old claims. They have been in Congress for 20 years. A great many claims similar in most respects have already been allowed and paid. So far as three of these claims are concerned, my understanding of the situation is that the claimants failed to take advantage of their legal rights and to take certain appeals. They have no legal status whatever. They are not claims that are authorized by law. There is no authority of law for the payment of them.

The Committee on Appropriations have refused to sit as a Committee on Claims. I think the Committee on Claims have on numerous occasions reported out these items, but they have never passed the House. In 20 years they have been buffeted about, first reported to the House and kicked out of the House, and now they appear in a Senate amendment. The committee therefore felt that we should not agree to these claims, and that we should ask the House to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment 28.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WINGO. What is the basis of the claims? I do not know anything about them.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ESCH. This claim arises out of the payment of an excess of customs duties upon steel blooms that were imported in 1879 under the then existing customs law.

Mr. WINGO. How did the Court of Claims get jurisdiction?

Mr. ESCH. The claims were sent to the Court of Claims by an act of 1903 and a subsequent act of 1905.

Mr. WINGO. Congress authorized their consideration by the Court of Claims?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; and the Court of Claims has filed its findings of fact and of law, and finds that while they are not legal claims they are equitable claims, and that some 20 of these claims arising out of the exactions of the Treasury Department under that old customs law have already been paid by acts of Congress. There are only three of them that still remain. Two of them are contained in this item. This matter has been favorably reported four times by the Senate committee and once prior to this Congress reported favorably by the House committee.

Mr. EDMONDS. These bills are reported favorably by the House committee again this year.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a preferential motion.

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] for a question.

Mr. EDMONDS. These bills have been reported favorably by the House committee again this year.

Mr. GOOD. I know that.

Mr. EDMONDS. And the case is as stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GOOD. The Court of Claims did not say that they are equitable claims; that is, quite to that extent. They say they are equitable in a sense. This is the statement of the Court of Claims:

Upon the foregoing findings of fact the court concludes that the claim is not a legal one. It is equitable in the sense that the United States exacted of claimant sums in excess of the legal rate of duty under the tariff law, aggregating (here follows the amount in each

case, being sums named in the pending bill). (See court findings S. Docs. 415 and 416, 63d Cong., 2d sess.)

This is not a claim against the Government in the sense that money of the Government is to be paid by it to the claimants; the money asked is the claimants' own money, paid by them to the Government, which the Government never should have collected.

Mr. ESCH. The Government has had this money for 40 years.

Mr. EDMONDS. I want to call attention to the fact that these are just as equitable claims as the $700,000 that have already been paid.

Mr. GOOD. That may be true as far as the money collected, but these claimants absolutely slept on their rights and did not do the things that the other claimants did to protect their rights.

Mr. EDMONDS. I agree with the gentleman that they did not.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the committee has no judgment in regard to these matters. This is purely a legislative matter. It is a matter over which the Committee on Appropriations does not believe it should exercise judgment at all, and under the rules we bring the matter back here. These claims should never have been brought in on a great appropriation bill like this. They ought to be considered in the House with time to consider them, when the merits of the claims can be gone into and every phase of the question discussed and analyzed. That was the reason that moved the conferees on the part of the House to ask that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss the merits or demerits of the proposition contained in the Senate amendment to pay these claims. I have wondered if this odd circumstance is not going to become the practice of the House under the new rule. Under the old practice of the House these claims inserted in a deficiency bill would have been disagreed to in conference and never have come before the House for a vote unless some one had demanded a vote when it first came in, because it is almost the invariable practice for the House conferees on a deficiency bill to refuse to agree to a claim inserted by way of amendment in the Senate.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the conferees in this case under the old rules of the House would not have been able to secure recession on the part of the Senate conferees, because they absolutely refused to recede and said they intended to put it through.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They absolutely refused to recede this time, because they knew that under the rules of the House it would have to come to a vote in the House and the House would have a chance to have a motion to concur in the amendment.

The House conferees are not supposed to know the merits of claims presented either to the House or the Senate. The House conferees on a deficiency bill have much to do without investigating the character of all the claims. But if it shall become the practice of the House without much knowledge and without a chance for much consideration to agree to claims inserted by way of amendment in the Senate I can see a very ready way of getting a great many Senate amendments. The Senate under its practice will insert almost anything concerning a claim as an amendment on a deficiency bill at the request of a Senator. They leave these matters mainly to be determined by the House, and everyone who has a claim will be asking the Senate to add it as a Senate amendment to a deficiency bill. If the House is going to act upon the bare statement of some Member of the House, where the House has not considered the claim at all, there is no limit to it. I do not know whether that is going to be one of the effects of the new rule or not, but if we start to pay these claims on a deficiency bill, that is the inevitable effect of it. It might be an additional reason for changing the rule.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a judgment of the Court of Claims upon these three claims. That judgment holds that these claims, while not legal claims, are equitable claims. The judgment in this case recites certain facts, and the judgment of the Court of Claims is based on these facts. These men were importers of steel blooms. Customs officers charged them 45 per cent ad valorem duty despite the contention that 30 per cent was the correct duty. One of the party that was importing steel blooms refused to pay the 45 per cent duty, claiming the duty was 30 per cent ad valorem. The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York held that the ad valorem duty was not 45 per cent, but 30 per cent, and the Treasury Department, without taking any appeal, accepted the ruling and thereafter held that the duty was 30 per cent.

Thereafter, 24 claimants, situated exactly as these claimants, were authorized by Congress to present their claims to the Court of Claims. The Court of Claims found in their favor, and upon those findings of fact and the conclusions of law their claims were allowed by Congress and were paid out of the United States Treasury. The claims of the Illinois Steel Co. and two or three other Illinois companies were paid in full, and all the claimants except the three named in this amendment received the amount due them. Thereafter these three claimants asked the same redress from Congress that the other 24 claimants had asked, and went through the same process exactly and have had their claims up here before Congress for the last eight years. These three claims have passed the Senate six different times. They have been approved by every committee that they have been before. I have before me an exhaustive report of the Committee on Claims of this House, made at this session, finding that these claims are just claims and unanimously recommending that they should be paid. The bills are on the Private Calendar, but the trouble is that we will never get up to the Private Calendar. The Private Calendar is a dead calendar for the session, at least. These claims were up in the Sixty-third and Sixty-fourth Congresses. The Committee on Claims reported in favor of them, and they were put upon the Private Calendar, but we never got to the consideration of that calendar, so far as these claims were concerned, and that will be the result here. The fact is that no one disputes the justice of the claims. These people paid 15 per cent more ad valorem on the steel imported than the courts held they should pay. The custom officers compelled them to pay this excessive and illegal charge or have their goods confiscated. The United States Government now has this money derived from this excessive charge, which the Court of Claims has adjudged belongs to these claimants. It is their money.

This amendment is not like an ordinary rider put on an appropriation or a deficiency appropriation bill. A committee of this House has not only passed upon it at this session of Congress, and I have the report here, an exhaustive report following every single step that has been taken, but other Committees on Claims of this House in other Congresses have passed on these claims, and all of them have been unanimous in finding that they were honest and just claims. The matter has been fully considered by the committees of both Houses, and we should not simply refuse to consider them now because of a technicality, because it was brought in at this time and in this way, the only way it could be brought into this House for consideration. The House can consider it as long as it wants to at this time. This exhaustive report of the Committee on Claims of both the House and Senate which I have here give the findings of fact and the conclusions of law of the Court of Claims, and also the decision of the Supreme Court, holding that these people were overcharged at the customhouse. There is no dispute but that the United States Treasury has this money which belongs to these people. The only way to reach this matter and give these people back their money, as in common honesty every Member of this House would do if it were brought up before him as an individual matter, is to pass this amendment at this time, which the Senate has fully considered, and in the report of the Senate committee will be found the report of the Treasurer of the United States, who says that these are just claims. I do not see why we want any more evidence on the question.

Mr. LAYTON. What is the amount of money involved?

Mr. BROWNE. In the three claims the aggregate amount is $140,000. There are 24 claims just like these that have all been paid, having been passed upon by Congress. These are the last of the claims resulting from the erroneous rulings of the custom officer.

Mr. LAYTON. Is that the original principal?

Mr. BROWNE. It is; without interest, as found by the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BEE. What is the date of the judgment?

Mr. BROWNE. Nineteen hundred and fourteen. They have had it up in every Congress since that time. It has been put off just the same as it will be put off now if you hold that we can not consider it on this deficiency appropriation bill. When it was up in the Sixty-fourth Congress the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] made an elaborate statement upon it, and it was thrown out because of some point of order that was raised against it.

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

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to this Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WASON].

Mr. WASON. Mr. Speaker, I have no interest in these claims, nor has any constituent of mine in my State that I know of. I happen to know about one of these claims through a friend of mine, a native of New Hampshire, who is an eminent lawyer and a former Member of this House from Wisconsin, now living, with whom I have been acquainted for a number of years. He has been counsel in the case and has furnished me with the facts.

The question before us to-day is not whether under our rules a few Members can hold back payments of honest claims. Here is a question of honesty on the part of the Government. I want to suggest to my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that some years ago some good people in the State of Illinois whose money had been taken from them at practically the same time and under the same law recovered and have been paid $208,000, and they are a part of the 28 claims the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] referred to. I do not see any reason to-day why the $65,000 that was unlawfully taken from Browne Howard & Co. in 1881 at the port of New York as customs duty, which has been lying in the Treasury of the United States from that time to this, should not be returned to them forthwith. There is no man on the floor of the House who believes that when money is unlawfully extorted by a Government agent wrongfully from an individual restitution should be delayed a single moment. I hope that the technical rules of this House will not longer prevent us from paying these claims and add still further to the 38 years that have passed before we restore to these people what they paid this Government under duress in 1882.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has just called attention to the many legislative features added to this bill in the Senate. Is it not perfectly natural under the rules now effective in the House that the Senate must become the legislative body on Capitol Hill? The rules have got to be changed or the Senate must legislate. There is no question about that. The Indian appropriation bill was brought in here by the Committee on Appropriations. It left the House in a lacerated condition and, of course, came back with lots of legislation upon it, put there by the Senate. There is a request pending in the Committee on Rules for a rule to bring up the Indian legislation necessary to make effective appropriations in that bureau, but consent will not be given, and the Indian legislative bill will die on March 4. I call attention in the bill now before the House to Senate amendment numbered 53, legislation for the Navy Department. It is very necessary and important legislation. It ought to go through. If it does not become law, it will be necessary for the House to appropriate some $114,000,000 before the 1st of the coming April in order to care for the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; that will not be required at all.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am told so by the chief of the bureau.

Mr. GOOD. It will not be necessary at all.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes; it will, or else the department will have to violate the law after that date. This legislation slightly changed is carried in the legislative bill reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs. There is no possible way that the Committee on Naval Affairs can get its bill up in the House any more than can the Indian Affairs Committee get its bill up. Until the rule is changed the Senate will naturally be the legislative body on Capitol Hill.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak in opposition to the preferential motion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] and against the consideration of this measure. The Private Calendar which the House started to consider the other day, and which will doubtless be considered again, carries a number of bills for the relief of certain persons in certain amounts, and carries the identical claim referred to here, the Walston H. Brown claim, the Henry A. V. Post claim, and a number of others, which are included in this deficiency appropriation bill.

So that it seems we are now engaged in transferring the business of the Committee on Private Claims to the Committee on Appropriations by reason of an amendment or a series of amendments offered in the Senate of the United States. It is a remarkable procedure, gentlemen, that here we have added to this deficiency bill over a million and a half dollars picked up from the Private Calendar. Now, the Private Calendar contains many, many items of merit. They should be considered. They have a right to be considered, and considered separately and upon their merits, but to say that anybody should have the right to take from the Private Calendar preferential claims, in its own mind, of a million and a half dollars to large manufacturers in these United States and ask action upon them and defer action upon a multitude of other private claims, as I say, seems to me strikes at the very basis of proper legislation. Now, that is what is being done here, because this claim, a claim since 1880, 1881, 1882, is pending upon the Private Calendar, and other claims in the aggregate of a million and a half dollars on this bill are likewise pending on the Private Calendar that have not been considered by this House, that have not been considered by the Senate of the United States so far except that they have been added by this amendment. There has been no report of the Committee on Claims in this House except the adoption of Senate Report No. 244 of the Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, on this so-called Brown claim——

Mr. BROWNE. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is mistaken. The Committee on Claims of this Congress and in the Sixty-fourth Congress have considered this matter thoroughly, and they have reported unanimously in favor of those three claims.

Mr. GARD. I hold in my hand the report of the committee of February 19, 1920, which adopts Senate Report No. 244, Sixty-fourth Congress, which purports to be a history of the Brown claim, because it is a stale claim, stale since 1879. It has a right to be considered, but it should be considered upon its merits.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman does not raise any question of the merits of this claim, does he?

Mr. GARD. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think the claimants are entitled to be paid this money?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it appears to me there is no merit attaching to the argument made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] when he says these matters should not be considered to-day, because there are numerous other claims on the Private Calendar to be reached. That is not the point in this case. The question is, Does this Government owe this money and should it be paid? I have served for several years as a member of the Committee on Claims, and I recall the exhaustive examination into this case. My recollection is that there was a unanimous report that the amount should be paid. The gentleman says that he raises the question as to the merit of the proposition. Two courts, the Federal court in the State of New York and the Court of Claims, have passed upon this matter. They have passed upon the merits of the proposition, they have held in effect that the Government wrongfully took this money away from these people, and that it should be paid. The importers thought they should pay only a duty of 30 per cent. The custom officers demanded 45 per cent. At first the importers refused to pay this amount, but they were told that unless they did pay the 45 per cent that they would be required to pay 180 per cent, and therefore in passing upon this matter the courts held that these men made a payment of this money under duress. I say to the House that you have an opportunity to right a wrong, and you should do it regardless of how many matters would be left undisposed of on the Private Calendar.

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

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. GOOD. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. GANDY. Three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I yield the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] may regard this as a remarkable proceeding, and yet I appeal to this House, to the fairness of the Members, whether it is not a remarkable proceeding that men should be kept out of money which rightfully belongs to them for nearly 40 years. They paid this money under protest; if you please, they paid it under duress. They were told if they refused to pay the 45 per cent it would be 180 per cent. There is no doubt of that. It went then to the court in the southern district of New York, and that court said the Government was wrong and fixed the amount at 30 per cent. The Treasury Department of the United States appealed to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court of these United States dismissed that appeal. Then these men tried to get back the 15 per cent which the Government wrongfully retains of the money that it collected. Is it not remarkable that through these years this wrong should

not have been righted? The Senate of the United States, in 1912, by resolution transferred this matter to the Court of Claims, and it comes back to you to-day, gentlemen, with this amount as fixed by that court. There is not any doubt about the obligation. There is not any doubt as to the amount. No interest has been added for the use of this money during all of these years. Now, let us not say because of some rule, because of some red tape, because of something or other, we will do wrong again. Let us do right to-day, let us pay back this money that belongs to these men who ought to have been paid years ago. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, as I stated a while ago, the managers on the part of the House have no opinion with regard to these claims. We concede that the Court of Claims has found they are equitable claims, but to make the claim here on the floor of this House that this matter was brought back because of the change of the rules is foolish.

Always at the short session of the Congress the conferees on the part of the House have been compelled to take claims that have been kicked around for years, and the only reason why now these three claimants are active is because an eminent lawyer up in Wisconsin, formerly living up in New Hampshire, has been employed and has stirred up the members on the part of the House and the Senate, and the Senate absolutely refuses to recede on this amendment. Take last year: We had the Thomas Keller claim pending here for more than eight years without any basis for it at all. It ought never to have been paid. Before you changed the rules of the House the House conferees were held up and compelled to sign a conference report agreeing to the Thomas Keller claim of four or five thousand dollars or allow the conference report to be defeated.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GOOD. For a question.

Mr. DEWALT. If unfortunately the House made a bad rule, is that any reason why a just claim should be defeated?

Mr. GOOD. I am not conceding that the House has made a bad rule. If the House wants this claim paid it now has an opportunity to say so, and it would not have had, as the gentleman has said, that opportunity without this rule. But it also has the right now to pass upon some of these matters that the Senate heretofore has exercised exclusive jurisdiction over. They would have been in the conference report just the same.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] moves that the House insist on its disagreement.

Mr. GOOD. There is a preferential motion, that the House recede and concur.

Mr. BROWNE. My motion is that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-six gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

Mr. GOOD. It is an automatic call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. As many as are in favor of the motion will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 253, nays 66, answered "present" 4, not voting 105, as follows:

YEAS—253.

Ackerman	Brooks, Pa.	Clark, Fla.	Denison
Almon	Browne	Cleary	Dent
Andrews, Md.	Buchanan	Coady	Dewalt
Andrews, Nebr.	Burke	Cole	Dickinson, Mo.
Aswell	Burroughs	Collier	Dominick
Babka	Butler	Connally	Dooling
Barbour	Caldwell	Cooper	Doremus
Barkley	Campbell, Kans.	Crago	Drane
Bee	Campbell, Pa.	Cullen	Drewry
Bell	Cantrill	Currie, Mich.	Dunbar
Benham	Caraway	Curry, Calif.	Dupré
Bland, Ind.	Carew	Dale	Dyer
Briggs	Carss	Dallinger	Eagan
Brinson	Carter	Darrow	Edmonds
Britten	Chindblom	Davis, Minn.	Elliott
Brooks, Ill.	Christopherson	Dempsey	Esch
Evans, Mont.	Kearns	Murphy	Small
Fairfield	Keller	Nelson, Mo.	Smith, Idaho
Fess	Kelly, Pa.	Nelson, Wis.	Smith, Mich.
Fields	Kendall	Newton, Minn.	Smithwick
Fish	Kennedy, R. I.	Nolan	Snell
Fisher	Kettner	O'Connor	Stedman
Focht	King	Ogden	Steenerson
Fordney	Kinkaid	Oldfield	Stephens, Miss.
Frear	Kraus	Olney	Stephens, Ohio
Freeman	Kreider	Osborne	Stevenson
Fuller	Lampert	Padgett	Stoll
Gallivan	Lanham	Park	Strong, Pa.
Gandy	Lankford	Parker	Summers, Wash.
Glynn	Layton	Parrish	Sumners, Tex.
Godwin, N. C.	Lazaro	Pell	Swindall
Goodykoontz	Lea, Calif.	Peters	Swope
Graham, Ill.	Lehlbach	Phelan	Taylor, Ark.
Green, Iowa	Lesher	Pou	Taylor, Colo.
Griest	Linthicum	Purnell	Taylor, Tenn.
Griffin	Longworth	Quin	Temple
Hadley	Luce	Radcliffe	Thompson
Hardy, Colo.	Lufkin	Raker	Tillman
Hardy, Tex.	Luhring	Ramsey	Tilson
Harrison	McAndrews	Ramseyer	Timberlake
Hastings	McArthur	Randall, Calif.	Tincher
Hawley	McDuffie	Randall, Wis.	Tinkham
Hayden	McKenzie	Ransley	Treadway
Hays	McKeown	Rayburn	Upshaw
Hernandez	McKinley	Reed, N. Y.	Vaile
Hersey	McLane	Reed, W. Va.	Venable
Hickey	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rhodes	Vestal
Hicks	McLeod	Riddick	Volgt
Hill	McPherson	Robsion, Ky.	Walters
Holland	Madden	Romjue	Wason
Houghton	Magee	Rose	Weaver
Howard	Major	Rowe	Welling
Hudspeth	Mansfield	Rucker	Welty
Hull, Iowa	Mapes	Sabath	Whaley
Humphreys	Martin	Sanders, Ind.	White, Me.
Husted	Mays	Sanders, La.	Wilson, La.
Hutchinson	Merritt	Sanders, N. Y.	Wilson, Pa.
Ireland	Michener	Sanford	Winslow
Jacoway	Minahan, N. J.	Schall	Woodyard
Jefferis	Monahan, Wis.	Shreve	Young, N. Dak.
Johnson, Miss.	Montague	Sinclair	Young, Tex.
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Va.	Sinnott	
Johnson, Wash.	Moores, Ind.	Sisson	
Jones, Pa.	Mott	Slemp	

NAYS—66.

Anderson	Dickinson, Iowa	Knutson	Siegel
Ashbrook	Dowell	Langley	Steagall
Begg	Elston	Larsen	Strong, Kans.
Black	Emerson	Lee, Ga.	Sweet
Bland, Va.	Evans, Nebr.	McClintic	Tague
Blanton	Flood	McLaughlin, Nebr	Towner
Boies	Foster	MacGregor	Volk
Bowling	French	Mann, Ill.	Volstead
Box	Gard	Miller	Watkins
Brand	Good	Milligan	White, Kans.
Brumbaugh	Hoch	O'Connell	Williams
Byrnes, S. C.	Huddleston	Oliver	Wilson, Ill.
Byrns, Tenn.	James, Va.	Ricketts	Woods, Va.
Copley	Johnson, Ky.	Robinson, N. C.	Wright
Cramton	Jones, Tex.	Rogers	Yates
Crisp	Kelley, Mich.	Rouse	
Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Sherwood	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Greene, Mass.	Juul	Sims	Walsh

NOT VOTING—105.

Anthony	Garner	McFadden	Rodenberg
Ayres	Garrett	McGlennon	Rowan
Bacharach	Goldfogle	McKiniry	Rubey
Baer	Goodall	Maher	Scott
Bankhead	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Scully
Benson	Gould	Mason	Sears
Bland, Mo.	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Sells
Bowers	Greene, Vt.	Mondell	Smith, Ill.
Burdick	Hamill	Moon	Smith, N. Y.
Candler	Hamilton	Mooney	Snyder
Cannon	Harreld	Moore, Ohio	Steele
Casey	Haugen	Morin	Stiness
Clark, Mo.	Hersman	Mudd	Sullivan
Classon	Hoey	Neely	Thomas
Costello	Hulings	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Nicholls	Vinson
Davey	Igoe	Overstreet	Ward
Donovan	James, Mich.	Paige	Watson
Doughton	Johnston, N. Y.	Patterson	Webster
Dunn	Kahn	Perlman	Wheeler
Eagle	Kennedy, Iowa	Porter	Wingo
Echols	Kiess	Rainey, Ala.	Wise
Ellsworth	Kitchin	Rainey, Henry T.	Wood, Ind.
Evans, Nev.	Kieczka	Rainey, John W.	Zihlman
Ferris	Little	Reavis	
Gallagher	Lonergan	Reber	
Gasly	McCulloch	Riordan	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. MASON with Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. WALSH with Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. LITTLE with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. REAVIS with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. SEARS.
Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. THOMAS.
Mr. MUDD with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.
Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. IGOE.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. MOON.
Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. MEAD.
Mr. WEBSTER with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. BURDICK with Mr. CANDLER.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. HOEY.
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GARNER.
Mr. HULINGS with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. VARE with Mr. RUBEY.
Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. BENSON.
Mr. CANNON with Mr. WINGO.
Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. DAVEY.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. GANLY.
Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. LONERGAN.
Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. NICHOLLS.
Mr. PATTERSON with Mr. MCGLENNON.
Mr. MOORE of Ohio with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
Mr. CLASSON with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. WATSON with Mr. CASEY.
Mr. DUNN with Mr. HERSMAN.
Mr. WARD with Mr. MCKINIRY.
Mr. SNYDER with Mr. OVERSTREET.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. WISE.
Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. VINSON.
Mr. STINESS with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. MCFADDEN with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
Mr. SCOTT with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. REBER with Mr. HAMILL.
Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. SELLS with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The House agrees to the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33, page 19, line 8, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$425,000, including not more than $300,000 for rebuilding the Coast Guard cutter *Onondaga*."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, there was an estimate of the Coast Guard Service of $425,000 for repairing Coast Guard cutters. The House has given $75,000 to repair these cutters where the repair items are comparatively small. The *Onondaga* is a large boat. I do not know what it cost; it cost possibly $200,000 or $300,000 to build; not more than that. The boat has been tied up for 18 months. It has not been in the service at all during the past year, and if we gave this amount of money the Goast Guard Service would not be able to use this boat unless we increased the appropriation for the pay of the men. The Coast Guard Service has been growing by leaps and bounds. We are the only country in the world that has a Coast Guard Service, and this year the estimate came in for more than $16,000,000 for the Coast Guard Service next year, or almost half the amount of the total appropriations for the Navy Department during the first year of the McKinley administration.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I was going to ask if this could not be obviated by transferring the Coast Guard to the Navy Department? They have the facilities for that purpose.

Mr. GOOD. This refers only to the repair of Coast Guard cutters. The committee has cut the estimates very materially, and there is absolutely no rhyme or reason at this time in spending $300,000 on reconditioning this vessel. That is more than its original cost.

I move, therefore, to insist on our disagreement to amendment No. 33.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment No. 33. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 35: Page 22, line 9, insert the following: "Payment to the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co.: For payment of the claims for damage to and loss of private property occasioned by the explosions and fire at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J., which have been determined by the Secretary of War and agreed to by the claimants and in amounts not exceeding those enumerated in the letter of the Secretary of War as submitted to Congress at the present session in Senate Document No. 363, $285,141.41."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, Congress has authorized the Secretary of War to investigate into that disaster where a great many lives were lost and much property destroyed in the explosion at the plant of the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co., at Morgan, N. J. The authority of Congress was not given to pay the claims or to adjust the claims, but only to ascertain what amounts were justly due. There have been several reports by the Secretary of War, and we have appropriated because of damages growing out of that explosion $1,646,576.93.

These claims that are now reported in Senate Document 363 are for damages to property that was detained in freight cars standing on the tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad. The property consists largely of freight cars—about 40 or 60 freight cars. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co. has settled with all of the railroad companies which had delivered freight to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and whose cars were on the tracks and destroyed.

This amount is not authorized by law, but is in the same class as the other property that was destroyed and for which appropriations have been made.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. This damage was done to property in the cars of the Pennsylvania Railroad. How is it that these payments are made to the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co.?

Mr. GOOD. That is the heading only. The T. A. Gillespie Loading Co. were the agents of the United States. I think all the disbursements heretofore have been made in that way.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman seen Senate Document 363?

Mr. GOOD. I have; I have examined it. It is here.

Mr. WALSH. Is there any claim that the property listed in Senate Document 363 was property destroyed, and which it was expected that Congress was to pay for at the time we passed this previous authorization?

Mr. GOOD. No. There is no claim here except for the property which was destroyed which was in the possession of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Delaware Dredging Co.

Mr. WALSH. Well, it is not the character of the property that was in contemplation when we passed the previous act.

Mr. GOOD. I think it was.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman will find on examination that it was not.

Mr. GOOD. There certainly is no difference in principle in regard to this property and the property there which was shipped from the gentleman's State in a freight car on the tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. That property was destroyed. It seems to me it was the intention of Congress to make investigation as to all property. That has been the attitude of the War Department.

Mr. WALSH. How much more is there that has not been reported on? When shall we get through with digging up the fragments of this gunpowder explosion and paying out money?

Mr. GOOD. We are advised that this is the end, with the exception of those claims made by insurance companies, where they had insured property that was destroyed by the recent explosion. Those claims have all been eliminated.

I move, Mr. Speaker, to concur in Senate amendment No. 35.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 35. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

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

Mr. WALSH. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 80, noes 13.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 37: Page 23, line 1, insert the following:

"PAYMENT TO LEAVENWORTH BRIDGE CO.

"To pay the Leavenworth Bridge Co., of the city of Leavenworth, Kans., the sum of $30,843.45, in settlement for extra expense in the building of the bridge across the Republican River at Fort Riley, Kans., such extra expense being the increased cost of labor due to direct Government competition in the local labor market and overhead costs during the period subsequent to the original completion date, which extra was required because such labor as was available was incompetent."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations knows very little about this claim. There were no hearings on it anywhere, unless the Committee on Claims has had hearings upon it. There were no hearings before the Senate. The claim involves the sum of $30,843. It is at present on the Private Calendar, S. 2934. It has been up in the House several times and has been objected to. It is a claim of that character which the House ought to act upon. We ought not to have coming in, as there were a few minutes ago on the other roll call, Members by the score asking what the item was about. This matter should be taken up in a reasonable and sensible way, in a businesslike way, and if we are to maintain any semblance of economy the House must recognize those plain, homely principles of economy, and demand that the Committee on Claims shall have its day and be permitted to discuss these matters, and as we get into the discussion of them we ought to take an hour or two on a claim of this kind, with the report of the Committee on Claims before us, and then determine whether or not Congress shall appropriate the money.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me a couple of minutes?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I passed on this particular claim as a member of the Claims Committee. I think in itself it is a perfectly proper and just claim, but I do think this method of passing claims should not be permitted by this House. If it is to be permitted, you might just as well abolish the Claims Committee. What is the use of any Member presenting a claim to the Claims Committee and going all through the labor incidental to having it considered, when instead of that, if he has a friendly friend at the other end of the Capitol, he can have it placed upon this deficiency bill without the claim ever having been considered. I think this House ought to preserve its rights to pass upon the justice of these claims. The decision of the Committee on Claims ought to be considered by this House, to the end that no unjust claim and no error of judgment be ratified by this House or action taken without proper consideration. I trust that the House will not permit this method of legislation with reference to claims to prevail.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, this claim is more indefensible than the one upon which we had the last roll call. It is another step in the new history of legislation, by having bills taken from the calendar and inserted as amendments to the deficiency bill at the request of some one who may have a little more interest in one bill than in others. I am very happy to see the attitude taken by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. GOOD] and by the gentleman from the Committee on Claims [Mr. MACGREGOR], because the calendar of the Committee on Claims is an important one to the people of the United States. It should have its day and its frequent day for the consideration of proper claims and for the votes of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARD. I have not very much time, but I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It would be entirely possible to consider this claims calendar and get action upon these bills, would it not, if the time of the House was not taken up in trying to promote generals?

Mr. GARD. I am not concerned with that, but I think we have plenty of time and have had plenty of time to discuss the Private Calendar, which is of such importance to the people of the United States, because it is the only way in which claimants against the United States can get the money properly due them. This new way of getting these claims inserted on the deficiency bill is, to my mind, indefensible.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 40: Page 23, line 17, insert: "Readjustment of contracts: For amounts found to be due various contractors under the provisions of section 10, river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919, on certain contracts for work on river and harbor improvements entered into but not completed prior to April 6, 1917, for work performed between April 6, 1917, and July 18, 1918, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 384, reported to Congress at its present session, $362,140.98."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, section 10 of the river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919, provides:

That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to ascertain whether any of the contracts for work on river and harbor improvements entered into but not completed prior to April 6, 1917, the date of the entrance of the United States into war with Germany, have become inequitable and unjust on account of increased cost of materials, labor, and other unforeseen conditions arising out of the war; and to ascertain and report what amounts, if any, in addition to those fixed by the terms of said contracts, should in justice and equity be paid to contractors for work performed between April 6, 1917, and July 18, 1918, the date of the approval of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," on account of the increased cost of labor and materials and other unforeseen conditions arising out of the war during that period: *Provided*, That in every case the amount so ascertained shall not exceed the actual loss sustained by the contractor in performing the work between the said dates: *Provided further*, That when such amount shall have been ascertained, the Secretary of War shall transmit to Congress for consideration a statement or statements of all findings or determinations rendered by authority of this section, the amounts thereof, the names of contractors, and dates of contracts.

It will be observed, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere in this section 10 of the river and harbor act approved 1919 is there any authority for the payment of any of these claims. There was only the authority that the Secretary of War should investigate and ascertain what the losses were that were due to war conditions and report them to Congress.

Now, it is true that Congress has already appropriated $2,000,000 in the river and harbor act for the payment of such claims. That was an appropriation carried in the act of the year previous. Subsequently in deficiency bills we have carried for this class of contractors appropriations aggregating $368,000. There were Senate amendments also. This class of claims is a little different class than some claims that we shall presently come to. These were claims for losses growing out of war conditions. While there is no authority in law for the payment of them we have already paid about $2,370,000 of such claims. But, Mr. Speaker, here again are claims that another committee of this House has authority to consider in detail. Besides, we can not recede and concur in this amendment, because the amendment of the Senate is bad. It refers to Senate Document 384. These claims are not reported in Senate Document 384; only a part of them are reported in that document. I will read from that report. It says "the ascertainment herein reported is $167,398.38."

Now, these claims were reported in House Documents Nos. 986 and 997 of this session of this Congress, and they are not reported at all except to the extent of $167,000 in the Senate document.

They had been referred to the River and Harbor Committee for this reason, in order that the House might act on the claims that I assume will some time be paid if we follow the practice we have already adopted. I think that they ought to be considered in the light of the new rules of the House by the committee that has jurisdiction of these claims and let them have their day in court, and let them come before this body of intelligent men who can consider them on their merits and not have them tied to an appropriation bill.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. SMALL. I think the gentleman from Iowa is entirely right, regardless of whether the claims are meritorious they have no part in a deficiency bill. They ought to be reported on a river and harbor bill after the committee has had full opportunity to consider the evidence of the engineers. They certainly have no place in a deficiency bill. They ought to come from the River and Harbor Committee or the subcommittee on appropriations. I think the gentleman is entirely right in insisting on a disagreement.

Mr. LUHRING. Will the gentelman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. LUHRING. Did not the deficiency act of 1920 make provision for claims similar to this?

Mr. GOOD. It did.

Mr. LUHRING. Does the gentleman think it fair to make the payment of those claims and not pay these?

Mr. GOOD. That was a Senate amendment, and under the old rules of the House they said "You take that amendment or you will have no bill." We had to take it. We say under the new rules we want a square deal and we do not want three men sitting in a committee to make this legislation; we want the members of the other committee that had jurisdiction to have the right to consider the claims and act as legislators.

Mr. LUHRING. Would not the same investigation that has already been made by the engineers be reported to whatever committee that considered it?

Mr. GOOD. I think that is true.

Mr. LUHRING. And therefore you would have the same result no matter what committee considered it.

Mr. GOOD. This amendment can not be agreed to in this form, it will have to be rewritten, and I think the Committee on Claims should investigate and report to the House.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment with the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD of Indiana moved to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment: In the matter inserted by said amendment, before the word "Senate," insert the following: "House Documents Nos. 986 and 997 and."

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman explain what this additional amendment is?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There was a mistake in the Senate amendment. Some of the claims were not included in Senate Document No. 384 and some of them were. Some of the claims are in House Document No. 986 and House Document No. 997. They have already been passed upon by the War Department and some have already been appropriated for.

Mr. LAYTON. How will this amendment of the gentleman change the total of $362,000?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It will not change it at all.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House insist on its disagreement, and the gentleman from Indiana makes the preferential motion that the House recede and concur. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOOD of Indiana) there were—ayes 44, noes 59.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands tellers. Those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-six, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. LUHRING (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker I withdraw the point.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41: Page 24, line 1, insert the following: "Payment to Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co.: To pay the sum of $204,307.98 to Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co., of which $150,110.07 is for themselves and $14,953.84 is for the use and benefit of their subcontractors, L. Lowrance & Bros.; $5,376 is for the use and benefit of the estate of their subcontractor, George F. Ramsey, and $15,822.82 is for the use and benefit of their subcontractor, Rodgers Construction Co., and $18,045.25 is for the use and benefit of their subcontractors, H. N. Rodgers & Bro., being the aggregate losses incurred by said Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co. and their subcontractors in the carrying out of certain contracts referred to in a Senate resolution of June 19, 1919, under which the Secretary of War was directed to report the amount of losses incurred by the contractors upon contracts mentioned in said resolution: *Provided*, That before paying said sums the Secretary of the Treasury shall require satisfactory evidence that said contracts have been completed, and that there are no other subcontractors who claim loss for work in connection with said contracts."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 41, Senate amendment No. 42, and Senate amendment No. 43 are amendments of the same general character. Not only is there no law authorizing the payment, but there is no law authorizing the Secretary of War to make an investigation. The Senate passed a resolution asking the Secretary of War to make an investigation, and after Senate bills numbered 4326, 4327, and 4328, which, as I recall, are these same amendments, had passed the Senate and were messaged over to the House they went to the Committee on Claims. The Committee on Claims referred these claims to the War Department. The other amendment which we have just passed over is, as I have said, of a different class altogether. Congress has already recognized the fact that after we entered the war there were a lot of contractors who had contracts to construct public buildings, contractors on river and harbor work and other kinds of work, where the price went up very materially after the contracts were made. When the contract was made the contractor had no thought and the Government had no knowledge that we would be in war during the time the contract was being performed. Therefore Congress in the case of public buildings passed a law providing for the payment to the contractor of his losses because of war conditions in respect to a contract for the erection of public buildings; and in the case of river and harbor work the river and harbor appropriation act carries section 10, which authorized the Secretary of War to ascertain what the losses were and report them to Congress. But these contracts are different and were made after the war began. These claims in Senate amendments 41, 42, and 43 are for losses arising on contracts entered into after we engaged in war. I want now to read to you what the Secretary of War says with regard to these claims.

He says in his report:

7. "The appropriations covered by S. 4326, S. 4327, and S. 4328 would relieve the contractors from the losses sustained by them as a result of a failure to properly estimate the consequences of the selective draft on labor, the disturbance of transportation, the shortage of supplies caused by the military activity, and other results of the war, and would put a premium on the neglect of these contractual obligations in favor of yielding to the incentive to engage in more lucrative work at current and war-stimulated prices.

8. "Other contractors engaged on Mississippi River levee work, and many other contractors for various other works throughout the United States, were similarly circumstanced, and unless the Congress is prepared to grant relief to all on equitable terms, involving in all probability great appropriations from the Treasury, these acts should not be favorably considered by the Committee on Claims, and thus show discrimination and favoritism for which no warrant is known."

9. The views and conclusions of the Chief of Engineers are concurred in, and it is recommended that the said acts be not passed by the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Is it not true that, although these contracts were entered into after the war began, the trouble that the contractors got into which caused their losses was because of governmental activities during the war?

Mr. GOOD. That is what is claimed.

Mr. BEE. Is not that the fact?

Mr. GOOD. They will always find some trumped-up claim if we recognize this class of claims. When the war was on these contractors knew that we were in a condition of war; they could not tell what the labor market would be, but they went into a competitive market and they took these contracts, and now, like men, they must stand up and take the consequences of their own contracts.

If we relieve this class of contractors, then we must come to the relief of every man who had a contract with the Government if he sustained a loss, and if we take care of these big contractors, the corporations named in the three amendments, what will we do for the men who were drafted into the Army who were compelled to leave their business and suffer a loss? [Applause.] What will we do for the farmers who were urged by the Government to plant more acres but who were compelled to market their crops at a loss? Are you going to make good those losses? If you make good this loss, then let us open the doors of the Treasury to all comers, and first come first served.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a further question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Is there not a distinction where the loss occurred by reason of the activities of Government agencies that deprived the contractors of the opportunity of carrying on their work where the Government was responsible?

Mr. GOOD. That is the worst piece of bunk I have ever heard of. There is nothing to it.

Mr. BEE. That is the testimony before the hearings.

Mr. GOOD. It is pure bunk. I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 41.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] says that these contractors ought to stand up like men. I will call attention now to the facts. In 1917 these contractors entered into a contract amounting approximately to a million dollars to build levees on the Mississippi River. That contract was to be completed by December of 1918. In December of 1917 we began our activities at Muscle Shoals and at the nitrate plant in Nashville. These gentlemen assembled their laborers and began the work. The Federal Government, through its agents, went to Memphis and employed a labor agent there who was in the habit of getting laborers for the levee contractors. All of the laborers of these levee contractors were negroes, and this labor agent was a negro. The Government went to him and told him that he could not engage further as a labor agent for private enterprise, and told him that they would employ him to get laborers for the Government work at Muscle Shoals and Nashville. He accepted the employment, put on his badge, immediately went down to the camps where these contractors were working. This is his testimony. He admits this in an affidavit. He went into this camp and he said to these negroes, "We want you to quit these contractors now

and go over to Nashville and Muscle Shoals and work for the Government, and instead of paying you a dollar and six bits a day we will give you $3.50 a day. We will pay your transportation to Nashville and pay it back. You do not have much work to do. It is an easy job; you work only 8 hours a day and we pay you for 11 hours, and furnish you entertainment." Now, listen to this: "We give you moving pictures, furnish you a big dance hall, plenty of craps and plenty of women." That is the testimony of this labor agent. [Laughter.] Well, as a matter of course, with that promise held out, the negroes followed him off like the rats followed the Pied Piper. [Laughter.] Now, it depleted these contractors of labor absolutely. They went to the Government employment service at Memphis and said, "What shall we do? You have taken all of our help. You have left us with nothing but teams. We need some help." They said, "The Government needs all the laborers it can get, and you can not even go out and solicit labor." Then they said, "We will go to Mexico and get Mexicans." They said, "You can not do that, because the Government has work down on the Mexican border." Then they proposed to go down 200 miles into Mexico below the border and get Mexicans that the Government could not reach. The Government agent told them that they could not do that. They said, "What shall we do? We have nothing left but teams." "Well," they said, "we will employ your teams. You go and we will give you work for your teams and we will pay your way over there and back," which the Government did not do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield me five additional minutes?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. They took the teams over there and were paid $7 a day for a team which consisted of two mules, a wagon, and a driver. The Government fixed the pay of the driver at $3.50 a day, so there was left only $3.50 for the team, two mules and the wagon, and they had to maintain the mules, and the Government gave them nothing for their own time while there. They had permission from the Mississippi River Commission for a leave of absence for 60 days and at the end of that time they said, "Now, we must go back upon the contract." They said, "You can not go; you will have to stay here with your teams." They insisted that they were losing money, that they could not afford it, that they must go back, but they had to stay. They were told that if they went back they would have them arrested as enemies of the Government. Now, think of that in time of war. They were advised by lawyers that there was no such law as that, but we were at war, and no patriotic citizen wanted to be arrested in time of war as an enemy of his country. They did stand up like men and stayed there until that summer and finally were relieved upon their insistence and went back to their contract, and, according to the Government's own report, they were never able to secure more than 43 per cent of their crews. After that the other contractors on the river laid down and said "We will not undertake to live up to our contract under such circumstances; let the Government sue us on our bond."

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. They laid down on their contract. The Government then relet those contracts and relet them at a difference in some instances of 50 per cent at the lowest and in other instances 120 per cent higher than the rate that the contractors had originally made. These men said, "We will not lay down on our contract. We will," as the gentleman from Iowa said, "stand up like men and finish the job," and instead of finishing up in December, 1918, they were forced to continue at work until December, 1919, and they finished the work. We passed a resolution calling upon the Secretary of War to audit their accounts and see what was actually lost, and he reported $343,000—these others are the same kind of contracts—but that did not cover their loss. They lost more than that; the books showed more than that. That is, what it showed was due to Government interference, $343,000. Then they came here and went before the Claims Committee of the Senate. They had a bill here. But in spite of the inequitable, unjustifiable, and unwarrantable report of the Secretary, the committee, upon a hearing, reported it favorably and the Senate passed it. Then they took it before the Committee on Claims of the House and had a full hearing, and the Claims Committee, after a full hearing, despite the Secretary of War, made a unanimous report favorable to the claim, and over in the Senate the other day it was taken up over there and considered by the Appropriations Committee and put on in the Senate and passed.

It is here now, and the question, and the only question, is whether the men who kept the faith in those trying times, who lived up to their contracts, shall now be made whole or whether the reward shall go to the contractors who did not keep the faith but who laid down on the job, and who thereby cost the Government an increase of from 50 to 120 per cent. If this appropriation is allowed, it will amount to an increase of 35 per cent. Gentlemen, I insist that there never was a more just claim presented to this House, and I hope very much that the motion which I have made will prevail.

Mr. BEE. Then, as I understand the gentleman from Mississippi, these men stood up like men——

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEE. And fulfilled their contracts and did not lay down on the job?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And the question is whether they shall receive the reward of the faithful, or shall it go to the contractors who laid down on the job.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I will.

Mr. COLLIER. If these contractors had laid down on the job and the work had been given out under new contracts, how much more would it have cost the Government?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Anywhere from 50 to 120 per cent more. In my district there are levees, in the construction of which the Government did not participate, where we voluntarily raised the price of the contractors 120 per cent.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I can add but very little to what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] has said about this matter. He has made a splendid presentation of the case. Having only five minutes, I want to talk to you hurriedly about two phases of the matter.

In June, 1919, the Senate passed a resolution asking that the War Department investigate this matter and determine the amount and the causes of the loss sustained by these contractors. In response to that resolution the War Department put auditors on the books, made a complete and thorough investigation of the matter, and reported the very sums that are contained in these items in the bill. Now, some gentlemen have argued these matters ought not to be considered on appropriation bills because of the fact that they do not have the opportunity to give careful consideration to such matters. I want to say this, that these items have been considered and, no doubt, carefully considered; because, first, the matters went to the Committee on Claims of the Senate; they took the report of the Secretary of War; they considered the matter, and reported the bill unanimously from that committee. The matter was then considered in the Senate and passed there. Then it came to the Committee on Claims of the House, and it was considered there. A unanimous report came from that committee. Then the matter was presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. It was considered there, and then later considered by the Senate itself, and placed as amendments on this deficiency bill. So this matter has been considered by two committees of the Senate; it has been considered by the Senate itself twice; it has been considered by one committee of the House, and favorable action had on each occasion. So five times the matter has been presented. And I want to say that the other day when this deficiency bill was before the Senate the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the careful guardian of the Treasury of the United States, rose and said that this matter was subject to the point of order, but that he would not make the point, but would allow it to go into the appropriation bill. And it did go in without any objection and without anybody making the point. Why? Because it had been carefully considered by the Committee on Claims; it had been before the Senate at one time; it had been carefully considered by the Committee on Appropriations, and there was no doubt in the mind of Senator SMOOT or any other gentleman, I imagine, as to the merits of the matter.

Now, gentlemen, the question is just this: Shall these men who stuck to the job, who performed their duties, who were unwilling to lay down on their contracts, be forced into bankruptcy simply because it is suggested that we should have more time to consider the matter? Gentlemen, the only honest thing to do, if this is a meritorious claim, the only honest and just thing to do if it is due, is to pay these men now. It is not right that they shall be allowed to become bankrupt simply because they, as many others refused to do, carried on their work and performed their contract.

Just another word. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] referred to the fact that these men were threatened; that they were told if they left Muscle Shoals and the nitrate plant and other governmental activities they would be arrested. Gentlemen, according to the proof in this case, two of the contractors were actually arrested when they endeavored to go back to their work. Remember, they were under contract

with the Government. The Government is the party that refused to allow them to complete their contract in time, and it put them to this great loss. I submit it is unfair and unjust not to require the Government, which is the sole cause of the loss, to pay these claims. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen have talked a good deal about the man who stood up during the war. Every one of these contractors had a bond, and they had to stand up or do just as every other contractor does—pay the damages.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. All the contractors had bonds.

Mr. GOOD. Of course they did. All of the contractors on the Mississippi River laid down except these, and the Government, realizing that they could not recover, has not proceeded against one of them on his bond.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds and thousands of claims that will appear just the minute we commence to announce this kind of a policy. I am unwilling that three or four contractors in Mississippi or Tennessee shall go to their Senators and have a special bill put in for them, without taking care of all the contractors and everybody who suffered loss when their contracts were entered into after we engaged in the war. We have taken care of the contractors whose contracts were entered into before we engaged in the war. These contracts were all made in the light of war conditions. The war was on. The contractors knew what would be expected of them. I say to you that if you put on these favored claims, worked up by contractors and lawyers, what are you going to do with the thousands of contractors throughout the United States who suffered a loss under war conditions? Now, I tell you what we ought to do. If this is a just claim, it can just as well afford to wait until we bring in a general law that will take care of all contractors who suffered under like conditions. Here is no place for it, on an appropriation bill. Let it be considered, and if it is a meritorious claim let it stand or fall on its merits.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House further insist on its disagreement, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] makes the preferential motion that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

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

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 102, noes 57.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order there is no quorum present. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi will, as their names are called, answer "yea," and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 178, nays 143, answered "present" 2, not voting 105, as follows:

YEAS—178.

Almon	Dent	Howard	McKeown
Aswell	Dewalt	Hudspeth	McLane
Babka	Dominick	Hulings	Madden
Barbour	Dooling	Hull, Iowa	Major
Barkley	Doremus	Humphreys	Mansfield
Bee	Drane	Ireland	Martin
Black	Dunbar	Jacoway	Mason
Bowers	Dupré	James, Va.	Mays
Bowling	Eagan	Johnson, Ky.	Miller
Box	Edmonds	Johnson, Miss.	Milligan
Brand	Elliott	Johnson, Wash.	Minahan, N. J.
Brinson	Evans, Mont.	Jones, Tex.	Monahan, Wis.
Browne	Evans, Nev.	Kahn	Montague
Buchanan	Fairfield	Kearns	Moore, Va.
Burke	Fields	Kelly, Pa.	Moores, Ind.
Byrnes, S. C.	Fisher	Kendall	Mudd
Byrns, Tenn.	Flood	Kennedy, R. I.	Nelson, Mo.
Caldwell	Gallivan	Kettner	Nolan
Campbell, Pa.	Gandy	Kincheloe	O'Connell
Caraway	Garrett	King	O'Connor
Carew	Glynn	Langley	Oldfield
Carss	Griffin	Lanham	Oliver
Carter	Hadley	Lankford	Olney
Cleary	Hardy, Tex.	Lazaro	Osborne
Coady	Harreld	Lea, Calif.	Padgett
Collier	Hastings	Lesher	Park
Connally	Hawley	Linthicum	Parker
Crisp	Hayden	Little	Parrish
Cullen	Hays	Luhring	Pell
Curry, Calif.	Hernandez	McAndrews	Phelan
Darrow	Hill	McArthur	Pou
Davis, Tenn.	Hoey	McClintic	Quin
Denison	Holland	McDuffie	Rainey, Henry T.
Raker	Sims	Stoll	Watkins
Randall, Calif.	Sisson	Summers, Wash.	Weaver
Ransley	Slemp	Sumners, Tex.	Welling
Rayburn	Smith, Ill.	Swindall	Whaley
Robinson, N. C.	Smith, Mich.	Tague	Williams
Romjue	Smithwick	Taylor, Ark.	Wilson, La.
Rose	Steagall	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Pa.
Rouse	Stedman	Tillman	Wingo
Sabath	Steele	Upshaw	Woods, Va.
Sanders, Ind.	Steenerson	Vaile	Young, Tex.
Scott	Stephens, Miss.	Venable	
Sells	Stephens, Ohio	Vinson	

NAYS—143.

Ackerman	Fess	Lufkin	Schall
Anderson	Fish	McFadden	Sherwood
Andrews, Md.	Focht	McKenzie	Shreve
Andrews, Nebr.	Foster	McLaughlin, Mich.	Siegel
Ashbrook	Frear	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinclair
Begg	Freeman	McLeod	Sinnott
Bell	French	McPherson	Smith, Idaho
Benham	Fuller	MacGregor	Snell
Bland, Ind.	Gard	Magee	Snyder
Bland, Va.	Good	Mapes	Strong, Kans.
Blanton	Graham, Ill.	Merritt	Strong, Pa.
Boies	Greene, Vt.	Michener	Sweet
Briggs	Griest	Mondell	Temple
Brooks, Ill.	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Ohio	Thompson
Brooks, Pa.	Harrison	Mott	Tilson
Burroughs	Hersey	Murphy	Timberlake
Butler	Hickey	Nelson, Wis.	Tincher
Campbell, Kans.	Hicks	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Cannon	Hoch	Ogden	Towner
Chindblom	Houghton	Paige	Treadway
Christopherson	Huddleston	Peters	Vestal
Cole	Husted	Purnell	Volk
Cooper	Hutchinson	Radcliffe	Volstead
Copley	Jefferis	Ramseyer	Walsh
Crago	Johnson, S. Dak.	Randall, Wis.	Ward
Cramton	Jones, Pa.	Reber	Wason
Currie, Mich.	Keller	Reed, N. Y.	Watson
Dale	Kelley, Mich.	Reed, W. Va.	White, Kans.
Dallinger	Knutson	Rhodes	White, Me.
Davis, Minn.	Kraus	Ricketts	Wilson, Ill.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kreider	Riddick	Winslow
Dowell	Lampert	Robsion, Ky.	Wood, Ind.
Echols	Larsen	Rogers	Wright
Emerson	Layton	Rowe	Yates
Esch	Lehlbach	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, N. Dak.
Evans, Nebr.	Luce	Sanford	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Greene, Mass. Lee, Ga.

NOT VOTING—105.

Anthony	Ellsworth	Kitchin	Rodenberg
Ayres	Elston	Kleczka	Rowan
Bacharach	Ferris	Lonergan	Rubey
Baer	Fordney	Longworth	Rucker
Bankhead	Gallagher	McCulloch	Sanders, La.
Benson	Ganly	McGlennon	Scully
Bland, Mo.	Garner	McKinlry	Sears
Britten	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Small
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Burdick	Goodall	Mann, Ill.	Stevenson
Candler	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Stiness
Cantrill	Goodykoontz	Mead	Sullivan
Casey	Gould	Moon	Swope
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Mooney	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, Mo.	Green, Iowa	Morin	Thomas
Classon	Hamill	Neely	Vare
Costello	Hamilton	Newton, Mo.	Voigt
Crowther	Haugen	Nicholls	Walters
Davey	Hersman	Overstreet	Webster
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Patterson	Welty
Dickinson, Mo.	Igoe	Perlman	Wheeler
Donovan	James, Mich.	Porter	Wise
Doughton	Johnston, N. Y.	Rainey, Ala.	Woodyard
Drewry	Juul	Rainey, John W.	Zihlman
Dunn	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramsey	
Dyer	Kiess	Reavis	
Eagle	Kinkaid	Riordan	

So the motion of Mr. HUMPHREYS was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. RUCKER.

Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.

Mr. DYER with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ with Mr. WELTY.

Mr. KINKAID with Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. DREWRY.

Mr. JUUL with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. BAER with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. VOIGT with Mr. OVERSTREET.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. MOON.

Mr. SWOPE with Mr. MCKINIRY.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. FERRIS.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
Mr. ELSTON with Mr. KITCHIN.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD. I voted "nay." I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 42: Page 24, after line 20, insert: "Payment to H. B. Blanks: To pay H. B. Blanks, levee contractor, the sum of $123,569.03, of which $40,720.95 is for the use and benefit of his subcontractors, Roach, Stansell, Lowrance Bros. & Co., and $82,848.08 is for the use and benefit of the estate of his subcontractor, George F. Ramsey, being the aggregate losses incurred by said subcontractors in the carrying out of certain contracts referred to in a Senate resolution of June 19, 1919, under which the Secretary of War was directed to report the amount of losses incurred by the contractors upon contract mentioned in said resolution: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, before paying said sums, shall require evidence satisfactory to him that said contracts have been completed, and that there are no other subcontractors who claim loss for work in connection therewith."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is similar to the one we have just voted upon. That amendment is one which the Secretary of War said would put a premium on the neglect and inefficiency of contractors. It places a premium on extravagance. Quoting his words, he says:

Unless the Congress is prepared to grant relief to all on equitable terms, involving in all probability great appropriations from the Treasury, these acts should not be favorably considered.

There is not a word on the statute books, not a word anywhere, authorizing the payment of these claims. The vote we have just taken is not on the merits of these claims. It is not on the merits of this class of claims, which the Secretary of War said would place a premium on the neglect of duty of contractors, but it is a tribute to the genial companionship, the wonderful ability of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. [Applause.] That is what you voted for; and when you open the doors of the Treasury to the genial companionship of a Member of the House or the Senate you are doing a dangerous thing.

I recognize the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] as one of the ablest Members of this House; but I did not know until we had the last vote that he held in the hollow of his hand the vote of practically every Member on that side of the House and many on this side. I did not look for any degree of economy from that side of the House on these matters, but to this side of the House, that went to the polls in November and said they were going to vote for economy, I did look for some degree of economy, but I have failed to find it. [Applause.] Yet by this vote you have taken out of the Treasury without warrant of law $204,000. You have placed a premium on the waste and extravagance of contractors. You have opened the doors of the Treasury wide to all classes of claims. Here is another opportunity for you to duplicate that performance, if you so desire.

I move to insist on the disagreement of the House to Senate amendment 42.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I have a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment 42. Will the gentleman yield me some time?

Mr. GOOD. I can not refuse the gentleman time, even though I am compelled to refuse to vote the money. I give the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the very frank and accurate manner in which he has delineated my characteristics. [Laughter.] Much as I appreciate the compliment, I know that the gentleman has overstated them.

This amendment stands exactly on all fours with the one we have just adopted. Amendments 41, 42, and 43 are alike in principle, and in my humble judgment no more righteous proposition has been before this House during this session or will come before it than is embraced in these three amendments. There is nothing partisan about it. I am sorry that we did not get all the votes on that side or on this side, but we did not get them all on either side. There is nothing partisan in this. There is nothing partisan in the membership of this firm. As a matter of fact, it is bipartisan, if that has anything to do with it.

I understood we were to return to normalcy, and normalcy in this Government means to pay its honest debts. [Applause.] The unwarranted interference of Government agents well-nigh wrecked this firm of contractors, the only firm on the river that were willing to stand up and take the gaff, relying upon the good faith of the Government to make them whole when the facts were all adduced.

This matter comes before the House in absolute order. It has been before the Committee on Claims and a full hearing had, and that committee, composed, as all the committees in this House are composed, of a majority from this side, unanimously recommended its payment. It was put on the calendar. It went before a committee in the Senate, and another hearing was had, and that committee there unanimously recommended that it be paid. It is put on now as an amendment which is now in order. Nobody denies that it is a righteous claim. Nobody denies that the Government ought to reimburse these men. The only claim is that this is not the proper day of the week. I hope, gentlemen, that you will not be led off by partisan considerations but that you will give to these men absolute and equal justice. They went through with their contracts. They are the only contractors on the river who did. The men who laid down cost the Government 50 to 120 per cent when the contracts were relet, but these men, who kept the faith, who lived up to the terms of their contracts, who trusted to the good faith of Congress to reimburse them—they are the ones to be penalized. These men are not millionaires, neither are they paupers; but, gentlemen, when you take from any firm $343,000 you well-nigh wreck them. I do not believe this House will do it. I ask you to vote again for this amendment.

Mr. GOOD. I ask for a vote.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield time for a question?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman half a minute.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. With reference to the proviso that the Secretary of the Treasury, before paying this sum, shall require evidence satisfactory to him that the contracts have been completed——

Mr. HUMPHREYS. They have actually been completed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But the legislation says that the Congress does not know whether they have been completed or not, but wants the Secretary of the Treasury to determine whether they have been completed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. They have been completed. There is no doubt about it, absolutely no question about it, and the contractors have received their pay and been discharged a year ago.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If, as a matter of fact, these contracts have not been completed, then these sums are not correct, are they?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Now, you leave it to the Secretary of the Treasury to determine whether the contracts have been completed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Oh, no. The contracts have been completed, and the Secretary has paid them and the men have gone hence.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But that is in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It does not make any difference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the war damaged everybody except a few people who had cost-plus contracts. [Laughter.] I take it that almost everyone suffered. Take it in my State of Illinois, for example, and in my own county, before the war we were building good roads under contract. When the war broke out there were hundreds of contracts made on the cost of labor and material for their construction before the war began. Many men were ruined by that and lost their property. They were good citizens. Everywhere everybody suffered. Thousands and hundreds of thousands were made bankrupt on account of the war because labor was impossible to get. If you could get it at all it was at an enhanced price. You could not get supplies, you could not get transportation, you could not get gravel and you could not get cement. Now, I think that all that class of people are entitled to relief if we are going to enter a campaign of relieving everybody who suffered. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Members of the House ought to realize something about the settlement of war contracts under the so-called Dent Act and other acts. Settlement of claims were made under those laws, and up to the present time $24,000,000 has been recovered back as overpayment. When settlements have been made under those laws the money can be recovered back for overpayment. If the Republican House desires to settle claims in this way and overpayments are made, none of that money can be recovered. I say without hesitancy that in the

settlement of these claims of $3,000,000,000 under the Dent Act and other acts there will be $50,000,000 recovered back. If you lay down the rule to-day that we are to settle matters by legislation, not one dollar will ever come back to the Government. It seems to me that it is time the Republican Members of this House remember their campaign promises. To-day when the Government is recovering back money that has been overpaid on these claims, if amendments of this kind are voted for without consideration you will close the door for the incoming administration to recover back any money wrongfully paid.

It seems strange that you are willing to pay the money on these claims when it is not possible to give the soldier adjusted compensation and take care of some of the men who perhaps suffered in other ways than by losing their money in the war. Until these claims are settled I do not believe these matters should be settled by legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. How have the $24,000,000 been recovered, by suit?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. By threatened suit.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And the money actually paid back after the Government settled with them?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Actually paid back to the Government. That will come in in some of the reports of the war investigating committee, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Those reports will be so long they will never be read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi to recede and concur.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOOD) there were 107 ayes and 101 noes.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 153, nays 146, answered "present" 3, not voting 126, as follows:

YEAS—153.

Almon	Fields	Lazaro	Rose
Ashbrook	Fisher	Lea, Calif.	Rouse
Aswell	Gallivan	Lesher	Sabath
Babka	Gandy	Linthicum	Sanders, Ind.
Barbour	Garrett	Little	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Glynn	Luhring	Sells
Bee	Griffin	McClintic	Sherwood
Black	Hadley	McDuffie	Sims
Bowers	Hardy, Tex.	McLane	Sisson
Bowling	Harrison	Major	Smith, Mich.
Box	Hastings	Mann, Ill.	Smithwick
Brand	Hayden	Mansfield	Steagall
Brinson	Hays	Martin	Stedman
Browne	Hernandez	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Hersman	Milligan	Stevenson
Burke	Hill	Minahan, N. J.	Stoll
Byrnes, S. C.	Hoey	Montague	Sumners, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Holland	Moore, Va.	Sweet
Campbell, Pa.	Howard	Moores, Ind.	Swindall
Candler	Hudspeth	Nelson, Mo.	Tague
Caraway	Hulings	Nolan	Taylor, Ark.
Carew	Hull, Iowa	O'Connell	Taylor, Colo.
Carter	Hull, Tenn	O'Connor	Taylor, Tenn.
Cleary	Humphreys	Oldfield	Tillman
Collier	Ireland	Oliver	Venable
Connally	Jacoway	Osborne	Vinson
Crisp	James, Va.	Overstreet	Weaver
Curry, Calif.	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett	Welling
Dent	Johnson, Miss.	Park	Whaley
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	White, Me.
Dominick	Kearns	Parrish	Williams
Doremus	Kelly, Pa.	Pell	Wilson, La.
Drane	Kendall	Quin	Wilson, Pa.
Dupré	Kennedy, R. I.	Raker	Wingo
Eagan	Kettner	Randall, Calif.	Woods, Va.
Edmonds	Kincheloe	Ransley	Young, Tex
Elliott	King	Rayburn	
Evans, Mont.	Lanham	Robinson, N. C.	
Evans, Nev.	Lankford	Romjue	

NAYS—146.

Ackerman	Chindblom	Evans, Nebr.	Hersey
Andrews, Md.	Christopherson	Fess	Hickey
Andrews, Nebr.	Coady	Fish	Hicks
Begg	Cooper	Focht	Hoch
Bell	Copley	Foster	Houghton
Benham	Cramton	Frear	Huddleston
Bland, Ind.	Currie, Mich.	Freeman	Husted
Bland Va.	Dale	French	Hutchinson
Blanton	Dallinger	Fuller	Jefferis
Boies	Darrow	Gard	Johnson, S. Dak.
Briggs	Davis, Minn.	Good	Jones, Pa.
Brooks, Ill.	Dickinson, Iowa	Gould	Keller
Brooks, Pa.	Dowell	Graham, Ill.	Kelley, Mich.
Burroughs	Dunbar	Greene, Vt.	Knutson
Butler	Echols	Griest	Kraus
Campbell, Kans.	Emerson	Hardy, Colo.	Kreider
Cannon	Esch	Hawley	Lampert
Langley	Mondell	Robsion, Ky.	Tinkham
Larsen	Moore, Ohio	Rogers	Towner
Layton	Mott	Rowe	Treadway
Lehlbach	Mudd	Sanders, N. Y.	Vaile
Luce	Murphy	Sanford	Vestal
Lufkin	Nelson, Wis.	Schall	Voigt
McFadden	Newton, Minn.	Shreve	Volk
McKenzie	Ogden	Siegel	Volstead
McLaughlin, Mich.	Paige	Sinclair	Walsh
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Peters	Sinnott	Ward
McLeod	Purnell	Slemp	Wason
McPherson	Radcliffe	Smith, Idaho	Watson
MacGregor	Ramsey	Snyder	White, Kans.
Madden	Ramseyer	Strong, Kans.	Winslow
Magee	Reber	Strong, Pa.	Wood, Ind.
Mapes	Reed, N. Y.	Summers, Wash.	Woodyard
Merritt	Reed, W. Va.	Temple	Wright
Michener	Rhodes	Thompson	Young, N. Dak.
Miller	Ricketts	Tinson	
Monahan, Wis.	Riddick	Timberlake	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Greene, Mass.	Lee, Ga.	Snell

NOT VOTING—126.

Anderson	Dunn	Kitchin	Riordan
Anthony	Dyer	Kleczka	Rodenberg
Ayres	Eagle	Lonergan	Rowan
Bacharach	Ellsworth	Longworth	Rubey
Baer	Elston	McAndrews	Rucker
Bankhead	Fairfield	McArthur	Scott
Benson	Ferris	McCulloch	Scully
Bland, Mo.	Flood	McGlennon	Sears
Britten	Fordney	McKeown	Small
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	McKiniry	Smith, Ill.
Burdick	Ganly	McKinley	Smith, N. Y.
Caldwell	Garner	Maher	Steele
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Mann, S. C.	Steenerson
Carss	Goldfogle	Mason	Stephens, Ohio
Casey	Goodall	Mead	Stiness
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Moon	Sullivan
Clark, Mo.	Goodykoontz	Mooney	Swope
Classon	Graham, Pa.	Morin	Thomas
Cole	Green, Iowa	Neely	Tincher
Costello	Hamill	Newton, Mo.	Upshaw
Crago	Hamilton	Nicholls	Vare
Crowther	Harreld	Olney	Walters
Cullen	Haugen	Patterson	Watkins
Davey	Igoe	Perlman	Webster
Davis, Tenn.	James, Mich.	Phelan	Welty
Dempsey	Johnston, N. Y.	Porter	Wheeler
Denison	Jones, Tex.	Pou	Wilson, Ill.
Dickinson, Mo.	Juul	Rainey, Ala.	Wise
Donovan	Kahn	Rainey, Henry T.	Yates
Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, John W.	Zihlman
Doughton	Kiess	Randall, Wis.	
Drewry	Kinkaid	Reavis	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. POU (for) with Mr. SNELL (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. BAER with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. MASON with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. YATES with Mr. MCANDREWS.

Mr. KINKAID with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. ANDERSON with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. EAGLE.

Mr. CRAGO with Mr. DREWRY.

Mr. DENISON with Mr. CARSS.

Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. HERNY T. RAINEY.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. JONES of Texas.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. MCKEOWN.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. MOON.

Mr. TINCHER with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. BURDICK with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. DUNN with Mr. UPSHAW.

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. CULLEN.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. COLE with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "present."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present, listening, when his name should have been called?

Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my vote of "no" on account of a pair that I have with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. POU, and vote "present."

The name of Mr. SNELL was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present, listening, when his name should have been called?

Mr. COLE. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I am paired and wish to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The name of Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 43: Page 25, line 11, insert the following:

"Payment to the estate of George F. Ramsey: To pay the sum of $15,561.23 to the estate of George F. Ramsey, levee contractor, of which $13,602.27 is for the estate of George F. Ramsey and $1,958.96 is for the use and benefit of W. H. Dennison, his subcontractor, being the aggregate losses incurred by said George F. Ramsey and his subcontractors in the carrying out of certain contracts referred to in a Senate resolution of June 19, 1919, under which the Secretary of War was directed to report the amount of losses incurred by the contractors upon contracts mentioned in said resolution: *Provided*, That before paying said sums the Secretary of the Treasury shall require satisfactory evidence that said contract has been completed and that there are no other subcontractors who claim loss for work in connection with said contract."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is similar to amendments numbered 41 and 42. It is on all fours with those two amendments, the only difference being that this amendment carries the amount of $15,561.23, while Senate No. 41 carries $204,307.98, and No. 43, $123,569.03. The Secretary of War, whom we have criticized on this side as being very extravagant, said that to vote for this class of claims was to put a premium upon extravagance. Those are his exact words. The House having twice voted to-day to put a premium upon extravagance and to open the doors of the Treasury wide for all kinds of unjust and extravagant claims, I assume that it will desire to vote for this amendment. However, to keep the record true, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 43.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement from Senate amendment No. 43, and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi, to recede and concur.

The question was taken.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. BEGG (while the House was dividing). Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 147, answered "present" 5, not voting 124, as follows:

YEAS—152.

Almon	Fisher	Lesher	Sabath
Ashbrook	Focht	Linthicum	Sanders, Ind.
Aswell	Gallivan	Little	Sanders, La.
Babka	Gandy	Lubring	Scott
Barbour	Ganly	McClintic	Sells
Barkley	Garrett	McDuffie	Sherwood
Bee	Glynn	McKeown	Sims
Black	Griffin	McLane	Sisson
Bowers	Hadley	Major	Smith, Mich.
Bowling	Hardy, Tex.	Mann, Ill.	Smithwick
Box	Harrison	Mansfield	Steagall
Brinson	Hastings	Martin	Stedman
Browne	Hayden	Mason	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Hays	Mays	Stevenson
Burke	Hernandez	Milligan	Stoll
Byrnes, S. C.	Hersman	Minahan, N. J.	Summers, Wash.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hill	Montague	Sumners, Tex.
Caldwell	Hoey	Moore, Va.	Sweet
Campbell, Pa.	Holland	Moores, Ind.	Swindall
Candler	Howard	Nelson, Mo.	Tague
Caraway	Hudspeth	Nolan	Taylor, Ark.
Carew	Humphreys	O'Connell	Taylor, Tenn.
Carter	Ireland	O'Connor	Tillman
Cleary	Jacoway	Oldfield	Upshaw
Coady	James, Va.	Oliver	Venable
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Osborne	Vinson
Connally	Johnson, Miss.	Padgett	Watkins
Curry, Calif.	Kearns	Parker	Weaver
Davis, Tenn.	Kelly, Pa.	Parrish	Welling
Dewalt	Kendall	Quin	Welty
Dominick	Kennedy, R. I.	Raker	Whaley
Dupré	Kettner	Randall, Calif.	Williams
Eagan	Kincheloe	Ransley	Wilson, La.
Edmonds	King	Rayburn	Wilson, Pa.
Elliott	Lanham	Robinson, N. C.	Wingo
Evans, Mont.	Lankford	Romjue	Woods, Va.
Evans, Nev.	Lazaro	Rose	Young, Tex.
Fields	Lea, Calif.	Rouse	Zihlman

NAYS—147.

Ackerman	Bland, Va.	Butler	Currie, Mich.
Andrews, Md.	Blanton	Campbell, Kans.	Dale
Andrews, Nebr.	Boies	Cannon	Dallinger
Begg	Briggs	Chindblom	Darrow
Bell	Brooks, Ill.	Christopherson	Dickinson, Iowa
Benham	Brooks, Pa.	Cole	Dowell
Bland, Ind.	Burroughs	Cramton	Dunbar
Echols	Husted	Monahan, Wis.	Sinclair
Emerson	Hutchinson	Mondell	Sinnott
Esch	Jefferis	Moore, Ohio	Slemp
Evans, Nebr.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mott	Smith, Idaho
Fairfield	Jones, Pa.	Mudd	Snyder
Fess	Keller	Murphy	Stephens, Ohio
Fish	Kelley, Mich.	Nelson, Wis.	Strong, Kans.
Foster	Kinkaid	Newton, Minn.	Strong, Pa.
Frear	Knutson	Ogden	Temple
Freeman	Kraus	Paige	Thompson
French	Kreider	Perlman	Tilson
Fuller	Lampert	Peters	Timberlake
Gard	Langley	Purnell	Tinkham
Good	Larsen	Radcliffe	Towner
Goodykoontz	Layton	Ramsey	Treadway
Gould	Lehlbach	Ramseyer	Vaile
Graham, Ill.	Luce	Randall, Wis.	Vestal
Greene, Vt.	Lufkin	Reed, N. Y.	Voigt
Griest	McFadden	Reed, W. Va.	Volk
Hardy, Colo.	McKenzie	Rhodes	Volstead
Harreld	McLaughlin, Mich.	Ricketts	Walsh
Haugen	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Riddick	Ward
Hawley	McPherson	Robsion, Ky.	Wason
Hersey	MacGregor	Rogers	Watson
Hickey	Madden	Rowe	White, Kans.
Hicks	Magee	Sanders, N. Y.	Winslow
Hoch	Mapes	Sanford	Wood, Ind.
Houghton	Merritt	Schall	Wright
Huddleston	Michener	Shreve	Young, N. Dak.
Hull, Iowa	Miller	Siegel	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Greene, Mass.	Lee, Ga.	Snell	Steenerson
Juul			

NOT VOTING—124.

Anderson	Donovan	Kahn	Rainey, Ala.
Anthony	Dooling	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, Henry T.
Ayres	Doremus	Kiess	Rainey, John W.
Bacharach	Doughton	Kitchin	Reavis
Baer	Drane	Kleczka	Reber
Bankhead	Drewry	Lonergan	Riordan
Benson	Dunn	Longworth	Rodenberg
Bland, Mo.	Dyer	McAndrews	Rowan
Brand	Eagle	McArthur	Rubey
Britten	Ellsworth	McCulloch	Rucker
Brumbaugh	Elston	McGlennon	Scully
Burdick	Ferris	McKinlry	Sears
Cantrill	Flood	McKinley	Small
Carss	Fordney	McLeod	Smith, Ill.
Casey	Gallagher	Maher	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Garner	Mann, S. C.	Steele
Clark, Mo.	Godwin, N. C.	Mead	Stiness
Classon	Goldfogle	Moon	Sullivan
Cooper	Goodall	Mooney	Swope
Copley	Goodwin, Ark.	Morin	Taylor, Colo.
Costello	Graham, Pa.	Neely	Thomas
Crago	Green, Iowa	Newton, Mo.	Tincher
Crisp	Hamill	Nicholls	Vare
Crowther	Hamilton	Olney	Walters
Cullen	Hulings	Overstreet	Webster
Davey	Hull, Tenn.	Park	Wheeler
Davis, Minn.	Igoe	Patterson	White, Me.
Dempsey	James, Mich.	Pell	Wilson, Ill.
Denison	Johnson, Wash.	Phelan	Wise
Dent	Johnston, N. Y.	Porter	Woodyard
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones, Tex.	Pou	Yates

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Mr. POU (for) with Mr. SNELL (against).

Additional pairs:

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. LEE of Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. PELL.

Mr. BROWNE with Mr. CRISP.

Mr. COPLEY with Mr. DOREMUS.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska with Mr. DENT.

Mr. REBER with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. MCLEOD with Mr. BRAND.

Mr. COOPER with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. HULINGS with Mr. PARK.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. BRAND. No, sir; I just came in.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I was not present, and if I can not answer "present"——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. CARSS. No; I just——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. UPSHAW. I wanted to; I was right here all the time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will explain, as he often has with reference to allowing gentlemen to vote on a roll call. It is on the theory that his name, by a mistake of the Clerk, was not called, and if the gentleman was present and listening and his name was not called, he had no opportunity to vote.

Mr. UPSHAW. I was listening.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must, of course, always leave it to the conscience of the gentleman answering. Was he present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. UPSHAW. I did not hear it called; I would have answered if I had; but I was present and listening.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must leave it to the gentleman. Was he present and listening when his name was called? If he answers he was, he can vote.

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes; and I desire to vote "aye."

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I have a pair with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts was called, and he answered "present."

Mr. REBER. Mr. Speaker, I came in after my name was called, and I would like to answer "present."

The SPEAKER. It is not allowed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the vote on Senate amendment No. 40 be reconsidered and that the amendment be placed before the House for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to reconsider the vote by which the House disagreed to Senate amendment No. 40. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

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

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question before the House is, that the House further insist on its disagreement, and the gentleman from Indiana offers a motion, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I offer the same preferential motion that I originally offered for that purpose—that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD of Indiana moves to recede, and concur in Senate amendment No. 40 with an amendment as follows: In the matter inserted by said amendment, before the word "Senate," insert the following: "House Documents Nos. 986 and 997."

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word. The appropriation carried by this amendment is upon the adjusted contracts made by the War Department under the law passed by this body for that purpose upon contracts which were entered into before the war and the loss occurred by reason of the Government's action in reference to labor and in reference to the increased cost of material. The amount involved in this item has been agreed upon and adjusted by the War Department. It is the actual losses as provided in the recommendation of the War Department. There is no one who knows anything about the facts in this case in reference to this item but knows that there is no dispute whatever in reference to the adjustment of these claims. The only objection that could be possibly made is in reference to the fact that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, and in view of the action of this House with reference to other claims just had and feeling that we misunderstood this item when it was up for consideration before, I am asking for this reconsideration, and I trust to be sustained by an affirmative vote upon this amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, after line 5, insert:

For the payment to the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co. as recommended in the report made to Congress under date of February 11, 1916, by the commission appointed under the act of June 24, 1914, and approved by the governor of the Panama Canal (H. Doc. No. 906, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), $714,007.39, said amount to be chargeable as part of the construction of the Panama Canal and reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the proceeds of the sale of the bonds authorized by section 8 of the act approved June 28, 1902, and section 39 of the tariff act approved August 5, 1909.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is recognized.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this claim involves $714,007.39. It is at present on the House Calendar, H. R. 6092, and also in Senate bill 1353, which has already passed the Senate, on April 20, 1920. I understand in previous Congresses it has passed the House once or twice, and at other times it has passed the Senate. It is an item growing out of the construction of the gates on the Panama Canal. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has some detailed information, and I yield him five minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I did not understand whether or not the gentleman made any motion.

Mr. GOOD. I have not yet. I am going to move to insist.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I make the preferential motion that the House recede from its disagreement with Senate amendment 45, and concur with the same.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this claim deals with the cap sheaf of the greatest engineering triumph of the world's history—the lock gates of the Panama Canal.

The fulfillment of the dream of Columbus—a western passage to the Far East—was made possible by the Panama Canal, and the Panama Canal depends upon the gates made by the McClintic-Marshall Construction Co.

The building of these gates was an epoch in construction. The contract was the largest ever let to a steel fabricator in the world.

It must be remembered that it was a launching out into unknown seas, and no living man knew exactly the nature of the task when bids were asked for the construction of the lock gates at Panama.

The whole colossal task was approached by America in the spirit of that great leader, Theodore Roosevelt, whose name will be forever linked with the uniting of the Atlantic and Pacific at Panama.

He visited Panama to personally inspect the Isthmus and the plans, and on his return sent to Congress the first illustrated message in American history. In that message he said:

After most careful consideration we have decided to let out most of the work by contract, if we can come to satisfactory terms with the contractors. The whole work is of a kind suited to the peculiar genius of our people; and our people have developed the type of contractor best fitted to grapple with it. It is, of course, much better to do the work in large part by contract than to do it all by the Government, provided it is possible, on the one hand, to secure to the contractor a sufficient remuneration to make it worth while for responsible contractors of the best kind to undertake the work; and provided, on the other hand, it can be done on terms which will not give an excessive profit to the contractors at the expense of the Government. The plan we have promulgated is tentative; doubtless it will have to be changed in some respects before we can come to a satisfactory agreement with responsible contractors—perhaps even after the bids have been received.

Mr. Speaker, that far-sighted President expressed the situation exactly. It was the great feat of the ages. It was expected that shipbuilders would respond, but not a single shipbuilder in America would attempt it. The McClintic Marshall Co., one of the great bridge builders in the country, had the nerve and the faith to say that the task was not impossible and that they would undertake it.

The contract was awarded to them and they began the mighty undertaking. There were difficulties, unexpected and unforeseen. The drawings were not approved by the Government, in some cases, for 21 months after they were submitted. There was an inspection which caused much waste in material and which sent the cost up $4 a ton higher than the average cost of the year before or the year after in the same plants. The gates were ordered absolutely water-tight, although that was not in the specifications. Then when the material was being assembled at Panama, the Canal Commission had not provided storage space.

The bolt holes ordered at the shops were enlarged, a task which in itself cost the contractors more than half a million dollars. The plates had to be ground to meet the action of the sun. Bitumastic enamel had to be used instead of bitumastic solution. There were numberless changes and complications.

But the contractors went ahead. Gen. Goethals testified before the Claims Committee that he feared many times the contractors would give up in desperation. They did not give up; they had the determination to succeed, which is the "genius of our people." They lost $2,802,765, but they finished the task ahead of time and left, according to Gen. Goethals and the commission, "the finest lock gates in all the world."

Then they laid the facts before Congress. In 1914, Congress passed an act, Public 119, requiring that a commission of Government employees, acting under Gen. Goethals, should determine what sum was in justice, fairness, and equity, owing to the McClintic-Marshall Co.

That commission was composed of Admiral Rousseau, engineer of terminal construction at Panama; H. A. Smith, auditor; and B. F. Harrah, examiner of claims for the Panama Canal Commission.

They spent months in investigating the claims. They went to Panama and to Pittsburgh. They saw every page of cost records from beginning to end.

Then this commission of Government employees, earnestly seeking the Government's interests, came back to Congress with the official declaration that $714,007.39 is in justice, fairness, and equity due to this company.

I introduced the claim bill and it went to the Claims Committee and was given the most painstaking attention. Gen. Goethals and the members of the commission were called and questioned. They insisted that every cent of the amount provided was in all justice due the contractors, and Gen. Goethals repeatedly declared that he would have approved a larger amount in view of the facts of the case.

The bill was favorably reported by the Claims Committee by a unanimous vote and was placed on the calendar. That was a year ago, and there has not been a time since then that it could be considered on its merits. Always it was subject to unanimous consent, where the whim of a single Member could prevent consideration.

Now, it comes back to us on the deficiency appropriation bill, having been placed there by the Senate. If you say that it is bad practice to put such provisions on an appropriation bill, I will agree with you, but I will also say that it is still worse practice to prevent consideration of such meritorious claims as this in regular order.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I recall very distinctly that this bill had very long and careful consideration before the Committee on Claims when I was a member, and I think that it is a just and fair claim and ought to be paid.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman, and will say that never has there been a claim more thoroughly considered than this one. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which in all justice should be paid, and I ask the House to vote with me to concur in the Senate amendment. It will be a square deal to the men who proved the impossibility of impossibility and who won new laurels for America in the successful accomplishment of the mightiest feat of engineering ever undertaken by mortal men.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in carrying claims on a deficiency bill, and if it had not been for what the House has already done to-day, I would not appear on the floor now.

I have had longer service in connection with the work about the Panama Canal than any other Member of the House. I served on the committee that had the legislative jurisdiction over the Panama Canal, and I have visited the canal half a dozen times or more. I had a great many conversations about the operation of the locks, as well as other portions of the canal, with officials in charge during the process of construction. These lock gates, which, I believe, this firm constructed, constitute the finest piece of machinery to be found in the world on a large scale.

There were a great many problems connected with the construction of the canal, and there was a great deal of doubt as to the form of the gates, and whether they could construct gates of the size that had to be constructed which would operate successfully. I talked frequently with the engineer in charge of that work on the canal, and although I knew nothing about such things I went over the plans in reference to the gates a number of times with him. There were many changes made, necessarily; many things were required which they had not originally thought of; and we knew while this work was being constructed that the contractors were being requested to go ahead with this work on the statement that the authorities of the Panama Canal would recommend that they be paid extra, more than the contract price.

They went ahead. They did this work. There was nobody else in the country who was willing to attempt it. These men did the work, and they did it perfectly. You who go down to the canal during the vacation will find that these monstrous gates are so finely geared that you could not begin to stick the point of a needle between the bottom of the gate and the floor sill below it.

It was recommended by the canal authorities that we pay the claim. Congress did not want to act without knowledge, and we provided by law that the canal authorities should investigate the claim and report to Congress. I do not know how carefully they did it, of course, but I apprehend they did it carefully, as they did all the work on the canal, and when they made their report they asked Congress to appropriate this sum of money as in justice due to these people because they had done work at the solicitation of the officials of the canal which they were not required to do. The work is there. It is a monument to America; the finest piece of work in the world, done by the only people in the country who were willing to attempt it. The changes and other things were made at the request of our officials there. They scaled down the claim from two or three millions to three-quarters of a million. I believe we ought to pay it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] moves that the House recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a division. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BUTLER. Get a division first.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members; a quorum is present.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for the yeas and nays. As many as favor the taking of the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Three gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, and the motion is carried. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 52: Page 30, line 6, insert:

"So much as may be necessary of that part of the $46,000,000 appropriated in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 for medical and hospital services of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance allotted to the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is hereby made available for the erection of 19 sets of double quarters at not exceeding $10,000 each for the medical staff at the various branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said in the public press in criticism of Congress with regard to what we have done in providing hospitals for our disabled soldiers of the recent war that I think it might be well to state a few facts in regard to what Congress has done and what the situation is regarding hospitals.

I do not know why a young man about 26 years old, down in the Treasury Department, an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, does not send men who are wounded or sick to the hospitals and stop whining about there not being hospital facilities. Certain it is that he is asking for large appropriations to build new hospitals, when he absolutely refuses to send men who were disabled in this war to the best hospitals that money can build.

Out of an appropriation of $46,000,000 there was allotted to the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes almost $5,000,000 to reconstruct these hospitals. They took the Johnson City hospital in Tennessee, for example, from which the old soldiers of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War were taken and sent to other hospitals. That hospital was rebuilt at an expense of more than $1,000,000 as a tuberculosis sanitarium, and it was rebuilt under the plans and specifications provided by the National Tuberculosis Society of America. That society says it is the finest tuberculosis hospital in all the world. It has a total bed capacity of 1,000, and yet to this very hour they have sent to that hospital only 223 tubercular patients from the Bureau of War Risk, and because they have not sent more of them there they have allowed the Vocational Board to use part of that hospital, and that board have 303 trainers there at present.

Take the soldiers' home at Marion, Ind. That was remodeled at an expense of $1,000,000, and it is the most modern sanitarium for the treatment of nerve diseases. That hospital today is partly completed. More than 500 beds are ready for use; and if there are boys discharged from this war who need hospital treatment along those lines I am sorry that our Treasury Department has not sent them there, because to this day it has sent to that hospital only 71 patients, while the hospital has a bed capacity to-day of 500 patients, and will have a bed capacity by the 1st of July of 1,000 patients, and it is the most modern sanitarium in all the world for the treatment of nerve cases.

To-day we find that we have 24,560 war-risk patients in these hospitals. There are to-day in the hospitals under the control of the Government vacant beds aggregating 3,858. That is the

report right up to this day. Yet men will stand before committees or go before newspaper reporters and make the statement that Congress has not provided beds—statements that are absolutely unfounded in fact. We have appropriated so much money that the departments that have had the appropriations to spend to provide for additional hospitalization have not been able to spend the money. The criticism is absolutely unjust and unfounded so far as Congress is concerned, and lies at the door of the executive department that does not send these men to these hospitals if there are men who need hospital treatment. I hope that the statement will go forth that we have provided the hospitals, that we have them now, that hospital beds are vacant numbering about 4,000, so that the young men of the country who have been discharged and are suffering from some disease entitling them to treatment may have that treatment to which they are justly entitled, and they should have the best.

The amendment passed by the Senate placed a limitation on the amount that could be expended for building some double quarters for the medical staff at some of these soldiers' homes, where we have provided for hospitals aggregating about 5,000 beds for the soldiers of this war. The Senate amendment limited the amount to $10,000 for a double quarters or $5,000 for each single quarters. The board of managers say they can not build quarters at that price. We are asking to recede and concur with an amendment striking out the number—19—and striking out the limitation, so that the medical quarters may be provided for in such numbers as may be necessary to provide proper quarters for the medical staff to take care of the men.

I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 52 and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"So much as may be necessary of that part of the sum of $46,000,000 appropriated in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 for medical and hospital services of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance allotted to the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers is made available for the erection of quarters for the medical staff at the various branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers."

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; the gentleman has heard propositions of that kind before. We made the appropriation so that the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Home received an allotment of $4,000,000 without limitation to improve the hospitals, and I think they have expended it wisely and economically.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. We gave to one department $46,000,000 last year, and they allotted $5,000,000 to the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes, and even with that nobody dreamed at that time of allotting them $5,000,000 to build officers' quarters.

Mr. GOOD. I will say that the estimate of Gen. Wood was that these quarters were to be built of hollow tile and could not be built at the present price, quarters of seven rooms, for less than $18,000 for double quarters or $9,000 for a house.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have no dispute about that. I have no knowledge of what it costs, and have no objection to that. The gentleman from Iowa must know from observation that while it may not always be abused, usually an authority of this sort is abused. I do not know that the Board of Managers of the Soldiers' Homes would abuse it, but if you grant authority of this sort everyone connected with every one of these homes will see the chance to get a new building to live in.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is only to build medical quarters. The fund is only available to build additional facilities for officers, and is not to be expended at homes where they are not making provisions for soldiers of the late war.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is for the National Homes for Volunteer Soldiers. It makes no difference what the fund is for, this authorizes the construction of medical quarters without limit, and I hope the gentlemen will change it in conference.

Mr. GOOD. Gen. Wood says that it is going to cost $9,000 per single quarter, but if you put that limit in he could not get it done for less, and they are going to let the construction of these quarters by competitive bids, by advertising, and I think that if they are going to do that the gentleman will agree that we ought not to hold up these thousands of beds in the hospitals and not send men there because we did not have quarters for the doctors to live there.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman knows that the Army in erection of officers' quarters got in the habit, when there was no limitation, to build palaces for officers of the Army. We had to resort in the end to a limitation on the cost of the quarters for officers. All men are alike when they have the power to do the same thing.

Mr. GOOD. They have not done it at the soldiers' homes, and they will not do it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They have not had the opportunity to do it; they have not had the money; they have not had the authority; but now you propose to give them money unlimited, authority unlimited, and unlimited quarters for medical officers. If I were one of the medical officers, I would want a fine house to live in at the Government expense.

Mr. GOOD. They will not get it from the board of managers.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 82 ayes and 15 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read Senate amendment 53, as follows:

Provided, That the sum of $1,700,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation "Provisions, Navy" to the appropriation "Maintenance, supplies and accounts," for the fiscal year 1921, and the limitation specified for pay of classified employees under the latter appropriation is correspondingly increased.

That deficiencies under appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year 1920 and prior years shall be charged to a naval supply account fund, which is hereby established and to which shall be transferred the unexpended balances of annual appropriations for the Naval Establishment for the fiscal years 1919 and 1920, after two years from the expiration of the fiscal year for which made, and, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the value of all stores in the naval supply account on March 31, 1921, preliminary adjustments on account of stores to be made upon the certificate of the Secretary of the Navy that stores to the value certified are on hand; and from and after said date the naval supply account fund shall be charged with the cost of all stores procured for and credited with the value of all issues or sales made from the naval supply account, necessary adjustments being made on account of outstanding contracts or orders.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in amendment 53 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 53 and agree to the same with the following amendment: In lieu of lines 1 to 7, inclusive, of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That the limitation specified in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 on expenditures for pay of chemists and for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year 1921, under 'Maintenance, supplies and accounts,' is increased by $750,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the House bill carried a provision increasing the limit for clerical services by $750,000. That item went out on the point of order. The limit fixed by law for this year was $3,500,000. The Senate provision not only increased the limit that can be used for clerical purposes by $1,750,000 but it appropriates $1,750,000. The amendment I have sent to the Clerk's desk cuts out the appropriation for clerk hire and reduces the limit from $1,750,000 to $750,000.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What does the gentleman's motion do with the rest of the Senate amendment?

Mr. GOOD. We do not touch that. The rest of the Senate amendment takes care of two things. It takes care of the book deficit in the general account of advances in the Navy Department, and it takes care also in part of the Navy supply account. The rest of the Senate amendment has to do only with the general account of advances for the years 1919 and 1920. In the Navy Department it is different from all other departments, except now in the War Department. When we make an appropriation for a great many different objects in the Navy bill, there is set up in the Treasury Department a single account, and that is the general account of advances. This is not the case in other appropriations. All checks drawn on any naval appropriation go to the Treasury Department, to the general account of advances.

What happened in 1919 and 1920 was this: While the appropriation bills carried enough money, those intrusted with the expenditure of the money did not expend it as provided by Congress. In some items they expended more than Congress appropriated, but it was paid out of the general account of advances in the Treasury Department. In other appropriations in the Navy Department there was a surplus, and this amendment simply permits them to use such surplus to wipe out the deficiency. It is a bookkeeping transaction, and that only. It carries no money out of the Treasury Department, but permits them to adjust their accounts.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Navy Department has a very large amount of materials on hand.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think I saw as much as two blocks of porcelain bathtubs, refrigerators, and things of that sort. Naturally those items are to the credit of the Navy Department?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In what way do they charge themselves up to the fiscal year 1921 or 1922, for instance, for materials of that kind used in construction?

Mr. GOOD. That is carried in the Navy supply account. This amendment deals with that in conjunction with amendment No. 56, and those two amendments treated together were intended to bring about this condition of affairs. A great many of those supplies for the Navy were purchased at a high price. When it comes to issuing them they issue them to various bureaus under reduced appropriations at the old price at which they were purchased. The position of the Navy Department, as provided for by this amendment and amendment No. 56, if adopted, will permit that department to issue the stores and supplies not at what they are carried for on the books but at the current price at which they could purchase them. It means, of course, a loss, and it provides for charging off that excess of cost.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. As a matter of bookkeeping?

Mr. GOOD. As a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The first provision of this second paragraph provides for taking care of the deficiencies amounting to $114,000,000, does it not?

Mr. GOOD. In a way it does take care of deficiencies for $114,000,000, but it takes care of them only out of the surplus.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. In the total appropriation for the Navy Department there was enough appropriated for all purposes, and the gentleman, I think, is well aware of the actual situation, that if the department had spent the money just as it was appropriated there would be no booking deficiency at all.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. But the Secretary, after he got the money, found that by spending more for one bureau or service than he had appropriation for could pay for it out of the general account of advances and still not exceed his appropriation. So, in the sense that the appropriation bill for the Navy Department for the years 1919 and 1920 fell short, the gentleman can see there is no actual deficiency.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. There really is no deficiency.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It just means that on July 1 the $114,000,000 will be covered into the Treasury unless we enact this legislation. Is not that true?

Mr. GOOD. No; they would simply have overdrawn some accounts, that is all; but they would have had the money.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Two years after the appropriation was made.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; for those two years they had a surplus of $127,000,000, and they had only $114,000,000 of booking deficit. So if we subtract the deficit from the surplus they still would have a surplus, as the gentleman can see, of $13,000,000.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. On July 1, $127,000,000 was covered into the Treasury.

Mr. GOOD. Well, it can not be covered into the Treasury, because it has already been paid out. Everybody has had his money. It would leave the Secretary of the Navy in a rather embarrassing position.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. With $127,000,000——

Mr. GOOD. This could better be called, instead of a deficit, an item to relieve the Secretary of the Navy from embarrassment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. But if you do not enact this legislation you would be embarrassed to the extent of appropriating $114,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. No; the Secretary of the Navy would be embarrassed.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman tell the House, because from reading the section nobody would know, in reference to the language beginning on line 18, "and, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to the value of all stores in the naval supply account on March 31, 1921." How much money does that make available?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, I do not know.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is it not a fact that it makes $280,000,000 available?

Mr. GOOD. The value of the stores at the price at which they were purchased is about $280,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not mean the expenditure of any money out of the Treasury, but it is simply bookkeeping altogether.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PADGETT. It is adjusting the account of the advances and naval supplies account on account of the purchase of more material in one line and less in another. It does not take any money out of the Treasury.

Mr. GOOD. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur in the amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 6, insert: "For the sum of $5,000,000 of the appropriation 'Maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps,' for the fiscal year 1919 is hereby reappropriated and made available for."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Does the word "for" precede the amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Now, the House provision carried $5,000,000 direct appropriation. The Senate amendment is simply a reappropriation of balances that are found in this appropriation unexpended, and therefore will cut down the balance I referred to a minute ago of $127,000,000 by $5,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The Senate amendment strikes out the word "for"?

Mr. GOOD. I understand the word "for" does not exist in the original appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 12, strike out "$5,000,000."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 17, insert:

"The prices at which material is to be expended from the naval supply account shall be fixed by the Paymaster General of the Navy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, and materials purchased during the war shall be issued at reduced prices in all cases appropriate, such differences in values and losses to be charged to the respective funds; and hereafter no charges on this account shall be made to naval appropriations."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this item goes to the last paragraph of amendment 53. It is the same language that was reported by the Naval Affairs Committee in a revised form. The amendments were prepared in the Navy Department and have been submitted to and are, I understand, in exact accord with the desire of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 18, insert: "To pay the Pawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma in full and final settlement for the purchase by the United States of 169,368.02 acres of surplus land belonging to said Pawnee Tribe, under the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893 (27 Stat., pp. 612–644), the sum of $312,811.27, with interest thereon from September 3, 1920, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, as provided in said act of Congress of March 3, 1893, and in pursuance of the findings of the Court of Claims of December 6, 1920, as set forth in Senate Document No. 311, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, $312,811.27."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to insist on the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 62.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker——

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a preferential motion to recede and concur in this amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman is going to do that he should also include in his amendment to strike out the figures in line 4, page 42, "$312,811.27," for the same amount appears in line 24, on page 41.

Mr. HOWARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the preferential motion to recede and concur.

Mr. GOOD. Let it be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOWARD moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment 62 with an amendment as follows: In the last line of the amendment, after the words "third session," strike out the figures "$312,811.27."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get the ear of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman. He was on his feet.

Mr. GOOD. The situation is as follows in regard to this item: The committee could not agree to it. It is the amount, I assume, that Congress is going to appropriate. The whole matter has by Congress been referred to the Court of Claims, and that court has made its findings. It was not empowered to render a judgment; and on December 6, 1920, the findings of the court were made, and I quote the last paragraph from the findings of the court:

Neither this principal sum of $132,916.71 nor any interest thereon has been paid. A claim is thus presented under the terms of said agreement the payment of which rests in the judgment of Congress. The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims does not extend to claims growing out of treaties with Indians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, more than half of this claim is for interest. I do not know anything about the claim. I feel about this claim just as I felt about these other claims the House has agreed to—that they all ought to go in the regular course to the Committee on Claims. That is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

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

Mr. HOWARD. Just for a brief history of this claim. In 1893 the United States Government bought from the Pawnee Indians their surplus lands in the Pawnee Reservation in Oklahoma. The Government sold these surplus lands to homesteaders for $2.50 an acre, having agreed to pay the Pawnees $1.25 per acre for them. The Government at that time paid the Pawnees $80,000. The balance has never been paid. The Government agreed to pay $1.25 per acre for the land and sold it for $2.50. Up to now only a part payment has been made to the Pawnees. The homesteaders have lived on it for 27 years. Homes have been built on this surplus land. The white homesteaders have become wealthy in farming it and producing oil therefrom, and yet the Indian has never been paid his full total according to that agreement, and this fact has been established in the Court of Claims.

Now, the situation with the Indians is this, gentlemen: Some of them need at this time to educate their children. Others need this money to build up the farms that they are trying to make. Some of them are living in comparative poverty. There are included in those who will benefit by this, gentlemen of the House, 11 old scouts who fought for this country as scouts in the northwestern Indian wars back in the sixties and seventies. This money is due them, and the financial depression in this country at this time makes it more necessary that we pay them. The Court of Claims has decided, after a thorough search, that the Indians are entitled to this money. Interest is accumulating against the United States Government, and more than half of the claim as now presented is in interest that has accumulated. I hope the House will see fit to pay this money to these Indians at this time, when they need it, the claim being a just one.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield two minutes to me?

Mr. GOOD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to say that there is no more just claim than this one. When it was submitted to Congress a few years ago it was referred to the Court of Claims, and at that time, as this record shows, the Assistant Attorney General appeared for the Government on one side and the attorneys for the Indians appeared upon the other side, and a judgment was rendered for the amount that is put in this amendment. The reason why interest is allowed upon it is because when they agreed to pay the Indians the $1.25 an acre for this land and paid them $80,000 upon account the Government agreed to place the rest of the money in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians, to bear 5 per cent interest. And that is the reason the court allowed the interest on it. There is no more just claim in this bill than this one. As I have already stated, it has been referred to the court and the court has made the finding that this amount is due, after both sides were represented, the Government by the Assistant Attorney General and the Indians by their attorneys. This is a tardy act of justice to an Indian tribe and the amendment should be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold until the Chair can lay before the House a report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8038. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act, extending its provisions to Porto Rico;

H. R. 11945. An act for the relief of W. C. Stewart; and

H. R. 12005. An act for the relief of Henry P. Corbin.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 4682. An act to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended;

S. 4897. An act to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended;

S. 3225. An act for the relief of bona fide settlers who intermarry after having complied with the homestead law for one year;

S. 4683. An act to amend section 11 (m) of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts approved September 7, 1916, and March 3, 1919; and

S. 4436. An act to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. CLARK of Missouri, for to-day, on account of illness;

To Mr. WEBSTER (at the request of Mr. HADLEY), for the day, on account of illness;

To Mr. MCKINIBY, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family; and

To Mr. REAVIS, for one day, on account of illness.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79: Page 59, line 11, insert the word "Senate."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 80: Page 59, line 12, insert "To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the appropriation for 1921 for compensation of officers, clerks, messengers, and others, to Mark L. Black for services rendered as clerk to Hon. J. THOMAS HEFLIN, Senator from the State of Alabama, from November 3, 1920, to December 5, 1920, at the rate of $2,500 per annum and additional compensation at the rate of $240 per annum."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is simply to make provision for the clerk to Senator HEFLIN from the time he was elected to the Senate to the time he was sworn in. I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves to recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 81: Page 59, line 19, insert: "For additional expenses of reporting and transcribing the debates and proceedings of the Senate and to equalize more nearly the amounts paid by the Senate and House of Representatives for reporting their respective proceedings from July 1, 1921, to June 30, 1922, payable in equal monthly installments, $4,844."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is to take care of the contract of the Senate reporters, Messrs. Murphy and Shuey. I believe there is a contract with them for about $25,000. It is a Senate item. I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to recede and concur. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 82: Page 60, line 1, insert: "To pay to Robert W. Farrar for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the sessions of the Sixty-sixth Congress $1,200."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 83: Page 60, line 4, insert: "To pay to Charles A. Webb for extra services rendered as clerk of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, $200."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby amendment No. 37 was disagreed to, and direct the conferees to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. How did the gentleman vote?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was there a roll call on that?

Mr. MACGREGOR. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to make the motion.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. MACGREGOR moves to reconsider the vote by which the House further insisted on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 37, and moves to recede and concur.

Mr. WALSH. You can not have two motions together.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The motion to reconsider is all that the gentleman can make.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The Chair's attention was diverted for a moment. What is the gentleman's motion?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I move to reconsider the vote to disagree.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which the House disagreed to amendment No. 37. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

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

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the door. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the point of no quorum was made pending the vote on the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The Speaker stated it to the House.

The SPEAKER. But no vote had been taken.

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

Anthony	Doughton	Kahn	Nolan
Bacharach	Drewry	Kennedy, Iowa	O'Connor
Baer	Dunn	Kennedy, R. I.	Olney
Bankhead	Eagle	Kiess	Patterson
Barkley	Echols	Kincheloe	Pell
Bee	Ellsworth	Kitchin	Perlman
Benson	Elston	Kleczka	Peters
Bland, Mo.	Esch	Langley	Porter
Boies	Evans, Nev.	Layton	Pou
Britten	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, Ala.
Brumbaugh	Fish	Lesher	Rainey, Henry T.
Burdick	Flood	Lonergan	Rainey, John W.
Butler	Frear	Luhring	Ramsey
Byrns, Tenn.	Freeman	McAndrews	Reavis
Caldwell	Fuller	McCulloch	Reber
Campbell, Pa.	Gallagher	McDuffie	Rhodes
Candler	Gard	McGlennon	Riordan
Cantrill	Garner	McKenzie	Rodenberg
Casey	Godwin, N. C.	McKeown	Rowan
Clark, Fla.	Goldfogle	McKiniry	Rubey
Clark, Mo.	Goodall	McKinley	Sanders, La.
Classon	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Scully
Coady	Graham, Pa.	Major	Sears
Cooper	Hamill	Mann, S. C.	Sells
Copley	Hamilton	Martin	Sherwood
Costello	Hardy, Tex.	Mays	Sims
Crisp	Harreld	Mead	Sinnott
Crowther	Hayden	Monahan, Wis.	Slemp
Davey	Hill	Montague	Small
Davis, Minn.	Hulings	Moon	Smith, Ill.
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Mooney	Smith, N. Y.
Dent	Igoe	Morin	Stedman
Dewalt	James, Mich.	Mott	Steele
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, Ky.	Mudd	Stephens, Miss.
Donovan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Neely	Stiness
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Nicholls	Sullivan
Swope	Voigt	Welty	Wood, Ind.
Thomas	Watkins	Whaley	Yates
Towner	Watson	Wheeler	
Vare	Webster	Wilson, Ill.	
Vinson	Welling	Wise	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and sixty-seven 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 question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR] to reconsider the vote by which the House disagreed to amendment numbered 37.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur n the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 15441) and asks unanimous consent that the statement of the House conferees be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the conference report, 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. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department 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 4, 5, 6, 8, 16, and 17.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 11, 15, and 21, and agree to the same.

The committtee of conference have not agreed upon the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, and 20.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
CHAS. F. OGDEN,
E. E. HOLLAND,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHAS. E. TOWNSEND,
GEO. H. MOSES,
LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
J. C. W. BECKHAM,
CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15441) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying report as to each of the said amendments, namely:

On No. 1: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for salaries of post-office inspectors, the words "as authorized in the act approved June 5, 1920."

On No. 2: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for compensation of clerks at division headquarters, the words "as authorized in the act approved June 5, 1920."

On No. 4: Strikes out the proviso, inserted by the Senate, authorizing in post offices where the receipts are $9,000,000 and less than $20,000,000, a superintendent of delivery at the same salary provided for superintendents of mail in offices of this grade.

On Nos. 5 and 6: Restores the word "temporary," stricken out by the Senate, in the appropriation for temporary and auxiliary clerk hire and substitute clerk hire at first and second class post offices and at summer and winter resort post offices.

On No. 8: Restores the word "temporary," stricken out by the Senate, in the appropriation for pay of substitutes for letter carriers and auxiliary and temporary letter carriers.

On No. 11: Increases from $4,100 to $7,000, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for street car collection service.

On No. 15: Increases from $3,000,000 to $3,089,931, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation for travel allowances to railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks.

On No. 16: Strikes out the increase of $1 per day, proposed by the Senate, in the per diem in lieu of subsistence allowance of mechanicians engaged in the repair of labor-saving devices and mail-handling apparatus.

On No. 17: Strikes out the proviso, inserted by the Senate, making basic pay the two bonuses granted to the employees in the mail equipment shops.

On No. 21: Changes a section number in the bill.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 3: Authorizing the Postmaster General to designate temporarily some person to act as postmaster when a post office becomes vacant through death, resignation, or removal of the postmaster.

On No. 7: Providing that marine letter carriers on the Detroit River postal service shall be paid $300 per year in excess of the highest grade for carriers in the City Delivery Service.

On No. 9: Providing that postal employees who served in the military or naval forces during the World War shall receive credit for the time engaged in such service if they have not reached the maximum grade of salary.

On Nos. 10 and 18: Appropriating $1,500,000 for village delivery service.

On No. 12: Authorizing the Postmaster General to deliver special-delivery matter without obtaining a receipt.

On No. 13: Authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for airplane mail service and to pay for the same out of the appropriation for transportation by railroad routes.

On No. 14: Appropriating $1,500,000 for the airplane mail service between New York and San Francisco.

On No. 19: Authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tractors to the various States for highway-construction purposes.

On No. 20: Extending until June 30, 1922, the joint commission to investigate the Postal Service.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
CHAS. F. OGDEN,
E. E. HOLLAND,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there are some amendments in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 3: Page 3, line 13, after the figures "$42,300,000," insert:

"*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."

Mr. MADDEN. I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 7: Page 5, after the figures "$70,000" insert:

"*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."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur. I wish to say in this connection that when the transportation act was passed adjusting the compensation of postal employees the Post Office and Post Roads Committee omitted inadvertently the marine letter carriers, who had always theretofore been paid $300 a year more than the other carriers. This is to rectify the mistake that was made.

Mr. STEENERSON. If the gentleman will permit me, as a matter of fact, was it not the commission that made the mistake instead of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; this is simply to rectify the error.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 1 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 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 service 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 service on the basis of one day's credit of eight 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. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is to provide in effect for substitutes in the Postal Service who were drafted or volunteered for the service in the World War that they shall be given credit for eight hours for each day on their military service, so that when they return from the military service if they reenter the Postal Service they will take the place they would have taken had they continued in the Postal Service.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Is not the situation just this? Here are two men who were in the Postal Service when they entered the Army; one lives in New York and the other in Chicago. They served two years; they come back and the Chicago clerk receives a permanent appointment and gets credit for the two years' advancement, which would mean $200. The New York clerk continues as a substitute and does not get permanent appointment, and he does not get anything under a proposition of this kind.

Mr. MADDEN. The substitute would continue to be a substitute until appointed to a regular position, and would then take his place in the grade to which his war service entitled him.

Mr. BLACK. He would get nothing until he received an appointment.

Mr. MADDEN. If he went into the military service, under the provisions of this bill, he would get what I have stated. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will have the amendment reported first.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 9: Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 9 and agree to the same with the following amendment: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment, commencing with the word "provided," in line 12, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That postal employees and substitute postal employees who served in the military, marine, or naval service of the United States during the World War and have not reached the maximum grade of salary shall receive credit for all time served in the military, marine, or naval service on the basis of one day's credit of eight hours in the Postal Service for each day served in the military, marine, or naval service, and be promoted to the grade to which such postal employee or substitute postal employee 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."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota demands a division on the motion to recede and concur. The question is first on receding.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STEENERSON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out all of Senate amendment No. 9, and in lieu of the matter so stricken out insert 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 1 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 1 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, effective as of July 1, 1921: *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 1 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, effective as of June 5, 1920.'"

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order and want to make a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offered an amendment to the Senate amendment, which is now pending before the House. Does not that have to be disposed of?

Mr. STEENERSON. I offer this as a substitute.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But this is not a substitute for this amendment. We have already receded. The gentleman proposes to strike out all of the amendment and insert other language. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has proposed to strike out part of the Senate amendment and insert other language in the way of perfecting the Senate amendment. What I want to get at is, if the motion is in order, how this amendment will be voted upon?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois would take preference, being a perfecting amendment, whereas the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is a substitute.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is not a substitute to that amendment.

The SPEAKER. It is a substitute for the whole Senate amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is a substitute for the entire Senate amendment, but is not a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STEENERSON. I have another draft here to offer as an amendment to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER. Does it make any difference to the gentleman from Minnesota which comes first?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think so. I would like to explain the effect of it. It does not change his motion, so far as that goes.

The SPEAKER. The only difference the Chair sees that it makes is as to which amendment shall be voted on first.

Mr. STEENERSON. The amendment I propose to offer is the amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois by inserting additional language.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota will correct the Chair if he is wrong in his statement of the situation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offered an amendment to the Senate amendment which perfected that amendment. The Chair understands the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota to strike out the whole of the Senate amendment and to offer an entire substitute.

Mr. STEENERSON. That was my substitute which I offered, but I now offer an amendment that adds simply to the Senate language—additional language.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman means to withdraw his first amendment and wishes to offer another?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. Is this an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; an amendment to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "provided," on page 6, line 14, insert as follows—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The reference should be to the Senate amendment and not to this point.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is line 12, according to the way the Clerk read it.

The SPEAKER. Line 12 of the House print?

Mr. STEENERSON. Line 12 of the Senate amendment, after the word "provided."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is referring to the engrossed copy?

Mr. STEENERSON. I have not been favored with a copy of the engrossed copy.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "provided" on page 6, line 14, insert the following: "That clerks and carriers in intermediate or automatic grades who were appointed to regular positions before June 5, 1920, and are receiving less than the maximum rate of salary, shall receive credit for all time served as substitutes on a basis of one year for each 306 days of eight hours served as a 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 one: *Provided further*."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is an amendment in the third degree and is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is in the third degree.

Mr. BLACK. We are considering a Senate amendment. The gentleman from Illinois moves to concur with an amendment and then the gentleman from Minnesota moves to amend that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Senate amendment is not considered as an amendment here.

Mr. BLACK. In that case I presume the amendment would be in order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, would I not be entitled in my own right to the floor?

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair thinks the gentleman from Illinois is entitled to the time.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment gives the substitute clerks and carriers credit for the time they served in the war and makes that retroactive to June 5, 1920, so that if a substitute has been appointed clerk or carrier he will, if this passes, if he served two years in the war, be given two years' promotion—that is, $200, or $100 a year. The substitutes that did not go into the war who were appointed clerks before the passage of the classification act of June 5, 1920, get no credit for the substitute service. They may have served five years as substitutes, but having been appointed before the act was passed, as construed by the Comptroller of the Treasury, they get no credit, but those who were appointed since the act was passed, who were substitutes before that appointment, are given credit, so we have in many of the large cities like Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, and Washington substitute carriers appointed since June 5 who have been given credit for two or three years' substitute service, whereas alongside of them are men working who served five or six years as substitutes but do not get the credit. They are appointed simply to grade 1, so the junior employee gets more than the senior employee.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do.

Mr. WALSH. Not that it is of very much importance, but I think as a matter of interest I would like to know what the expense of this proposition would be?

Mr. STEENERSON. If this is made effective as of July 1, 1921, which I had intended to put in, it would cost about $700,000.

Mr. WALSH. We will not have much money left in the Treasury after the performance of this afternoon.

Mr. STEENERSON. If it is retroactive, like the soldiers' provisions, it will cost a million and a half at least, and with the provision that the Senate has put on, according to the department's figures to me, it will cost $2,000,000 additional the first year, and perhaps a little more the next year. For that reason I think we are laboring under a difficulty if we do not include these clerks and carriers now. There will be an unjust discrimination. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had this matter under consideration, but they have not determined what to do. We have the bill under consideration and intend to report, as I understand, to give them all credit for substitute service. It should not be retroactive but simply operative for the next fiscal year. That is the intention, as I understand, of a majority of the committee. But here comes the Senate under this new rule to legislate this in favor of the military service, and they leave this off for clerks and carriers, who will labor under this discrimination I have described. My amendment leaves the provision of the Senate as to soldiers unchanged.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Will this correct the situation in regard to letter carriers who have served as substitutes for five, six, or seven years and under the reorganization part of the Post Office have been discriminated against in such a way that those who have come in the service some three or four years after they have are now drawing more salary?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is exactly what this was intended to remedy and will remedy.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. Then I think we ought to remedy it.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think if we give credit to these substitutes that have military service we certainly ought to give it to these substitutes who actually served.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman give me a few more minutes?

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

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. I would like to say to the gentleman that I know in Cincinnati we have a great many carriers who have served for six or seven years as substitutes and they came in as regular carriers, and other substitutes later under the reorganization bill have passed by them, drawing $300 or $400 more.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is not the worst of it.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. This does not affect that case at all; it only affects military cases.

Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio. As I understand, the amendment takes in those carriers.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; my amendment does. The worst discrimination is, here is a substitute who might be on the substitute list at New York or Boston, where there are probably five or six hundred on the list, and would never be called, yet if he went to the war this gives him constructive time. Unless we give the substitutes who actually performed service also credit they can justly claim they have been unfairly discriminated against. My amendment equalizes the matter and deals fairly with all of them, and if we do not do it now, why, we will have to do it at some other time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, if the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is adopted, this will be the effect of it: It will advance every substitute in the Postal Service, regardless of whether he served in the war or not. And my proposition is to provide credit for the period men who were substitutes in the Postal Service served in the war. That is all.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is not this the exact provision that was in the bill that is known as the Madden bill that was before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads?

Mr. MADDEN. It is not pending now. And I want to say to the Members of the House that the men who served as substitutes during the war and did not get to the war are not entitled to any consideration in this bill. This is a proposition to do something for the men who offered their lives for their country. If they had served in the Postal Service during the period of the war instead of in the Army, it is altogether likely they would have been advanced. Now, all I am asking is to advance them to the place they would have advanced to if they had not gone into the war.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not true that a substitute who, we will say, did not go to the war but remained at home, if he was reached by appointment, was appointed? Is it not true that a man who went into the war was correspondingly advanced on the substitute list by reason of the law we passed during the war that provided that he should not lose any grade or advancement on account of his services?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what happened to the substitutes after they came back from the war. It may be that some of them did not come back into the service. If they did not, this will not apply; if they did, they ought to be carried for the period of the war service. That is all we are seeking. If you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota you advance every man who has been a substitute over a period, whether it be one, two, three, four, or five years, regardless of whether he had military service or not, and nobody is seeking to do that. And I say it does not cost any such sum to do the thing we propose as it would cost to do the thing the gentleman from Minnesota proposes, and it does not cost any such sum to do the thing we propose as the gentleman from Minnesota says it does. Nobody knows how many men will be affected by this. It can not be more than three or four thousand at the outside. If it should happen by any chance that it should be three or four thousand, and they should be advanced to the first grade instead of being substitutes, they would probably get $100 apiece on account of the advancement.

Mr. STEENERSON. I have the testimony of the First Assistant Postmaster General——

Mr. MADDEN. He wrote to me and said over his own signature that he could not tell how many men will be affected, but whatever number may be affected, whether great or small, if it is right it is the thing to do. Is it right? I ask you gentlemen whether it is right or wrong to provide credits for the period a man served in the war and offered his life to his country, while the other men were sitting idly by living in luxury? Are we going to provide for those men or provide for the men that did not serve?

Mr. STEENERSON. This amendment includes soldiers as well as others.

Mr. MADDEN. I know.

Mr. STEENERSON. What are you talking about, then?

Mr. MADDEN. The others ought not to be included.

Mr. PURNELL. Just for information, I would like to know how, for the purpose of carrying this out, you will determine what is military and naval service?

Mr. MADDEN. The record of the man in the service. His honorable discharge will determine that.

Mr. PURNELL. I have a particular case in mind that causes me to ask the question. Suppose a man were in the Y. M. C. A. service?

Mr. MADDEN. That is not military service.

Mr. PURNELL. But handling the mail for the military service?

Mr. MADDEN. He was in the mail service, then. He was not in the Army. He was simply doing Postal Service work on the front, or wherever he might have been sent. Many postal men were sent to France who were not in the Army.

Mr. PURNELL. You would not regard him as in the military service?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote.

Mr. BLACK. I want five minutes in which to oppose both amendments.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Both of these amendments ought to be discussed, and unless you have 10 minutes you can not make much headway. You can not discuss these two amendments adequately in five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I will yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I think both of these amendments should fail of adoption, and both of them illustrate the disadvantages of the rule we adopted at the last session of Congress. What are we doing? For the last two or three days these committees have been bringing in here item after item of legislation which has been put on these appropriation bills in the Senate, and we have less opportunity to consider them now and discuss them than we would have had if they had been riders on the appropriation bills when they were first considered by the House. How many Members in the House now understand the effect of these two amendments? They will, if adopted, cost several hundred thousand dollars, at least, and very probably much more than that.

Mr. STEENERSON. Two millions.

Mr. BLACK. Now, in order that we may understand the effect of these amendments, let us take into consideration these facts: We have in the Postal Service, as to letter carriers and postal clerks, a classified service and a substitute list. In the classified service there are five grades—grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. A man is not in the Postal Service as a permanent employee until he is given a permanent appointment to one of these grades. He is appointed first to grade 1. He serves in that grade a year, and then automatically he goes to grade 2 and serves in that grade for one year and then automatically goes to grade 3, and the next year into grade 4, and the next year into grade 5. But when he is a substitute he works only when he may be needed in the service. That may be six days in a year. It may be 52 days. It may be 100 days. It might be that he would work 306 days. Of course, in such instances as the last one cited he would probably get a permanent appointment.

Now, what is the situation? In July, 1920, we reclassified the postal employees and raised their salaries to what I think was a generous and liberal figure, considering present conditions, making the salary of grade 1, $1,400; that of grade 2, $1,500; grade 3, $1,600; grade 4, $1,700; and grade 5, $1,800, and providing for automatic promotions until the top grade was reached. We also provided in that bill that hereafter substitute clerks in first and second class post offices and substitute carriers in City Delivery Service, when appointed as regular clerks and carriers, shall have credit for actual time served in the substitute service.

The intention of the committee—and I believe that every member of the committee will say that such was the intention of the committee—was that when a substitute was appointed

after the passage of the law, he should be given credit for the substitute service he had put in after the date of the enactment of the law, but not before. But the comptroller, in construing that provision of the law, held that "hereafter" meant that the Post Office Department should go back and take up the substitute's whole record and figure out how much time he had served as a substitute since he originally entered the service and give him credit for it.

Now, the result of this ruling was that when an appointment was made from the substitute list after July 1, 1920, the Postmaster General was required to take up his record, and if it was found that he had served as much as one year of 306 days a year the substitute so appointed went into grade 2 instead of going into grade 1, and if he had served two years as a substitute went into grade 3. Now, the complaint is—and here we are getting down to the point—that clerks who were appointed before July 1, 1920, did not get this retroactive credit for substitute service, and therefore a man may have been appointed on or before July 1, 1920, and still be in grade 1, nothwithstanding he may have seen considerable substitute service. But the answer to this whole proposition is: It was not the intention of the committee to make the original provision in the reclassification law retroactive in its effect, and because that has been done should we go and do the illogical thing and broaden it out still further, merely because it was given an interpretation not intended to be done in the one case? I do not think we ought to do it. If we adopted a consistent course, we ought to amend the law and make it conform to the original intent of Congress, which was that substitute service which was eligible for credit was that which was to be performed after the passage of the law. That was the intent of Congress. Why not perform it? Is the taxpayer ever going to receive any consideration in making up these appropriation bills?

Now, then, as to Mr. MADDEN's amendment, what is the effect? We all remember that some time during the war we put a provision on one of the appropriation bills to the effect that any postal employee who served in the military service should receive credit for such time and be advanced automatically just as if he had remained at home doing his regular work in the Postal Service. That provision of law was as follows:

Employees, including substitute employees, of the Postal Service who have entered the military or naval service of the United States or who shall hereafter enter it during the existence of the present war, shall, when honorably discharged from such service, be reassigned to their duties in the Postal Service at the salary to which they would have been automatically promoted had they remained in the Postal Service, provided they are physically and mentally qualified to perform the duties of such positions.

What was the effect of that? The effect of that was that if a young man was a substitute when he went into the Army and was reached for regular appointment he was appointed, and if he remained in the service he would not lose his automatic promotion, and when he got back home he was appointed into grade 2 or 3, as the case might be.

Anything wrong about that? No; it was just what Congress intended. They were not permanent employees until regularly reached for appointment. Until appointed they were advanced on the substitute list under the regular rules. If a man was No. 100, for instance, at the Boston, Mass., office, he went right on up notwithstanding he was in the military service, and maybe he was up to No. 1 on the substitute list when he went out of the Army, or, indeed, he may have already received a permanent appointment.

Mr. STEENERSON. But, then, he would have been appointed clerk or carrier and would have been given leave of absence because of military service.

Mr. BLACK. I am glad the gentleman stated that leave of absence was given in such cases. If a substitute was reached for appointment he was not discriminated against because of being in the military service. But what will the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] do? It will go very far beyond what Congress intended to do in the original provision. It will say to the man who was a substitute in the Postal Service, "We will say by law that every day that you serve in the military service shall for the purpose of promotion count as one day as a permanent employee in the Postal Service."

Now, what does that amount to? It will amount to this: If a man served two years in the military service and gets a permanent appointment, then, instead of going into grade 1 at $1,400 he will go into grade 3 at $1,600. Now, that is a bonus, and you can not call it anything else, a bonus of $200 to a man because he happened to be a substitute in the Postal Service. I have already shown that under existing law his advancement on the regular substitute list and subsequent appointment, if his name was reached, was not in the least interfered with by his military service. If we are going to pay a bonus to the soldiers, that is a question of general policy, and if adopted should apply to all ex-service men alike. If we are going to give a bonus for military service—and that will certainly be the effect of the Madden amendment—then the farmer boys in my district, the boys who work on the railroads, the boys who work in the stores, the boys who work in the banks are entitled to the $200 bonus as much as the substitutes in the Postal Service. Now, who can tell how much actual service a substitute would have rendered if he had not gone to the Army? It must be remembered that he was not an employee serving 306 days in the year. He was only serving as a substitute when called upon. He might have served 2 days. He might have served 50 days. He might not have served any, and I submit that we ought not to adopt either one of these amendments, because I do not believe the House would adopt them if we had time to consider them fully and measure their full effect. I may say that the Post Office Committee has not recommended either one of these propositions. They are legislative provisions and should not be adopted in this hurried and ill-considered manner on this appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield a minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] to present a conference report.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. GOOD presented the conference report on the bill (H. R. 15422) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER. The House will proceed with the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] amending the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEENERSON) there were—ayes 8, noes 76.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 60, noes 21.

Accordingly the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10: Page 7, line 3, insert the following:

"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."

Mr. MADDEN. This is simply a transposition from its place in the bill when it was reported and passed by the House. It carries the same amount. I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12:

"*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 by messenger in the first instance.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and agree to the Senate amendment with the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all the matter inserted in the said amendment commencing with the colon, in line 5, down to and including the word "instance," in line 7.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What is left? The amendment strikes out all of the Senate amendment, even the colon.

Mr. MADDEN. This is amendment No. 12, and it strikes out the proviso.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is all there is, is the proviso.

Mr. MADDEN. No; this is the second proviso.

Mr. WALSH. What is the idea of striking out the proviso? It says that it shall not be considered an excuse for delivery.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not mean anything, because they do make the delivery just the same.

Mr. WALSH. It gives him the authority to issue regulations?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under the first proviso he can make regulations. He may make regulations that the special delivery matter shall be delivered by the ordinary carrier when he makes his rounds, and I would not be surprised if he did make such regulations.

Mr. MADDEN. This does not mean a thing.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. For instance, in the parcel post law we gave without knowing it authority to the Postmaster General to change the law—make an absolute change of law. Nobody knew it was in the law, but it was. The Postmaster General discovered it and has entirely revised the law in reference to the parcel post. I am not criticizing that.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, if there is no objection, I will withdraw the amendment and move to concur.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to know where the original proposition came from in amendment 12?

Mr. MADDEN. It came from the Senate. Of course, it was carried in the last appropriation bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. Without the second proviso.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. And the gentleman's proposition is that we leave it as it is in the existing law?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand, the current law carries the same provision and this is a proposition to make it permanent.

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. WINGO. For another year.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I have been keeping track of this special delivery. I have one once a week, and in the majority of cases the special delivery does not give any quicker service than the regular service. They do not deliver it. A letter written Saturday evening for the purpose of reaching its destination Sunday morning is not delivered until 3 o'clock Monday afternoon.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not mean that it gets a quicker transit, but after it reaches the post office at the point of destination it is delivered quicker.

Mr. WINGO. That is the trouble; it lies in the post office down in Virginia——

Mr. MADDEN. I am very sorry.

Mr. WINGO. All day Sunday, and goes out with the regular delivery to a suburb of a Virginia city on Monday.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under the law they do not sort incoming mail in the post offices on Sunday, and they ought not to.

Mr. WINGO. They ought not to take pay for special delivery.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman ought to send his letter out on Friday night.

Mr. WINGO. But I can not send it out under the circumstances.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is a misfortune.

Mr. WINGO. If they do not propose to give special delivery, they ought not to accept money for it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Has the committee heard any testimony about the operation of this provision put in last year?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman does not know whether it has been a success or whether it is open to the criticism of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. MADDEN. No. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to recede and concur with an amendment, and move to recede and concur.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that. I have not had a single special-delivery letter delivered to my apartment in the last 12 months. They stick it in the box downstairs.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, we will have a better mail service after the 4th of March.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The question was taken.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 11.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subject and I think we ought to have a quorum present, and 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 not.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, does not this call come as an automatic call on the motion?

The SPEAKER. It does. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recede and concur.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 160, nays 32, answered "present" 1, not voting 236, as follows:

YEAS—160.

Almon	Fish	Lampert	Reed, W. Va.
Andrews, Nebr.	Flood	Langley	Ricketts
Ashbrook	Foster	Lanham	Riddick
Babka	French	Lankford	Romjue
Barbour	Gallivan	Larsen	Rose
Begg	Ganly	Linthicum	Sabath
Bell	Glynn	Little	Sherwood
Benham	Good	McArthur	Shreve
Bland, Ind.	Goodykoontz	McDuffie	Siegel
Bowling	Gould	McKenzie	Sinclair
Briggs	Graham, Ill.	McKeown	Sinnott
Brinson	Greene, Vt.	McLane	Smith, Idaho
Brooks, Ill.	Hadley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Ill.
Buchanan	Hardy, Colo.	McLeod	Smith, Mich.
Burke	Hardy, Tex.	MacGregor	Smithwick
Byrnes, S. C.	Harrison	Madden	Steagall
Campbell, Pa.	Haugen	Magee	Steenerson
Cannon	Hayden	Mapes	Stephens, Ohio
Chindblom	Hays	Mason	Stoll
Clark, Fla.	Hernandez	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Cleary	Hersey	Miller	Sumners, Tex.
Cole	Hersman	Minahan, N. J.	Sweet
Collier	Hickey	Moore, Ohio	Swindall
Connally	Hoch	Murphy	Swope
Crago	Hoey	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Cramton	Holland	Newton, Minn.	Temple
Cullen	Huddleston	O'Connell	Thompson
Currie, Mich.	Hudspeth	Ogden	Tilson
Dale	Ireland	Osborne	Timberlake
Darrow	Jacoway	Paige	Tincher
Denison	Jefferis	Park	Upshaw
Dominick	Johnson, Wash.	Phelan	Vaile
Drane	Kearns	Purnell	Vestal
Dupré	Keller	Quin	Voigt
Eagan	Kelley, Mich.	Radcliffe	Volk
Emerson	Kettner	Raker	Watkins
Esch	King	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Evans, Nebr.	Kinkaid	Randall, Calif.	Woods, Va.
Evans, Nev.	Knutson	Randall, Wis.	Zihlman
Fairfield	Kraus	Reed, N. Y.	The Speaker

NAYS—32.

Ackerman	Dallinger	Hastings	Ransley
Anderson	Dickinson, Iowa	Hutchinson	Rogers
Black	Dowell	Kreider	Rouse
Bland, Va.	Dunbar	Lufkin	Tillman
Blanton	Edmonds	McClintic	Tinkham
Box	Fields	Moore, Va.	Volstead
Brooks, Pa.	Focht	Oliver	Walsh
Carter	Griest	Parrish	Wingo

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Greene, Mass.

NOT VOTING—236.

Andrews, Md.	Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Oldfield
Anthony	Dyer	Kendall	Olney
Aswell	Eagle	Kennedy, Iowa	Overstreet
Ayres	Echols	Kennedy, R. I.	Padgett
Bacharach	Elliott	Kiess	Parker
Baer	Ellsworth	Kincheloe	Patterson
Bankhead	Elston	Kitchin	Pell
Barkley	Evans, Mont.	Kleczka	Perlman
Bee	Ferris	Layton	Peters
Benson	Fess	Lazaro	Porter
Bland, Mo.	Fisher	Lea, Calif.	Pou
Boies	Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, Ala.
Bowers	Frear	Lehlbach	Rainey, Henry T.
Brand	Freeman	Lesher	Rainey, John W.
Britten	Fuller	Lonergan	Ramsey
Browne	Gallagher	Longworth	Rayburn
Brumbaugh	Gandy	Luce	Reavis
Burdick	Gard	Luhring	Reber
Burroughs	Garner	McAndrews	Rhodes
Butler	Garrett	McCulloch	Riordan
Byrns, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	McFadden	Robinson, N. C.
Caldwell	Goldfogle	McGlennon	Robsion, Ky.
Campbell, Kans.	Goodall	McKiniry	Rodenberg
Candler	Goodwin, Ark.	McKinley	Rowan
Cantrill	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rowe
Caraway	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Rubey
Carew	Griffin	Maher	Rucker
Carss	Hamill	Major	Sanders, Ind.
Casey	Hamilton	Mann, Ill.	Sanders, La.
Christopherson	Harreld	Mann, S. C.	Sanders, N. Y.
Clark, Mo.	Hawley	Mansfield	Sanford
Classon	Hicks	Martin	Schall
Coady	Hill	Mays	Scott
Cooper	Houghton	Mead	Scully
Copley	Howard	Merritt	Sears
Costello	Hulings	Milligan	Sells
Crisp	Hull, Iowa	Monahan, Wis.	Sims
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Mondell	Sisson
Curry, Calif.	Humphreys	Montague	Slemp
Davey	Husted	Moon	Small
Davis, Minn.	Igoe	Mooney	Smith, N. Y.
Davis, Tenn.	James, Mich.	Moores, Ind.	Snell
Dempsey	James, Va.	Morin	Snyder
Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Mott	Stedman
Dewalt	Johnson, Miss.	Mudd	Steele
Dickinson, Mo.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Neely	Stephens, Miss.
Donovan	Johnston, N. Y.	Nelson, Mo.	Stevenson
Dooling	Jones, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Stiness
Doremus	Jones, Tex.	Nicholls	Strong, Pa.
Doughton	Juul	Nolan	Sullivan
Drewry	Kahn	O'Connor	Summers, Wash.

Tague	Vinson	Welty	Wilson, Pa.
Taylor, Ark.	Walters	Whaley	Winslow
Taylor, Tenn.	Ward	Wheeler	Wise
Thomas	Wason	White, Kans.	Woodyard
Towner	Watson	White, Me.	Wright
Treadway	Weaver	Williams	Yates
Vare	Webster	Wilson, Ill.	Young, N. Dak.
Venable	Welling	Wilson, La.	Young, Tex.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I desire to withdraw my vote, as I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD.

The name of Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow——

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain any motion in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MADDEN. But I am asking unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the ayes are 159, the noes 32, "present" 1; 192, not a quorum.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion, as I understand the gentleman from Illinois desires to make a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to make a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn——

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can do this—he can move a recess until an hour certain.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can order the bringing in of absentees or he can move to adjourn.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of any motion, the Speaker will issue warrants to bring in absent Members.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 24, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENISON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 460) to change the name of the Grand River, in Colorado and Utah, to the Colorado River, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1354), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 16145) to amend sections 2, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 32 of the Federal farm loan act, approved July 17, 1916, as amended, and to amend sections 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 of the United States warehouse act, approved August 11, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 16146) to reduce taxes, to repeal the war-profits and the excess-profits tax, to simplify the revenue act of 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the French-Capper "truth in fabric bill"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the appointment of ex-service men to the various public health offices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, regarding the exchange of lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the passage of the French-Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the adoption of the metric system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 16147) granting a pension to Mary F. Zuill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 16148) granting a pension to Harrietta C. Dickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 16149) granting a pension to Mary A. Hicks; 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:

6024. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Company B, of the Old Guard, of Newark, Ohio, protesting against any attempt to incorporate the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6025. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of the Milk Producers' Association of Central California (Inc.), Modesto, Calif., asking that a tariff of not less than 8 cents per pound be placed on all imported butter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6026. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of 80 members of the Olney Post, No. 388, the American Legion, urging the passage of the Rogers-Capper bill for the consolidation of ex-service agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6027. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the Licensed Tugmen's Association of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring a duty on imported fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6028. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of residents of Sauk and Richland Counties, Wis., favoring beer and light wines and protesting against the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6029. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Mendota (Ill.) Council, No. 2090, of the Knights of Columbus, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6030. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolutions of the Lansing (Mich.) Trades and Labor Council, favoring release of all political prisoners confined in Federal prisons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6031. By Mr. LUHRING: Petition of Right Rev. A. J. Schmitt, president of St. Meinrad College and Seminary, and others, protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6032. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition of the Michigan State Farm Bureau, Lansing, Mich., regarding the tariff on lumber, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6033. Also, petition of teachers in the public schools of Adrian, Mich., indorsing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6034. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of sundry women of Minneapolis, protesting against deleting from sundry civil appropriation bill item for aid to the States in combating venereal disease; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6035. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Au Sable Forks, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6036. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Constable, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6037. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the town of Waddington, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6038. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Alfred Carlson and other residents of Bismarck, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6039. Also, petition of the North Dakota Society of Engineers, Bismarck, N. Dak., urging appropriations for public improvements, and also favoring the national adoption of the metric system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6040. Also, petition of Harry Hardy Post, No. 47, of the American Legion, of Burnstad, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for better hospital facilities for our disabled war veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.