nor to pass any legislation of religious nature which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3453. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 740 residents of California, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 3218, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3454. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petitions of residents of Morrow County, Oreg., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3455. By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of over 100 citizens of Clay Center, Kans., favoring passage of legislation to increase pensions of veterans of the Civil, Indian, and Spanish Wars and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE

THURSDAY, *January 15, 1925*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, we rejoice before Thee this morning. Thy rule over us is a rule of love. Thou dost bear with us in many of the circumstances of life, and Thou dost bring us safely through all the pathways wherein we find confusion and distress. Thou art the same yesterday, to-day, and forever in Thy care over us. Humbly we look unto Thee with gratitude this morning and ask for Thy further guidance, so that whatever may be awaiting us as the days multiply we may be able to say according to Thine own word, as thy day is so shall thy strength be. Hear us, help us, forgiving our failings and shortcomings, and accept of us, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, January 5, 1925, when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8887) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations," approved November 7, 1918; to amend section 5136 as amended, section 5137, section 5138 as amended, section 5142, section 5150, section 5155, section 5190, section 5200 as amended, section 5202 as amended, section 5208 as amended, section 5211 as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and to amend section 9, section 13, section 22, and section 24 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

METHOD OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE DISTRICT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 387) to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia, which were, on page 2, lines 2 and 3, to strike out "available and not otherwise" and insert in lieu thereof "hereafter"; and on page 2, line 6, to strike out "available and not otherwise" and insert in lieu thereof "hereafter."

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 387) to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia, to strike out on page 1, line 3, of the engrossed bill the following: "on and after the 1st day of July, 1924," and insert: "hereafter."

Mr. KING. May I understand the purpose of the amendment proposed to be made?

Mr. BALL. The reason for this action is that the Senate passed the bill last January and it was to go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1924. Now, the object is to have the date changed so that it will go into effect after its approval.

Mr. KING. I think that is a mistake.

Mr. BALL. As the bill stands now it is to go into effect on the 1st day of July, 1924.

Mr. KING. I see, but it ought to be July 1, 1925, because the necessary arrangements will have to be made.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

OFFICIAL PAPERS OF TERRITORIES

Mr. RALSTON. There is on the calendar the bill (S. 2935) for the publication of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in the national archives. The bill was reported from the Committee on Printing with an amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment found on page 3, line 1, consisting of the insertion of the three words "authorized to be" may be agreed to at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. MOSES. May I interrupt to say to the Senator from Indiana that I think the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] wishes to be present when the bill is considered?

Mr. RALSTON. I had an understanding with him yesterday that in his absence I could ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MOSES. Very well. I did not know the Senator had such an arrangement with the Senator from Utah. I have no objection.

There being no objection the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment of the Committee on Printing was, on page 3, line 1, after the word "hereby," to insert the words "authorized to be," so as to make the sentence read, "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated," etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RALSTON. Now I move that the bill be further amended by striking out the word "historian" wherever it occurs in the bill and inserting in lieu thereof the word "editor."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Wherever in the bill the word "historian" occurs, strike out the word and insert in lieu thereof the word "editor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana desire the bill passed at this time?

Mr. RALSTON. No. I did not have an understanding with the senior Senator from Utah that it was to be put upon its passage, but that I would simply have the amendments agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments have been agreed to and the bill will be returned to the calendar.

MAY ADELAIDE SHARP

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration——

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may we not have the regular order? I have a number of small reports from the Committee on Printing that I would like to present to the Senate and ask for their immediate consideration. We are under the head of presentation of petitions and memorials, if I understand the situation correctly.

Mr. SIMMONS. What I desire to do will not take three minutes.

Mr. MOSES. I shall not object to the request which the Senator is about to make, but I certainly wish to reach the regular order at some time.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 6498) for the relief of May Adelaide Sharp. It is a bill to pay to Mrs. Sharp, the widow of Hunter Sharp, late American consul at Edinburgh, Scotland, the sum of $5,000. The bill has passed the House. It has been favorably reported by the Committee on Claims, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

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 Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to May Adelaide Sharp, widow of the late Hunter Sharp, late American consul at Edinburgh, Scotland, the sum of $5,000, being one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died of illness incurred while in the Consular Service; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sufficient sum to carry out the purpose of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WARREN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11308) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, 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 amendment numbered 15.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out in lines 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of the matter inserted by said amendment the following: "including the same objects and under the same limitations as are prescribed under this head in the act making appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 7 and 8.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WARREN. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. KING. What are the amendments not yet agreed to?

Mr. WARREN. They do not involve the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Utah. That is contained in the bill, having been agreed to by the conferees. The two items that must go back to the House do not involve a disagreement except that they are of such a nature that the House members of the conference considered that they must take them back to the House. I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report just presented. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHURST. I have no objection to its consideration, but——

Mr. WARREN. Under the rule, when a conference report is presented, there has to be a vote without debate if the motion is made to proceed to its consideration. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. ASHURST. A motion for the adoption of a conference report is open to debate. I have no objection to its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is no objection to the present consideration of the conference report, and the question is, Shall the report be agreed to?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it is always a dubious performance, usually of doubtful propriety, and should be resorted to only in extreme cases, to attempt to impede the progress of an appropriation bill or supply bill, because the functions of our Government are so numerous that frequently in one supply bill are carried the funds to conduct the energies and agencies of the Government to which we have committed the Government. Hence, although after a service of some years, I have never attempted wantonly to impede the progress of a supply bill. It is regarded in the parliamentary procedure of the United States as contra bona parliamenta to impede wantonly the progress of a supply bill.

We have reached a position respecting our supply bills, the appropriation bills, where it is necessary for the Congress to remind the Executive that Congress lays the taxes and appropriates the money; that whilst we have invited the Executive and the Budget master to make recommendations, Congress retains control of the purse. Indeed, that is one of the most cherished principles of parliamentary governments. When Parliament was forming in England, no matter how arrogant the King might be, no matter how many ministers he might behead, the Parliament always reserved to itself the control of the purse. So in the Congress of the United States, whilst it welcomes suggestions, messages, opinions, and estimates from the Executive, Congress nevertheless reserves the right to say what sums of money may be appropriated. Laying down that broad premise, I discuss a situation that has arisen.

When the deficiency appropriation bill was before the Senate on the 5th of June, 1924, my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON], offered an amendment to the bill, as follows:

That there is hereby appropriated, from the reclamation fund established by the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. L. p. 388), the sum of $200,000, for operation and maintenance and completion of construction of the irrigation system required to furnish water to all of the irrigable lands in part 1 of the Mesa division, otherwise known as the first Mesa unit of the Yuma auxiliary project, authorized by the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stat. L. p. 868), as amended by the act of February 11, 1918 (40 Stat. L. p. 437): *Provided*, That all moneys received by the United States in payment of land and water rights in said part 1 of the Mesa division, beginning one year from the date this act becomes effective, shall be covered into the reclamation fund until the sum advanced from said fund hereunder is fully paid.

SEC. 2. That the purchase price of land and water rights hereafter sold in said part 1 of the Mesa division shall be paid to the United States in 10 equal installments, the first of which shall be due and payable at the date of the purchase, and the remaining installments annually thereafter, with interest on deferred installments at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, payable annually; and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, at any time within one year from the date this act becomes effective, to amend any existing uncompleted contract for the purchase of land and water rights so that the aggregate amount of principal and interest remaining unpaid under such contract may be paid in 10 equal installments in accordance with the conditions of this section, beginning with the date of amendatory contract.

SEC. 3. That land and water rights in said part 1 of the Mesa division heretofore or hereafter offered at public sale under said act of January 25, 1917, and not disposed of at such public sale may be sold later at private sale at not less than $25 per acre for the land and at $200 per acre for the water right, and a corporation may purchase land and water rights at any such sale either public or private and receive patent therefor.

Upon that same date my colleague laid before the Senate certain pertinent facts showing the necessity for the adoption of this amendment, and the Senate unanimously agreed to the amendment.

Upon the same day I offered another amendment to the same deficiency bill, which I shall not now read, because whilst it is important it is not an issue at this moment, but I include it in the RECORD. My amendment was unanimously agreed to by the Senate on June 5, 1924.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated the sum of $597,088, or so much thereof as may be necessary to reimburse the reclamation fund for the benefit of the Yuma Federal irrigation project in Arizona and California for all costs, as found by the Secretary of the Interior, heretofore incurred and paid from the reclamation fund for the operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system adjacent to said project.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be 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 transferred to the reclamation fund and to be 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 adjacent to said Yuma project, Arizona-California, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925.

SEC. 3. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and annually thereafter, the sum of $35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, as the share of the Government of the United States of the costs of operating and maintaining said Colorado River front work and levee system: *Provided*, That the said sum of $35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall only be available if and when double such said amount of $35,000 shall have been provided by the States of Arizona and California, the county of Yuma, Ariz., and the Yuma project, or any of them, it being hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to assume one-third of the obligation of caring for said river-front work and levee system adjacent to said Yuma project, Arizona-California.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the two amendments to the deficiency bill to which I have referred went to conference.

The amendment of my colleague provided that the Yuma Mesa, so called, should be administered under the general reclamation law; that, after omitting all extraneous matter, is what the amendment provided. Referring now to my amendment, it will be remembered that in 1910 the Congress appropriated $1,000,000 to revet the western bank of the Colorado River below Yuma. The sum of $1,000,000 was expended in Lower California, in Mexico, on the revetment of the bank of the Colorado River. This revetment work threw the waters of that river with great force against the eastern or Arizona bank, and, like a giant with steel fingers, the river overwhelmed and destroyed many farms and bankrupted many worthy people; my amendment simply provided, as to the amount of money those farmers had expended in revetting the river, whose overflow had been caused by the expenditure of the million dollars which the Government had spent in Mexico on the west side of the river, that the Government of the United States and not those farmers should pay the expense and that thereafter an agreement should be made whereby the Federal Government should pay a third of the expense of maintaining the river below Yuma within a fixed channel.

Those two amendments were unanimously agreed to. Soon after my amendment was presented the esteemed Senator Lodge, whose name I mention with great respect, made some objection; but I had no sooner stated my case than Senator Lodge said, "Certainly, I have no objection to such an amendment," for he was a practical statesman of such judgment and sagacity that merely to state a proposition of that sort was to convince him.

Those two amendments went to conference. Parliamentary law, which I recognize and respect, would not permit me to refer to the treatment of those amendments in conference. I recognize parliamentary law, and even if there were no parliamentary law on the subject, I am not here to challenge motives. I impugn the motives of no individual, whether he be a Member of this body or of a body elsewhere. I must point out to the Senate and to the country an obvious injustice that must not be permitted longer to continue.

The Senate conferees receded from the amendment which my colleague introduced, and also from the amendment which I introduced. It will be remembered that when the deficiency bill came before the Senate, on the conference report, in the closing hours of the session, on June 7, 1924, my colleague and I each stated that we would not assume the responsibility for the defeat of the deficiency bill; that it was a burden which we did not wish to assume, and which we would not assume; and that if the deficiency bill was killed or delayed until the December session, it would not be through our fault or procurement, whereupon assurances came to us of a high and responsible character that if we would permit the deficiency bill to pass, at the first opportunity which offered itself those two amendments would again be stapled to the first deficiency bill.

On June 7, 1924, as will be found on page 11189 of the RECORD, I stated:

> Much as I desire to see my own amendment and the amendment of my colleague retained in this conference report, I decline to assume the responsibility of killing this deficiency bill, as such action would starve many of the great energies of the Government. I have conferred with my colleague [Mr. CAMERON], but neither he nor I will assume the heavy responsibility of killing this vital bill, as such action would paralyze too many agencies of the Government, although the conferees have abandoned and thus defeated the legislation that we seek.

At the same time I reminded the Senate of the injustice that would be perpetrated if the amendments were not agreed to; but, refusing to assume that heavy responsibility at that time because the agencies of government in too many places would have been starved, the bill did not fail through our fault or procurement or through our designs.

No sooner had we announced that we did not intend to obstruct that deficiency bill than Senators—not by twos, but by dozens—came forward and stated, "By your action to-day you have absolutely made it certain that we will pass your two amendments at the next session of Congress." I did not consider that that was a bargain; the statement was voluntarily made on the part of Senators; they had a right to make such statements.

What is the reason for this amendment? I will ask Senators to refer to page 10913 of the RECORD of the last session of Congress, where will be found the speech of my colleague pointing out the necessity for this legislation. It will be remembered that under the terms of the act of June 25, 1917, certain lands known as the Yuma Mesa or auxiliary to the Mesa project, embracing about 6,400 acres, were set aside for sale and settlement. This acreage was subdivided into farm units of from 5 to 20 acres each, and, in accordance with the special act, those farm units were offered for sale at public vendue, on December 10, 1917. The terms of the sale were 10 per cent cash on the day of sale, 15 per cent additional in 60 days, and thereafter, if the sale were approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the remaining 75 per cent was to be divided into 3 equal annual payments of 25 per cent each, with 6 per cent interest.

In 1917, at the time of the sale, it looked as if the terms were not oppressive, but, owing to the enormous advance in the price of commodities everywhere, it was discovered to be impossible for many of these purchasers to make their payments, and if they did not make the payments the amounts they had paid into the Government might be retained as liquidated damages and possibly would not be returned to them, whereas if the law could be amended so that the terms of the general reclamation law would apply the settlers would be able to make the payments.

The figures were as follows: There were 121 purchasers owning 1,385 acres who had paid 100 per cent on their contract; 59 purchasers owning 740 acres who had paid 75 per cent; 74 purchasers owning 875 acres who had paid 50 per cent; and 120 purchasers owning 645 acres who had paid 25 per cent.

So Senators will perceive that, whilst 121 purchasers have completed their payments, there are 59 who have paid 75 per cent, 74 who have paid 50 per cent, 120 who have paid 25 per cent who will suffer loss unless they obtain relief.

To afford relief to the settlers I introduced a bill when Congress convened in December last, and my colleague offered it as an amendment to the deficiency bill which was passed the other day when there were present more than the usual number of Senators.

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

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. KING. My attention was diverted for a moment, and I did not follow the Senator. Were these people who the Senator says would be annihilated the ones who suffered by reason of the act of the Government in expending $1,000,000 in Mexico?

Mr. ASHURST. Some of them were the same people, but by no means the same lands are involved. Some of them having been injured by their own Government when it spent $1,000,000 in Mexico, concluded that they would go upon the Mesa, where the Federal Government could not by spending $1,000,000 in Mexico throw the water onto their lands; but they find now that the payments can not be made at this time.

Mr. KING. Just one moment. Are these payments due on account of an irrigation project which the Government has inaugurated and under which these people have claims?

Mr. ASHURST. There was a tract of land about 35,000 acres in area, once said by Secretary Lane to be the most fertile tract of land in the Western Hemisphere. It is in a frostless zone. The upset price at which the raw lands were to be sold was $225 an acre. Senators who are familiar with the cultivation of land must know that the initial cost of the land is only one of the small items in preparing the same for the cultivation of oranges, olives, grapes, and grapefruit. The question simply is, Shall we allow these purchasers to pay in 10 installments rather than in four? Stripped of verbiage, that is the question. They will pay 6 per cent interest on the deferred payments. Shall we play the part of that famous character in "The Merchant of Venice"? Shall we, as the representatives of the people, play the part of a money grabber in dealing with those who are asking only that they be permitted to make payment in 10 installments?

I have here a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, dated January 2 of this year:

> HON. CHARLES L. MCNARY,
> *Chairman, Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation,*
> *United States Senate.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR MCNARY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of December 4, 1924, transmitting copies of two bills (S. 3537 and S. 3538) with request for immediate report thereon. * * *
>
> The proposed measure is entitled "A bill for the completion of the first Mesa division of the Yuma Auxiliary reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes."
>
> This bill is designed—

Now, this letter is signed by the Secretary of the Interior—

This bill is designed to provide sufficient funds with which to complete the first unit of the so-called Mesa project and to ameliorate the terms of payment prescribed in the original act. Under the terms of the original law payments for the land and water right was to be made 25 per cent immediately upon execution of contract and the remaining 75 per cent in three annual installments, with interest at 6 per cent per annum on deferred payments. The funds thus far provided have been entirely advanced by the contract holders, no appropriation having been made by Congress to aid in the construction or operation and maintenance of the unit.

Some of the contract holders—

That is, the purchasers—

have been unable to complete payments, from which it follows that there is a dearth of funds with which to complete construction of the necessary works and to operate and maintain the completed works.

The operations thus far conducted serve to confirm the belief that the unit possesses great possibilities. It is now proposed that there be advanced from the reclamation fund the sum mentioned, and that all moneys received by the United States in payment for land and water rights beginning one year from the date this act becomes effective shall be covered into the reclamation fund until the sum thus advanced is fully paid. To make clear that the advances proposed are to be made from the reclamation fund, I suggest that for the words "That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," * * * there be substituted the following: "That there is hereby appropriated from the reclamation fund"—

And so forth.

The Secretary continues:

Provision is made in the bill that payments on land and water right contracts hereafter executed shall be made in 10 equal annual installments, with interest on deferred payments at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, payable annually, with authority given to the Secretary of the Interior to amend uncompleted contracts so that the unpaid balance shall be paid in 10 equal annual installments.

The bill has been submitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who reports that the contemplated expenditure from the reclamation fund is not in conflict with the President's financial program, provided the amendments herein suggested are incorporated.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT WORK, *Secretary.*

My colleague has incorporated in his amendment the changes and corrections indicated by the Secretary of the Interior. Now it is proposed that the Senate shall recede from this amendment, which, in my judgment, means a further continuation, postponement, neglect, and delay in settling this question.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I dislike to interrupt him, but I want to follow him and get as much information as I possibly can.

A moment ago I made an inquiry of the Senator as to whether this was a reclamation project. That is, that was the substance of my inquiry. I gathered from what the Senator said that it was not a reclamation project; that the Government owned a tract of land considered by Secretary Lane to be very valuable indeed, and that a certain amount of this land was sold to these settlers. If that be true, it is not a reclamation project; and I was wondering how many refunds could be made from the reclamation fund to these individuals, no matter how much they had suffered, because the reclamation fund, as the Senator knows, is derived from various sources, and the entire fund is to be used under the reclamation law, under the so-called Newlands Act. I can not quite follow the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. It is the intention of the bill to place this project, in a manner, under the general reclamation law. Although the general reclamation law, as amended in 1914, required the payments to be made within 20 years, this bill does not ask that the payment be made within 20 years, but within 10 years. I have read to the Senator the figures showing that a large number have paid 100 per cent, some have paid 75 per cent, some 50, and some 25 per cent. The lands were sold at public outcry; the upset price was fixed at $225 per acre, but in most instances the lands sold for a higher sum per acre, to be paid in four equal installments. The question now is simply this: Shall we allow these purchasers to have a 10-year period for the payment of the balance of the purchase price, or must they comply with what now appear to be the harsh, rigid terms of the law of 1917?

Mr. KING. Then, as I understand, it is merely granting a moratorium with respect to the period of payment, and is not a charge upon the reclamation fund?

Mr. ASHURST. It simply is an advance of $200,000 from the reclamation fund, and is approved by the Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, approved by the Director of the Budget, approved by the President of the United States, and approved twice by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator a moment?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. BAYARD. I do not quite understand one part of the Senator's proposition. The Senator says that some of these settlers have paid a certain percentage on account and a varying percentage on account. Is that right?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. BAYARD. Is the Senator's proposition to cover a 10-year period for the balance? In other words, suppose one man has paid 50 per cent and another man 75 per cent. Is each one of those men to have a 10-year period from now on to pay the balance?

Mr. ASHURST. I think I would better resort to the bill, because I would not be guilty of such temerity as to try to construe a law for him.

Mr. BAYARD. I am not trying to get a construction.

Mr. ASHURST. I want the Senator's construction. Let us read the bill. It appropriates—

the sum of $200,000, to be paid out of the reclamation fund established by the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stats. p. 388), for operation and maintenance and completion of construction of the irrigation system required to furnish water to all of the irrigable lands in part 1 of the Mesa division, otherwise known as the First Mesa Unit of the Yuma Auxiliary project, authorized by the act of January 25, 1917 (39 Stats. p. 868), as amended by the act of February 11, 1918 (40 Stats. p. 437): *Provided,* That all moneys received by the United States in payment of land and water rights in said part 1 of the Mesa division, beginning one year from the date this act becomes effective, shall be covered into the reclamation fund until the sum advanced from said fund hereunder is fully paid.

That is to say, whoever among these who have not paid shall make payment, those avails shall be restored and repaid to the reclamation fund.

Provided further, That the purchase price of land and water rights hereafter sold in said part 1 of the Mesa division shall be paid to the United States in 10 equal installments, the first of which shall be due and payable at the date of the purchase, and the remaining installments annually thereafter, with interest on deferred installments at the rate of 6 per cent per annum, payable annually.

Mr. BAYARD. That is the future payments?

Mr. ASHURST. The future payments; but the $200,000 is to continue the development of the project, to pump the water up there.

Mr. BAYARD. May I interrupt the Senator to this extent? I do not understand this phase of his remarks:

He says a number of people are already on there, not referring to those to come hereafter. They have paid a varying proportion of the amount due upon their holdings; and, as I understand, the purpose of the Senator is so to amend the law that instead of having the four equal annual payments the balance shall be extended over a term of 10 years, regardless of the amount they have paid on account?

Mr. ASHURST. Let me say——

Mr. BAYARD. What I want to ask the Senator is: How does he make that an equitable proposition when there have been varying payments made on account?

Mr. ASHURST. The amendment provides—

And the Secretary of the Interior is authorized at any time within one year from the date this act becomes effective to amend any existing uncompleted contract—

That is the contract between the Government and the purchaser. It is left in the breast of the Secretary of the Interior, so that he may bring about an equitable adjustment.

I read again:

to amend any existing uncompleted contract for the purchase of land and water rights so that the aggregate amount of principal and interest remaining unpaid under such contract may be paid in 10 equal installments.

That is to say, under this language the Secretary of the Interior undoubtedly would have a right to say to those who have paid 75 per cent, the 50 per cent, or the 25 per cent, "You may have 10 equal annual installments in which to pay the balance."

Mr. BAYARD. At that point may I make this suggestion: Suppose A, B, C, and D had all bought rights at $1,000 apiece, and A had paid 50 per cent, B had paid 60 per cent, C had paid 70 per cent, and D had paid 80 per cent. The Senator is proposing to give the Secretary of the Interior the right to tell them whether or not they can have any intermediate period

between the balance of the existing period and a 10-year period at his own option. Suppose he said to A, who has 50 per cent still to pay: "You can have only five years."

Mr. ASHURST. No; he could not do that under the law.

Mr. BAYARD. But the Senator says he gives him the option.

Mr. ASHURST. No.

And the Secretary of the Interior is authorized at any time within one year from the date this act becomes effective to amend any existing uncompleted contract for the purchase of land and water rights so that the aggregate amount of principal and interest remaining unpaid under such contract may be paid in 10 equal installments.

Mr. BAYARD. "May be"—that is the very point; but the point I make is that the Senator's language is such that he may say to the one who has paid 50 per cent, "You shall pay in five years," and to the one who has paid 80 per cent, "You may pay in 10 years."

Mr. ASHURST. I admit that the word "may" there might be construed to be directory.

Mr. BAYARD. I do not think the Senator's language is equitable.

Mr. ASHURST. I think it is directory. "May" frequently is directory.

I do not claim, Mr. President, that the Senate is foreclosed because the Senate adopted this amendment twice, once on June 5 and once on last Monday. I do not recognize in the Senate a doctrine of foreclosure. Because, forsooth, the Senate voted for an amendment last June and last Monday is no argument for foreclosing Senators from altering their opinions. I refuse to be bound by such a rule. If I voted for a bill last June and last Monday and see new facts develop, I change my vote, and any other Senator under similar circumstances would do the same. But no new fact has been submitted which would militate against this amendment my colleague proposed to the deficiency bill. Indeed, the only new facts developed are comprehended within the letter of the Secretary of the Interior setting out his approval of this legislation, setting out that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget recommends this legislation. I have never dipped my words into a tank of diplomatic antiseptic before I gave them utterance. I have never been given to censorship. During the war I opposed censorship. I have no patience with a man who turns each phrase carefully and neatly, fearful that it may later impale him. I want the words to come hot from the heart. It has been a habit of mine—possibly it is a habit I have indulged too frequently here—of speaking my mind, and in this case I shall continue my lifelong habit of saying what I think.

I repeat that I challenge no motives. I impugn the good faith of no man, here or elsewhere. Doubtless Senators are acting according to the lights before them, and when men do that they are secure from my prejudice. But I am radically at variance with the idea that great appropriation bills, appropriating millions of dollars, may be put through here under whip and spur, with frowns of disapprobation on the brows of leaders and on their lips requests to be silent when some Senator from a sovereign State of the Southwest intimates that at least a shred, a small modicum, of justice now and then ought to be done.

Consider the case. Have I been patient? I leave that to the judgment of a Job. Have I been meek? I will leave that to the meekest man to say. Mr. President, consider your situation if this should happen to your State as it has happened to my State. In 1910 the Congress of the United States appropriated $1,000,000—and of that I make no complaint—to revet the banks of the Colorado River. Federal money, which your constituents dived deeply into their pockets to pay, was expended in Mexico to revet the banks of the Colorado River and build what is known as the Okerson Levee. I am not challenging the correctness of that legislation. You, sir, are a man of conscience and you are a statesman—and you were in the Senate at the time—and I will warrant the assertion that you voted for that appropriation, and possibly others would have done the same, and possibly I would have. I am not complaining about the $1,000,000 being appropriated, but consider, it was spent in Lower California, in Mexico, on the Mexican side of the Colorado River—because Arizona extends lower and more southerly into Mexico than does California.

Possibly conscience and engineering skill required that the money should be spent in Mexico. But, Mr. President, when the irresistible tide of the second largest river in the United States—the Colorado River, a river more temperamental and flashy than any other river in the world, not even the Nile being more flashy and temperamental—when that mighty river, which in its history has risen 25 feet in a few days and struck the Okerson Levee, it rebounded and resurged over onto the Arizona side, and like a million giants with fingers of steel it clawed and ate away the rich farms of my constituents on the Arizona side.

Finally the river was revetted at the expense of the farmers. My former colleague, Senator Marcus A. Smith, saw the situation and attempted to secure legislation to repay the farmers. In 1914 he introduced the appropriate legislation, and esteemed Senators on yon side said, "Be patient a little longer; your case is so equitable, the overwhelming equities are so in your favor, that you should be patient a little longer, and we will take care of it." The farmers continued to pay for controlling the river, and have already paid over $600,000 to control the banks of the mightiest river, except one, in the United States; a river which is interstate and intrastate in character; a river which flows 1,700 miles, and, as I have described, rises suddenly and defies the puny efforts of mankind to control it. Every engineer, every Senator, every person capable of reading a book or comprehending a fact, who has ever looked at the question has said, "Arizona farmers should be reimbursed for the expenditure to which they were put in controlling that river below Yuma."

That is a navigable stream below Yuma. Whether it be practically navigable above there or not I will let others decide, but it is a navigable stream below Yuma, and I have ridden on a steamboat there. These hands have held the wheel, as an experience, on the river there years ago. So last June, when my colleague [Mr. CAMERON] offered his amendment to give the people of Yuma Mesa relief, the amendment went onto the bill. I offered my amendment to give relief to these farmers who have taken care of the control of the river below Yuma. The amendments went out in conference. Howsoever much internally I may have boiled with indignation, I kept a calm exterior, because Senators who are powerful on yon side said, "Be ye patient just a little longer; let your farmers stand up to the waist in the sand and water for a while longer; let their breasts hurl back the onrushing surge of waters; be ye patient a little longer, and we will see that the Federal Government controls that river below Yuma."

I have not offered my amendment to this particular bill; I did not wish to attempt too much at one time. I stand squarely for the amendment of my colleague. I think we have a right to ask that that simple amendment of his shall be retained in the deficiency bill. Esteemed Senators say, "Are you going to delay the deficiency bill? Do you not know that in the deficiency bill are $150,000,000 to repay men who have overpaid their income taxes?"

I have no quarrel with legislation which proposes to return to citizens excess payments on their income taxes. Indeed, one of the complaints I have against the operation of bureaus of our Government is that they do not settle with the citizens soon enough. But that is no reason——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think that tax collectors ought to know their business well enough not to collect too much taxes from the citizen in the beginning?

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator pardon me? I do not want to be drawn into a discussion of that subject.

I do not quarrel with any particular item in the deficiency bill, but will submit to the judgment of my fellow Senators as to whether or not there be any item in the bill more important than this one. The Chair will pardon me if I do not specialize in the matter of the first few items in the bill, because they are to pay, and properly pay, to the surviving relatives of deceased Senators and Representatives the amounts proper to be paid.

The next is an appropriation of $1,587, an unexpended balance of appropriation for the legislative drafting service of the Senate. That is a very important service. Senators might, if they would avail themselves of the energies of that legislative drafting service, ascertain from information furnished to them that this amendment is in accordance with the rules. That is what that drafting service is for.

The next is for "conveying votes of electors for President and Vice President" and "for the payment of the messengers," $14,000. That is to pay the messengers who are going to bring to us the returns of the last election. He would be a poor sportsman, he would not have a grain of statesmanship in his make-up who, because his party happens to be defeated, would attempt to delay the payment of the messengers who

are to bring to us the news, the astounding news, that Calvin Coolidge was elected President of the United States.

In this deficiency bill $40,000 is appropriated for the joint committee on inaugural ceremonies. Although Democrats remember that when Thomas Jefferson was to be inaugurated he left Conrad's boarding house, rode to the Capitol, and tied his horse to a picket fence a few rods from here, and that no expense of inauguration was incurred, it would be a very ungracious act on the part of any Democrat to begrudge the appropriation of the comparatively small sum of $40,000 to prepare for the inauguration of the President. So I make no objection to that $40,000 in the deficiency bill.

The General Accounting Office is authorized to credit the accounts of the disbursing office of the Public Buildings Commission with $180.

Then follow provisions for payments to the personal representatives of deceased Representatives. I make no comment on that. That is proper, and I voted for it.

The next item is to pay the expenses of the agricultural conference assembled by the President in 1924, including expenses of travel as may already have been incurred by the members.

I perceive no objection to that provision. The agricultural conference item is the next one:

For expenses of the agricultural conference assembled by the President in November, 1924, and for each purpose connected therewith—

Including, of course, the expenditures they made for their Pullman reservations and their meals in the dining cars, and their high-class hotel accommodations which were incurred. Of course, when a man expects that he is going to be repaid by the Government he is always quite liberal in his expense account.

The next is "Federal Oil Conservation Board." Mr. President, I could embark upon a sea of words regarding oil conservation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, how much was the item for the agricultural conference?

Mr. ASHURST. For the expenses of the Federal Oil Conservation Board convened by the President on December 18, 1924, and for each purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the board and to remain available until June 30, 1926, $50,000.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish the Senator would tell us the amount for the farmers' conference.

Mr. ASHURST. For the farmers' conference, $50,000, and for oil conservation, $50,000.

It is never too late to mend. The only purpose that a Democratic minority would have would be to induce the majority to reform. If we do not try to induce the majority to reform, then we have no function to perform here. Having bargained away through Mr. Fall, sometime Secretary of the Interior, the great oil reserves of the Government, having bargained away the great oil reserves to Mr. Sinclair and Mr. Doheny, I am not disposed to be captious in my observations when I see enough repentance from those acts to induce an appropriation to call an oil conservation congress after the oil is all gone out of the Federal grasp. But a repentance, no matter how long delayed, is always proper.

For actual and necessary traveling subsistence expenses of members of the United States Lexington-Concord Sesquicentennial Commission in the discharge of their duties outside of the District of Columbia, $5,000, and for expenses incident to the appropriate celebration and observation of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, $10,000; in all, $15,000, said sum to be expended in the discretion of the commission named herein.

Ah, he would be a poor patriot who would stand here and unduly obstruct the progress of a deficiency bill which carried $10,000 so that certain gentlemen may observe the exercises incident to the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington. Sir, I have ridden over the field. The man who can ride over that field, view those hills, and feel within himself no surge of the tide of his blood, the man who can view the fields of Concord and Lexington and not feel a great pride that he is an American, is not fit to be an American. So I am not making objection to that particular item in the bill. I am arguing that the amendment of my colleague, which the Senate twice put on a deficiency bill, is equally as important.

Do you know that years ago an editor in my State gave a great prize to the person who could produce or collate the 100 most beautiful words of the English language? My State turned to me as the man whom they thought would win the prize. I submitted my list of the hundred most beautiful words of the English language—eloquence, love, mercy, mother, wife, home, duty, justice, country, music, industry—but I put "justice" too far down the list and did not get the prize. A schoolboy put "justice" at the head of the list and received the prize. I am only asking that we follow the same rule and put justice along with other items in this bill.

Surveyor's office: For services of temporary draftsmen, etc., care or hire of teams, etc., $8,200.

Supreme Court: For such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and its officers, * * * $20,500.

Interstate Commerce Commission: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep informed regarding and to enforce compliance with acts to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, * * * $27,275.

I am proud to vote for that provision.

For all authorized expenditures under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, * * * $54,000; for printing and binding, $20,000.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to be facetious on a matter that involves—I will say the destiny—of a large number of worthy people. I have no desire to deal with this matter other than in a most serious manner because as the years glide by, as year rolls on after year, I am told to wait patiently, and my present colleague and my colleague before him have been told to wait patiently. But it is necessary for us to point out to Senators what are the particular objects for which appropriations are made in the deficiency bill. There will be an outcry against us. The indignation of officialdom will frown upon us. There be those who will assent with civil leer, and while not exactly sneering, will teach the rest to sneer because we have held up the deficiency bill.

There is $150,000 appropriated for a reclamation project:

The following sum is appropriated out of the special fund in the Treasury of the United States, created by the act of June 17, 1902, and therein designated "The reclamation fund":

For carrying into effect the provisions of subsection K of section 4 of the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, approved December 5, 1924, to remain available until June 30, 1926, $50,000.

Then comes the amendment No. 15 proposed by my colleague, which I have already read. Then comes the following provision for the National Park Service:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to meet the emergencies caused by forest insects within national parks and national monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, and to provide personnel and equipment for the investigation, control, and prevention of spread of such insects, to be expended directly or in cooperation with other departments of the Federal Government or with States, $25,000, to remain available until June 30, 1926.

That is followed by a provision for the Department of Justice, for salary and expenses of Assistant to the Solicitor General, and so forth, $500. Then:

For the Pueblo lands board, expenses, including compensation for a member appointed by the President of the United States, and for clerical assistants, interpreters, and stenographers, * * *, $19,500.

Under the heading "Judicial, United States courts," is the following:

The appropriation of $9,000 for supplies for United States courts, contained in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1924, is hereby made available for the fiscal year 1925.

Then we have "Naval Observatory," a lighthouse of the sky:

For installation of 8-inch water mains for fire protection, $15,000.

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

Mr. ASHURST. I yield, but I do not want to lose the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not understand that the Senator will lose the floor by yielding.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the able Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has been recounting certain individual items of appropriations to meet deficiencies. They seem to have a pretty broad scope. The Senator said that his amendment is a very meritorious one and that it has been ignored. The Senator has not given the Senate the reasons for ignoring it. I hope he will do so before he concludes.

But I want to ask the Senator a question. The question is, What amount does the deficiency bill carry?

Mr. ASHURST. Many, many millions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator pardon me just for a moment? This is the second deficiency bill that we have passed.

Mr. ASHURST. That is true, at this session.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am told this bill carries $300,000,000. Can my colleague, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], tell me the amount carried by the other deficiency bill already passed?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know the exact amount, but something over $200,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is a total of $500,000,000, approximately. Then there is to be another deficiency bill passed before we adjourn. We have a Budget system in the country, and I understand that the committees are held strictly to the findings of the Budget. We are constantly told that the Budget is holding down expenses for the purpose of accomplishing economy. When they have added up the total allowed by the Budget Committee, it is published to the country as a great reduction in expenses, and the Congress is told and the committees are told that we must not make appropriations in excess of the Budget estimate.

After the Budget estimate has been adopted, after we have been prohibited from increasing the Budget estimate, if we are to pass deficiency bills—one, two, three of them—carrying appropriations, probably, not far from $1,000,000,000, is not that an indirect disregard of the Budget? Why hold us down so tightly to the Budget estimate, and then subsequently permit us, through deficiency bills, to increase the Budget estimate to the extent possibly of nearly $1,000,000,000? Is not that conclusive evidence that the Budget, for the purpose of catering to a public sentiment, is trying to carry the matter of economy a little bit too far?

Mr. OVERMAN. And fooling the people.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is it not a direct method, as my distinguished colleague [Mr. OVERMAN] suggests, of fooling the people as to what amount is necessary in order to carry on the Government under this administration by not permitting them to know what amount is necessary until it is too late?

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Ever since we commenced this great economy program I have noticed that deficiency bill after deficiency bill has been brought in here increasing the amount of appropriations by hundreds of thousands of dollars, and now it looks as though the increased amounts might go up to a billion dollars.

Mr. ASHURST. I have no quarrel with the man who says he is for economy; he has a right to be, and should be, for economy. What I am objecting to is a lip service to economy, an economy on paper, which insists that our appropriations shall be relatively small, and then masks and conceals after a fashion a deficiency of $1,000,000,000, as the able Senators from North Carolina have pointed out. If it shall require $3,000,000,000 to conduct the agencies of the Government, fairly administered, I believe the people will stand the expense, but they are not going to tolerate any man or bureau that cries economy from the housetops and then in the closet does not practice economy. The people will have no sympathy with a Congress that pretends to practice economy but in truth does not practice economy.

I once knew a man, who died many years ago, who amassed riches by avoiding the payment of his debts. Is the Government to have a full Treasury by avoiding the payment of its just obligations, or is it going to pay its running expenses and then deceive the people as to the amount of the expense? No, Mr. President. The people of this country expect us to make fair, honest appropriations and to state what they are for.

I was reading the items of this bill, but I stated I was not objecting to any particular item. I have not yet objected specifically to any item; but I ask Senators, on their consciences, to say whether there was a more important item than the item which my colleague caused to be incorporated in the deficiency bill?

Resuming the reading of the bill:

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION

For the share of the United States of the expenses of the International Fisheries Commission—

I only read in skeletonized form from the bill—

* * * $11,250.

PUBLISHING ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Not exceeding $2,000 of the appropriation for printing and binding, Department of State, fiscal year 1925, shall be available to pay the expenses of publishing, in compliance with the requirements of the act of February 3, 1887, the certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors for the President and Vice President of the United States as transmitted by the executive of each State to the Secretary of State.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

This is not the last line. It was Cyrano de Bergerac who always struck on the last line, and this strikes in the middle of the book.

For refunding taxes illegally collected under the provisions of sections 3220 and 3689, Revised Statutes, as amended by the acts of February 24, 1919, November 23, 1921, and June 2, 1924, including the payment of claims for the fiscal year 1926 and prior years—

I do not put the bel canto on the words "$150,000,000"—

to remain available until June 30, 1926: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress of the disbursements hereunder as required by such acts—

To that proviso the able junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] offered an amendment in the Senate which reads:

including the names of all persons and corporations to whom payments are made, together with the amount paid to each.

I understand that that is the other amendment to which there has been no agreement.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the junior Senator from Utah?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. KING. I am advised by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], that that amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. That amendment was agreed to by the House.

Mr. ASHURST. Resuming the reading:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Prevention of epidemics: To enable the President, in case only of threatened or actual epidemic of cholera, typhus fever, yellow fever, smallpox, bubonic plague, Chinese plague or black death, trachoma, influenza, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, or infantile paralysis, to aid State and local boards or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same, and in such emergency in the execution of any quarantine laws which may be then in force, including the purchase of newspapers and clippings from newspapers containing information relating to the prevalence of disease and the public health, $275,000.

No citizen will object to that item of $275,000. Reading further in reference to the Coast Guard:

Repair of vessels: For necessary emergent repairs to the cutter *Manning*, $150,000.

Office of commandant: For personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with "the classification act of 1923," $7,500.

* * * * * * *

WAR DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

Of the unexpended balance of the appropriation provided by section 124 of the national defense act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended, the sum of $15,000 is hereby made available for such expenses as may be necessary and incidental to the arbitration of the rate of royalty to be paid the American Cyanamid Co. on patents owned by said company, as provided in section 10 of the contract of June 8, 1918, between the United States and the American Cyanamid Co.

MUSCLE SHOALS

For the continuation of the work on Dam No. 2, on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., $3,501,200.

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

For the purchase of capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation created by the act approved June 3, 1924, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

JUDGMENTS, UNITED STATES COURTS

For payment of the final judgments and decrees, including costs of suits, which have been rendered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," as amended by the Judicial Code, approved March 3, 1911, certified to the Sixty-eighth Congress by the Attorney General in House Document No. 532, and which have not been appealed, namely:

Under the Navy Department, $69.57;

Under the War Department, $20,627.45; in all, $20,697.02, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on the respective judgments at the rate of 4 per cent from the date thereof until the time this appropriation is made.

For payment of judgments, including costs of suits, rendered against the Government of the United States by the United States district courts under the provisions of certain private acts, certified to the Sixty-eighth Congress in House Document No. 534, as follows:

Under United States Shipping Board, $6,063.08;

Under the Navy Department, $149,819.51; in all, $155,882.59.

For payment of judgment rendered against the Government of the United States by the United States District Court for the District of Indiana, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, certified to the Sixty-eighth Congress in House Document No. 531, as follows:

Under the War Department, $12,107.79. None of the judgments contained herein shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

JUDGMENTS, COURT OF CLAIMS

For payment of the judgments rendered by the Court of Claims and reported to the Sixty-eighth Congress in House Document No. 533, namely:

Under the Navy Department, $119,487.69;

Under the Treasury Department, $19,754.82;

Under the War Department, $161,814.48; in all, $301,056.99, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest on certain of the judgments at the legal rate per annum as and where specified in said judgments. None of the judgments contained herein shall be paid until the right of appeal shall have expired.

AUDITED CLAIMS

SEC. 2. That for the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1922 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in House Document No. 535, Sixty-eighth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

LEGISLATIVE

For Capitol power plant, $10,778.86.

For furniture, Library of Congress, $99.38.

For public printing and binding, $131.40.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

For Interstate Commerce Commission, $46.11.

For international exchanges, Smithsonian Institution, $1.56.

For preservation of collections, National Museum, $61.77.

For fuel, lights, etc., State, War, and Navy Department Buildings, $408.03.

For Council of National Defense, $84.13.

For Board of Mediation and Conciliation, $5.42.

* * * * * * *

For vocational rehabilitation, Veterans' Bureau, $79,828.43.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For improvement and care of public grounds, District of Columbia, $7.56.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For increase of compensation, Department of Agriculture, $7.

For stimulating agriculture and facilitating distribution of products, $100.33.

For general expenses, Weather Bureau, $61.52.

For general expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $826.14.

And so on. I will not read each item specifically.

The concluding paragraph of the bill reads:

This act hereafter may be referred to as the "First deficiency act, fiscal year 1925"—

indicating that there may be another deficiency bill that will come here later carrying many millions of dollars—we know not how many.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the one that is to come later will probably be the largest deficiency bill that will come before Congress. That bill appears just at the close of the session, and generally is a sort of basket deficiency bill.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has read many items, but he read one that startled me. I refer to the item, as I understood him to read it, appropriating one hundred and fifty-odd million dollars to pay refunds to the taxpayers who have paid in excess of what they lawfully owed the Government.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. It has not been long since we acted upon the estimate of the Budget Bureau, and it is inconceivable that, since action upon the Budget estimate, the requirements of the Treasury for the purpose of paying refunds have increased to the enormous sum of $150,000,000. It must have been within the knowledge of the Treasury Department that they would need that sum of money, or the larger part of that sum of money, at least, at the time the Budget Bureau acted. If the departments are not to be held to the Budget estimates, I do not see why Members of Congress should be held to them. If they can divide up and put so much in the Budget, and then come to Congress a little bit later and ask for another sum, probably equal to the sum allowed by the Budget, that seems to me to be an indirect method of repealing or modifying or setting aside the action of the Budget.

Here in the Congress we are told that the Budget is sacred, that it can not be disturbed; but if the departments, after dividing up and asking the Budget Committee for so much and getting it, are allowed later to come to Congress and ask for a large additional amount which could just as well have been included in the original estimate, that is an indirect method of circumventing the Budget Committee and making its action ineffective.

Mr. ASHURST. It is what is called, in legislative parlance, short circuiting the Budget.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; but the estimates made by the Budget Bureau amount to nothing if, after they have made their estimates and we have acted upon them, the departments can come in here and ask for large additional appropriations that they knew, or ought to have known, would be necessary at the time the Budget acted. Of course, if the necessity for expenditures unexpectedly arises after the action of the Budget, that is a different proposition. But it is inconceivable that the Treasury Department should have been in error as to what they needed early in this session as compared with what they need now, to the extent of $150,000,000.

Mr. ASHURST. Some Senators said some years ago—and I believe they were sincere in their statements—"We ought to have a general survey of the Reclamation Service." I agreed with that. As to the items which my colleague and I put on the last deficiency bill, if we had felt that they would not stand the test of a general investigation and close scrutiny, we could not have hoped to succeed in getting the Senate and the House to agree to them. So, following out the general idea of the necessity for a survey of the Reclamation Bureau, Secretary Work appointed what is called a fact finding commission, and the fact finding commission was composed of men whose judgment on reclamation matters and whose general character could not be questioned anywhere.

The chairman of the fact finding commission was Hon. Thomas E. Campbell, sometime Governor of Arizona; James R. Garfield, who, I believe, was in President Roosevelt's Cabinet; Oscar E. Bradfute; Clyde C. Dawson; John A. Widtsoe, and Elwood Mead. These gentlemen composed the committee of special advisers on reclamation. That committee sat here for some time and made field surveys and observations. On April 10, 1924, they transmitted their report to the Secretary of the Interior, signed by the gentlemen whose names I have just mentioned, and the report was published as Senate Document No. 92, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

The fact finding commission investigated the very subject to which the amendment of my colleague relates. It will be found on page 160 of the fact finding commission's report. Under the head of "Recommendations," I read:

This division—

Now, they are referring to the Mesa division of the Yuma project, located in the State of Arizona, County of Yuma; project headquarters, Yuma; water supply, Colorado River.

Agricultural products.

Principal products: Semitropical fruit.

Size of farm unit: Not over 40 acres.

Character of soil: Fresno gravelly sand.

Elevation: 130 to 215 feet.

Annual rainfall: 3.1 inches.

Length of growing season: 335 days.

Temperature: Maximum, 115°; minimum, 28°; average, 72°.

Principal markets: Los Angeles, Calif., Arizona towns, and eastern markets.

* * * * * * *

Nationality of settlers: Ninety per cent American.

What are the recommendations respecting legislation to give relief?

This division—

That is to say, this Yuma auxiliary project (Mesa division of Yuma project)—

was constructed under the provisions of an act of Congress approved January 25, 1917, known as "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project in Arizona" (39 Stat. 868). The drastic provisions of this act are impossible of fulfillment and only a few of the settlers have been able to meet their contracts. They, too, will soon fail, as the charge for water will bankrupt them.

The committee recommends that an early study be made by the Bureau of Reclamation of this division, with a view of making Recommendations to Congress for financial relief or the disposal of the division if adequate relief is not feasible.

I betray no secret when I say that my colleague's amendment was practically prepared by the Reclamation Bureau. So eager was the Reclamation Office to secure this legislation that the bureau aided in drawing the amendment. So eager was the Secretary of the Interior to grant relief that I hope I betray no secret when I say that the Secretary of the Interior, for the first time in my knowledge, urged the Director of the Budget to O. K. and to approve this item; and for the first time in the history of the Budget—I trust I betray no secret—the Budget master said: "I am so impressed that I am willing to hear arguments on the subject."

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, does the Senator state that the Secretary of the Interior took the initiative, or did the Senators from Arizona request it?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senators from Arizona have been active for years.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. They made the request of the bureau?

Mr. ASHURST. They made the request, and the fact finding commission appointed by Secretary Work recommended it to the Secretary.

Now, I want Senators to remember that we have not suddenly sprung some dubious proposition upon the Senate.

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

Mr. ASHURST. Of course I yield to the able Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, the Senator knows that so far as the Senate conferees are concerned they are perfectly satisfied with the item. The Senator, I think, will admit that the only reason why the Senate conferees receded was because this measure ought to become a law to-day in order to avoid the discharge of a lot of men at Muscle Shoals, which will occur to-morrow if the bill does not go through to-day. The Senator will recall that one of the conferees upon the other side, the chairman of the conference committee, stated that he had not had time to read what had been presented, that he had not heard of this subject, and that if it went over he would give a full and complete hearing to it before the next deficiency bill came up. The Senate conferees are already convinced that the item is a proper one. There is no official Budget estimate yet. Now, why not let this conference report go through and have the hearing before the House committee, and if they fail, the Senators can put in their item again on this side, as they did before?

There will be no reason for speedy action upon the next deficiency appropriation bill, as there is upon this one. I hope the Senator will see that no good can come of delaying action on this report. I am satisfied, from what I heard this morning, and I think the Senator is satisfied, that the House conferees will not recede until they have had time to study this matter; and I do hope the Senator will let the conference report go through.

Mr. ASHURST. I pay attention to what the able Senator from Kansas says. I am not ashamed to say that on legislative procedure I have confidence in his judgment; but let me recite briefly to the Senator the history of the past.

The Senator is only saying what has been said to us for years and years.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, just a minute.

Mr. ASHURST. Not that the Senator from Kansas has ever made a false promise. He never has made me any promise, and if he made one I am convinced that he would keep it.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas has been with the Senators from Arizona on this proposition ever since it was first made.

Mr. ASHURST. I believe that.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator must admit that no regular estimate came to the Congress on this subject. The Senator did have a letter from the Secretary of the Interior——

Mr. ASHURST. Which I read.

Mr. CURTIS. Which was read. Of course, the House is entitled to an estimate; the House is entitled to time to consider this question; and I am speaking to the Senator as a friend of his amendment——

Mr. ASHURST. I know that.

Mr. CURTIS. As a Senator who has supported it every time it has been up——

Mr. ASHURST. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. And as a Senator who expects to support it.

Mr. ASHURST. Let me say that in June, when this amendment was put on in the Senate, and the Senate conferees were obliged to recede—and I am not blaming them; they were obliged to recede—what did the Members of another branch of Congress say? "Grant us a period of time during this recess for study." Now, after all summer has elapsed—June, July, August, September, October, November, December—they still say, "Give us more time to study this question."

I repeat, I am not impugning the motives or the good faith of any man here or elsewhere; but do you know that you can sing one song so long that the tune becomes dolorous, and the words a burden to your ear?

For years we have been told to wait for a more convenient season, for the next bill, and so forth. We tried to put this amendment on the Interior Department appropriation bill. We conferred with the friends of the legislation. "Oh," they said, "Senators, do not attempt to put that on the Interior Department bill. That is not the place for it. You might get it involved in some entanglement and tie up the whole Interior Department bill. Wait for another time." Again we refrained and did not offer it to the Interior Department bill, and men in authority in this Government said, "Be patient; be calm. We will put it on the first deficiency bill."

I shall not reveal anything that was said among Senators. Were I to reveal the same, it would be to nobody's discredit. Nothing was said among Senators but what would be to their own credit, as far as I know. They said to me and to my colleague, "You were acting wisely and handsomely in not beating the last deficiency bill last June. You have acted handsomely and wisely in refraining from offering your amendment to the Interior Department bill. The deficiency bill is the place for it." Now a power over which we have no control cavalierly says, "We will not even consider it on the deficiency bill."

If my colleague and I do not speak for our State upon these important matters of justice, who will? You are all too busy with your own affairs to take care of such relatively small matters.

There must be no juggling in this matter. I hold in my hands the outline of a report that was about to be signed by the Secretary of the Interior last June to take care of the expenses of river control on the Colorado River below Yuma, urging that the half million dollars expended by the farmers there be reimbursed to them and that the Federal Government should thereafter assume one-half the expense of maintaining the river in a fixed channel below Yuma. The letter, a copy of which I have in my hand, was about to be signed by the Secretary of the Interior, when an influence intervened. The Arizona Senators were not present to object to that influence which intervened to prevent the signature of the Secretary to this letter urging that this half million dollars be restored to the farmers.

We must meet these practical situations as they come to us. We must deal with this situation in a practical way. I have never yet in my service here obstructed a bill. I refused last June to be a party to obstructing the deficiency bill. My colleague and I are not to be held to blame if the Government agencies were paralyzed for a time by the obstruction of that bill.

I submit to the civil consideration of all Senators that we have observed those amenities that should govern gentlemen. I submit it for the calm determination of every man who attempts to represent a State, that it is but natural that after 10 years of being told from season to season to wait, the reservoir of patience which I had originally should be about exhausted. There is such a thing as going too far with even the most patient man.

For years the Senate has been convinced of the propriety, indeed, the necessity, of reimbursing the farmers who have been controlling the Colorado River below Yuma. For a long time, two or three years, the Senate has been convinced of the necessity of placing the auxilliary project under the reclamation law. The Secretary of the Interior recommends it, the Budget Bureau recommends it, the fact finding commission recommends it, and the Senate adopted the amendment twice. Shall some influence now over which we have no control be

allowed to continue, or shall we say that this appropriation is as important as any other?

Yea, more. I sat in my seat yesterday about adjournment time and heard what took place in the Senate which now appears on page 1812 of the RECORD. I did not desire to let escape an intemperate word, but I now put that circumstance into the scales to show to Senators how much injustice has been perpetrated upon Arizona, and how much more injustice apparently is contemplated. Turn to page 1812 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. President, it required all of my prudence and self-command to refrain from an outburst of indignation. I would not advert to the unfair episode were it not for the fact that I want in no uncertain terms to let the Senate and the country know that Arizona wears no shackles and spurns all bribes.

A telegram was read here last evening intimating that unless and until Arizona did a certain thing she would not be permitted to have justice. That is the tenor of the telegram, and there were some expressions, which appear on page 1812 of the RECORD, which indicated that the wise legislation for the authorization of the San Carlos irrigation project in Arizona, which had already been passed by Congress and signed by the President, would be repealed unless Arizona took a certain action before she was ready to act. That is a poor way to attempt to secure diplomatic negotiation with a sister State, and let me warn Senators now that any attempt whatever savoring of intimidation or coercion will be met, and justly met, by the contempt and the righteous indignation of every person in Arizona, and that those who gave expression yesterday to words which might be construed to be an attempted intimidation did not promote their own cause.

Arizona spurns all bribes and wears no chains. She will in her own due season, in her own way, as becomes a sovereign State, enter into agreements with other States when she is ready to do so, but not before, and the suggestion that certain laws of value to Arizona ought to be repealed or suspended until she is coerced into a particular agreement is not to be heard with patience, no matter by whom uttered.

ISLE OF PINES TREATY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the close of the morning hour having been reached, the Senate automatically goes into open executive session for the consideration of the treaty with Cuba known as the Isle of Pines treaty.

Mr. SWANSON obtained the floor.

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

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask the Senator from Kansas to withhold the call for a quorum for a moment.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator from Virginia yield to me or just one minute?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate resumes its legislative session and the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, on Wednesday we had a vote to substitute the Jones amendment for the Underwood amendment with reference to Muscle Shoals. That prevailed by a majority of 13. On yesterday we had a vote substituting the Underwood amendment for the Jones amendment, the Underwood amendment having been changed slightly to make it in order. The result was a majority of five for the Underwood proposition.

I wish to insert in the RECORD a statement that I find in the Washington Post of to-day, under the title "Underwood shoals measure is passed by Senate." There is a subtitle, "Coalition for bill," and the paragraph to which I wish to call attention reads as follows:

> The Senate approval of the Underwood measure was brought about by a coalition of administration Republicans and a group of Democrats, and came after Senator CURTIS, of Kansas, the majority leader, had conferred with President Coolidge at the White House.

CHILD LABOR

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter written by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, formerly United States Senator from Colorado, upon a question of vital importance to the American people to-day, namely, the ratification of the child-labor amendment to the Constitution. I also offer a communication to the New York Evening Post on the same subject from Hon. Henry Van Dyke, former minister to the Netherlands.

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

The communications are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 5, 1925.*

W. H. LEONARD, Esq.,
Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR SIR: I am glad to note your identification with the movement to defeat the ratification by our general assembly of the twentieth or so-called child-labor amendment to the Federal Constitution. When in Denver last July I discussed it with some of my friends and acquaintances, and have since written them urging an organized opposition to its proposed acceptance.

The past 50 years has witnessed many successful invasions of State prerogatives by the National Government, the most of them, I regret to say, with the approval, tacit or expressed, of an easy-going public sentiment. Generally they have been accompanied by the establishment of a board or bureau for their administration. These have, in greater or less degree, disturbed the original balance between the powers delegated by and those reserved to the States. The eighteenth amendment endowed the Congress with ample power to enact affirmative legislation over a subject hitherto of local concern, and clothed it with a police power which belonged to the States exclusively. This was a startling departure from our scheme of government, yet it concerns a specific subject and can not therefore be extended beyond the manufacture or distribution of intoxicants. It has, nevertheless, virtually displaced State jurisdiction over that subject, both as to administration and punishment. It has subjected individual conduct to Federal supervision and crowded the Federal courts with controversies, civil and criminal, which were hitherto wholly within the competence of the local tribunals.

But the proposed child-labor amendment is the most radical innovation in the form and the nature of our governmental system that the Congress has ever sought to accomplish. The eighteenth amendment does not in terms substitute the Federal for the State authority. It has "concurrent power" with the States to enforce the prohibition of the amendment; and although the concurrent exercise of that power may provoke conflict, in which event the State authority becomes dormant, yet it is potentially there.

But the proposed twentieth amendment tolerates no such condition. It does not supplement the State authority but supersedes it altogether. It clothes the Congress with unrestricted and exclusive power "to limit, regulate, or prohibit the labor of persons under 18 years of age." Every effort of the Senate to modify this sweeping delegation of authority was defeated by its proponents. Although familiar with judicial decisions construing Federal power to regulate commerce among the States as including the power to prohibit, they insisted upon express terms of prohibition, so that nothing should be left to the States or to the parents of children which they might invoke, even by way of implication, against an act of Congress or the rules of a bureau prohibiting juvenile activities, however pernicious the consequences to them might become.

Under this constitutional provision the authority of Congress over the Nation's youth is as limitless as that of the soviet over the children of Russia. It is not affected by the fifth amendment, which forbids legislation depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, because that is an earlier inhibition which must give way to the last expression of the people upon the subject. Hence any legislation designed to make the amendment effective and confined in its operation to the class of people described by it, will stand, whatever the grounds assigned for its enactment. It may or may not pretend to conserve the morals, health, safety, religion, or politics of our children. It may or may not discriminate between different kinds of labor, outlawing the one and legalizing the other. It may even penalize instruction or exercise or amusement; or it may and probably will subject every industry wherein child employment is permitted to a system of regulation and espionage so intricate, expensive, and burdensome as to render the employment impossible. And it will certainly subject all parents to a code of conduct and penalties regulating their relations with their offspring which will not only be destructive of parental discipline but turn every unruly child into an informer.

For it is obvious that unless parents and guardians are subjected to the inquisitorial power of the bureau charged with the administration of the law, its functions would be restricted and its effectiveness curtailed. This means a bureaucrat in every household, a Federal agent in every community. It means a suppression of parental authority and presupposes the arbitrary removal of children from the parental home and the selection of guardians both of person and property of minors subjected to any discipline or employment not sanctioned by the national commission and its swarming minions.

And since the Constitution, as well as the proposed amendment, endows Congress with full power to enforce the article by appropriate legislation, the wage of the child permitted to labor, his right to strike, the adjustment of disputes between him and his employers or between

him and adult employees, indeed, every possible phase of his existence while in such employment will find due expression either in acts of Congress or rules and regulations made thereunder.

But if the child does not labor in the usual acceptance of that familiar word, he must do something else. He is in the stage of development, material and mental, and his abundant energies will find their vent somewhere. We are told by the highest authority that the devil finds congenial work for idle hands to do. It may be affirmed, however, that what is not work is leisure, whatever its manifestations. Many forms of leisure are, however, not only laborious but demoralizing. Attendance at school is labor or leisure. Its classification is perhaps unimportant because it must be manifest upon slight reflection that the labor of a child can not be properly "regulated" unless his leisure is regulated also. Otherwise, brutal or thoughtless parents, and yet more brutal or thoughtless guardians, could easily, under the guise of amusement, recreation, education, experiment, and countless other forms of leisure, actually devote many hours of juvenile time to labor. One naturally recalls how Tom Sawyer, condemned to painting a fence as punishment for disobedience, beguiled his companions into painting it for him and paying him for the privilege. They worked and worked enthusiastically under the sinful delusion that they were at play. Such breaches of the law can not be tolerated with impunity under the approaching régime of child emancipation, lest the new reform, like nearly all its predecessors, becomes "the record of a tested and discredited remedy."

It is obvious, therefore, that if a child's labor is to be regulated by law, the same law must regulate his leisure. The regulation of both is the regulation of his life. And since virtually every child under 18 years has parents or guardian charged legally and morally with his support and education, these must be regulated also. Regulation must go a step further and include employers of labor, together with teachers, preachers, and all business enterprises devoted to supplying the public with amusements, games, recreation, and the like. Indeed, as a recent writer has said, the power conferred by this amendment "is so broad that it draws to itself as if by gravitation, a power so vast that Congress and its most ardent advocates would pause, could they realize it."

The amendment is based upon the false conception that the care and education of the child is a primary duty of the State, which has neglected it. This is not, and never was true. The primary duty is that of the parent, who is in turn responsible to the State for its due performance. If he fails or abuses the trust partly imposed and partly assumed, the State, as parens patrie, interposes and either compels such performance or itself assumes the burden. The parent is in turn entitled to the services and the custody of the child. Natural affection, born of close relationship, tempers the burden, spiritualizes the companionship, and makes the duty and its discharge a sacred and a welcome task. It is sometimes abused. So is every other relationship in life. But shall it therefore be thrust aside and supplanted by an artificial, unnatural, and heartless politico-economic, constitutional, and legislative status?

I deliberately affirm that it is the unquestioned obligation of the parent to impose the habits of industry, thrift, and a due appreciation of the value of time upon the child. He can do this only by requiring him to labor, to study, and to utilize his powers of observation. The period of childhood is the formative one as the habits, character, and tendencies of the child are assuming definite shape. "As the twig is bent, the tree is inclined." If his "direction" is normal then, it will remain so during his life. A young man whose youth is given to useful employment and the acquirement of knowledge, to respect for law and the rights of others, seldom goes wrong in after years. And he who is idle, unmindful of his responsibilities, and taught to regard labor as a burden only to be assumed with his years of maturity, can hardly be otherwise than worthless or dissolute as a citizen. For him toil has been made irksome by law, and time the concern of slaves. If labor was so pernicious that his government prohibited him from laboring for 18 years, it will be none the less so when government tutelage shall have ceased to rule his conduct.

The evil of the day as regards our youth is that it does not labor enough. The laxity of parents, synchronizing with the multiplied attractions of the cinema and the automobile and kindred modern conveniences have weaned the child from employment and in large degree have broken down the restraints and the good influences of home with its domestic discipline. Inducements to labor and the enjoyment of its fruits make little if any appeal to him. The excitements of the street and the example of his associates bring discontent if he is poor, and undue extravagance if he is not. The old virtues of obedience, thrift, and every-day morality are to be shunned rather than observed. From the universal existence of these conditions a juvenile problem of formidable proportions confronts us. But it is not the problem of labor.

Crime and juvenile delinquency have become too common to excite or even to disturb us. Murder is an American pastime, and banditry a lucrative profession. It is an appalling fact that the greater proportion of our modern criminals are youths of both sexes between the ages of 15 or 16 and 25. They are the logical offspring of idleness, turning to pleasures and excitements for the employment of time and a natural departure from the scriptural admonition which tells us to "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." We are told by a new sort of pseudo scientists that these youngsters are criminals because of inherited traits for which they are not responsible. They should not be punished for what they can not help, but rather herded in groups and fed and entertained at the public expense until their inherited criminality becomes dormant or until a cure is demonstrated to be impossible. These are to be deprived of further liberty, confined together, and supported for life from the Public Treasury. Strange that these inherited traits should coincide so perfectly with the decay of parental authority and the encouragement of idleness for children.

If this situation be curable only by constitutional amendment, better by far an amendment enforcing the obligations of parenthood upon our adult population and due employment for their vagrant offspring.

The exploitation of children in some parts of the country, and by parents whose greed blinds them to their duty, can not be denied, and the need for suppressing the evil where it exists is readily conceded. The same was true in large degree of many forms of adult labor not long ago. But the spirit of the age has condemned both, and the States—all of them—whose duty it is to protect its citizens have enacted their child and other labor codes whose enforcement is everywhere quite as effective as the work of any national bureau of which I ever heard. Each State being familiar with the needs and conditions of its people and cognizant of their industrial life, can better legislate in their behalf than a central government, which unmindful of local needs and local policy would place all our population and all parts of the country, making neither distinctions nor allowances for them, under a single code, and apply its laws alike to Maine and California, to Pennsylvania and to Alaska. What might be a boon to one section would be an outrage upon another. This is one of the subjects peculiarly of local cognizance which vividly illustrates the need and the virtue of local government and justifies the reflection of Jefferson that "Were not this great country already divided into States, the division must be made, that each might do for itself directly and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should want bread."

The advocates of the twentieth amendment concede the existence of State codes regulating child labor, but they say their provisions are defective or are not enforced, either from indifference or connivance with those who would evade them. This is not true except as the complaint might apply to laws generally, of which there are so many, State and national, that no one knows the titles, much less the contents of most of them. They are enforced quite as vigilantly and effectively as any laws, national or otherwise, are in these days, except revenue laws, whose exactions are as implacable as the laws of nature.

But if it were true that the States were lax in the enforcement of their labor laws or did not enforce them at all, what then? Has it come to pass that if a State, or several of them or all of them, are remiss in legislating or in the enforcement of laws relating to subjects within their exclusive competency, the National Government must, therefore, take over to itself the neglected subject and administer it as it deems proper? Apart from Theodore Roosevelt, I never heard of a man bold enough to announce such a doctrine. Once admitted, the consequences may be readily predicted. And if Federal administration of a subject not common to the entire country, like war, foreign relations, or customs duties, is exemplified by its enforcement of the Volstead Act, we should by far better "endure the ills we have than fly to those we know not of."

Secretary Davis is reported to have said that if the child-labor amendment had been in force in his boyhood the career which he has enjoyed would have been impossible of attainment. He began as a coal-breaker boy in the Pennsylvania mines and worked as hard as any boy ever did. He made of it an opportunity and marched from it to place after place. In 1921 he was elevated to the Cabinet of the President. Andrew Carnegie began work as a messenger boy before reaching his teens, helping his widowed mother to bear her burdens and helping himself as well to meet other and greater positions. Indeed, I dare affirm that half the Senators and Representatives of the Congress proposing this amendment began the hard and sober labor of life in their childhood, but for which they would never have attained the eminence they now enjoy. And I can conceive of nothing more brutally cruel than to deny to a boy or girl the right to aid an impoverished father or a dependent widowed mother in their effort at support by prohibiting their labor until 18 years of age.

I need not advert to the consequences to the States of this absorption by Congress of one of their principal prerogatives or to parents forcibly prevented from the discharge of their duties to the children of their loins. But I heartily commend to everyone the profound wisdom displayed by President Coolidge, who thus expressed a great truth which all should ponder well:

"Efficiency of Federal operations is diminished as their scope is unduly enlarged. Efficiency of State governments is diminished as they relinquish and turn over to the Federal Government responsibilities which are rightfully theirs."

Our emotions have for years played a dominant and generally a controlling part in our conceptions of modern industrial, political, and economic life. They have distorted evils, some of them very real, out of all proportion to their environment, and have envisaged a line of reforms which have been urged with little or no regard either to their immediate efficacy of their ultimate results. They have been advocated by organizations equipped with the weapons of entreaty, threat, and widespread propaganda. Instances of wrongs, some of them recent, most of them ancient, have been magnified with all the embellishments of rhetoric and photography. These reforms being many, and their advocates insistent as crusaders, they have made common cause with each other that all their purposes might be accomplished. Such were the forces aligned behind the child-labor amendment, and such, for the most part, the influences now bombarding the State legislatures and demanding ratification. Another of their reforms is the nationalizing of education as a fitting supplement to the amendment. With the bodies of our children enfolded in the tentacles of one national bureau and their minds lodged behind the portico of another, what remains to the citizen of that liberty he pretends to cherish and of that choice of vocation he has so highly prized? That either will long survive such a monstrous transformation of governmental activities is beyond belief.

Let it be known also that the proponents of these far-reaching innovations are precisely those who intend to preside over their administrations. Like the advocates of the maternity and other bills, they expect to be provided for. And the cost of these new reforms? That of prohibition enforcement, plus the Veterans' Bureau, the Census Bureau, and the Division of Pensions, will in the aggregate constitute a fair comparison of the cost of two such governmental agencies. The initial expense will be moderate. That is always so. But the modern bureau, consciously or unconsciously, moves along two well-defined lines. One involves an increase of jurisdiction, the other of personnel. They are like the Canada thistle or the gypsy moth. Once introduced, they grow apace and go on forever. They are now more numerous than the plagues in Egypt, and, save in a few instances, the subjects they administer were less objectionable before they were reformed. Bureaucracy is not and never can coexist with representative government. One or the other will eventually disappear. And bureaucracy shows no signs of invalidism, much less of disintegration. Every Congress adds to their numbers, and every scheme of change or reform contemplates another. Strong governments, said an ancient historian, do not perish by the operation of external forces. They commit suicide.

I do not question the sincerity of most of those who champion this amendment. They believe in governmental paternalism and chafe under the restrictions placed by the Constitution upon congressional authority. They have little confidence in the self-governing capacity of the States. They may be right, but I am unable, as a student of governments and a believer in our dual system, to perceive aught but tragedy and disaster in the growing tendency toward the centralization of all authority in the Federal Government, to be wielded by a Congress unhindered by the checks and limitations which wisdom imposed and experience has vindicated as the indispensable conditions of ordered liberty under the guerdon of a confederated republic.

Let us hope that the proposal of this amendment sets the high-water mark of emotional assaults upon American institutions, that its rejection will cause a reaction against the spirit of great and ill-considered changes prompted by some real or imagined evil, and that we may enjoy a recrudescence of statesmanship which—

"Seeing far an end sublime,
Contends, despising party rage,
To hold the spirit of the age
Against the spirit of the time."

Very truly yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

UNITED STATES CHILD LABOR LAW OPPOSED BY VAN DYKE—PRINCETON SCHOLAR WARNS USURPATION OF STATES' RIGHTS MAKES FOR IMPERIAL NATION—CITES STAND OF COOLIDGE

To the EDITOR OF THE EVENING POST:

SIR: May an old-fashioned Democrat thank you for your editorial to-day on "Federal Bribery of the States?" You have touched the point accurately and profoundly. Aid from Congress is worse than futile; it is fatal if it impairs or destroys the inherent rights or weakens the responsibilities of the States.

That our country is an indissoluble Nation since the ordeal of the Civil War no thinking man can deny. But the most vital question of our domestic politics is this:

Shall our country be an imperial Nation or Federal Nation?

It was founded and has prospered on the basis of federalism. Why change the foundation by "weasel" amendments to the Constitution, which is our safeguard of the rights of man? Frankly, I think our Federal Republic is in more danger from well-meaning borers from within than enemies without.

Take, for example, the proposed "child-labor" amendment to the Constitution. For many years, with pen and voice, I have ardently protested against the cruelty and folly of the commercial exploitation of the labor of children. But shall we cure this evil by introducing a worse one, namely, an invasion of the right of the States to home rule in domestic affairs, and the right of parents and children in each household to live together in such freedom as does not impair the liberty of others?

Who shall say that a healthy boy or girl of 14 or 15 years, left without a father, shall not do any work to help to keep the widowed mother and the rest of the family from starvation or pauperism? I tell you from experience that some of the best men and women in America have been educated by just such a working boyhood and girlhood.

Let the States regulate it by the wisest and most careful legislation they can get. Let them prosper or decline, according to the wisdom and humanity of their rule. But let not the National Government add another to the contradictory amendments under which our Constitution is already cracking wide open to ruin. Let not the people of America change from a Federal to an imperial rule without considering well what such a change means.

As a Democrat I stand by President Coolidge's admirable saying, quoted in your editorial:

"Efficiency of Federal operations is diminished as their scope is unduly enlarged. Efficiency of State governments is impaired as they relinquish and turn over to the Federal Government responsibilities which are rightfully theirs."

Yours truly,

HENRY VAN DYKE.

PRINCETON, N. J., *December 20, 1924.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of College Corner, Ohio, praying for the passage without amendment of the so-called Cramton bill, being the bill (H. R. 6645) to amend the national prohibition act, to provide for a bureau of prohibition in the Treasury Department, to define its powers and duties, and to place its personnel under the civil service act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of California presented sundry memorials numerously signed by citizens in the State of California, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution of Florence Kimball Post, No. 7, the American Legion, of Lisbon, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide further for the national security and defense, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial numerously signed by sundry citizens of Topeka and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DILL presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wapato, Granger, and Zillah, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. EDGE presented a memorial numerously signed by citizens of Vineland and vicinity, in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FERRIS presented a petition of the officers of the Oakland County Law Enforcement League, of Rochester, Mich., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice under the terms of the so-called Harding-Hughes plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Holton, Benton Harbor, Shelby, and Bangor, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS COMMITTEE

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4441) to provide for quarterly money-order accounts to be rendered by district postmasters at third and fourth class post offices, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 867) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 3937) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Dean; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 3938) granting an increase of pension to Jennie C. Young (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 3939) for the relief of Walter L. Lee; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LADD:

A bill (S. 3940) to restore homestead rights in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. LADD (for Mr. FRAZIER):

A bill (S. 3941) for the relief of William Lentz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3942) for the relief of Oscar P. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 3943) granting a pension to Bessie Knotts;

A bill (S. 3944) granting a pension to Elijah C. Waln;

A bill (S. 3945) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Mallonee; and

A bill (S. 3946) granting an increase of pension to Dortha Rodgers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3947) granting a pension to Mark Sheldon; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3948) for the relief of Henry Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 3949) for the relief of the Central National Bank, Ellsworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 3950) granting a pension to Henry Phillips (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3951) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Rodgers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3952) granting an increase of pension to Jennie E. Kelsey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3953) granting a pension to Charles C. Spencer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3954) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Lloyd (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3955) granting a pension to Mary C. B. Shultz (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3956) granting an increase of pension to Laura C. East (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3957) for the relief of William Mansfield (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE:

A bill (S. 3958) granting a pension to Harriet C. Spoor;

A bill (S. 3959) granting an increase of pension to Sarah P. Wilder;

A bill (S. 3960) granting an increase of pension to Ellen N. Lawrence;

A bill (S. 3961) granting an increase of pension to Clara G. Cole;

A bill (S. 3962) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Pattison;

A bill (S. 3963) granting an increase of pension to Estella E. Moore; and

A bill (S. 3964) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Waite; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3965) to amend section 206 of the transportation act of 1920; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 3966) granting a pension to Clara W. Stearns; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3967) to authorize the Postmaster General to rent quarters for postal purposes in certain cases without a formal written contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 3968) granting an increase of pension to George E. Coombs; and

A bill (S. 3969) granting an increase of pension to Walter E. J. Wynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 10894, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

SARAH BLACKFORD

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 299), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Sarah Blackford, widow of Charlie Blackford, late an employee on the maintenance roll, Senate Office Building, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, and said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ISLE OF PINES TREATY

The Senate, in open executive session and as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty between the United States and Cuba, signed March 2, 1904, for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Ferris	McCormick	Shipstead
Ball	Fess	McKellar	Shortridge
Bayard	Fletcher	McKinley	Simmons
Bingham	George	McLean	Smith
Borah	Gerry	McNary	Smoot
Brookhart	Glass	Mayfield	Spencer
Broussard	Gooding	Means	Stanley
Bursum	Hale	Metcalf	Sterling
Butler	Harreld	Moses	Swanson
Cameron	Harris	Neely	Underwood
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Heflin	Oddie	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Howell	Overman	Warren
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Watson
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Weller
Dial	Kendrick	Ransdell	Willis
Dill	King	Sheppard	
Edge	Ladd	Shields	

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is unavoidably absent. I wish the announcement to stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

THE ISLE OF PINES

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, we are considering a treaty negotiated on the 2d day of March, 1904, between John Hay, Secretary of State for the United States, and Mr. Quesada, then minister from Cuba, for the adjustment of title and ownership of the Isle of Pines, and which was promptly submitted to the United States Senate by President Roosevelt with a strong recommendation that the Senate give its approval to the treaty. For more than 20 years this treaty has been pending in the Senate and the Senate has taken no action, either accepting or rejecting it. On February 1, 1906, Senator Foraker reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations a resolution recommending that the treaty be ratified and fully citing the history in connection with the Isle of Pines, and gave many cogent reasons, both from the standpoint of right and broad public policy, why the Senate should promptly give its consent to the treaty as submitted.

The Foreign Relations Committee at that time was composed of many of the ablest Members of the Senate, who had participated in and were personally acquainted with all the transactions connected with the Spanish-American War and our understanding with Cuba. Of the 13 members of the committee all concurred in the report except 2, Morgan, of Alabama, and Clark, of Montana.

Ever since Cuba obtained her independence and the administration of affairs in Cuba were transferred to the Cuban Government, the Isle of Pines has been under the sovereignty of the Cuban Government and has been administered as a part of its territory. The failure of the United States to ratify this treaty has subjected this Government to much adverse criti-

cism abroad, produced ill will and apprehension in Cuba as to our future fairness and generosity in dealing with the Cuban people, has created a fear in many of the South American Republics as to our imperial designs and willingness under a plausible pretext unjustly to acquire territory. America's fair and unselfish course in the Cuban-Spanish War has been challenged and this Nation put in an attitude which is neither creditable nor desirable. The delay has been productive of no good to the Americans who have settled in the Isle of Pines nor to many others who own either land or stock in land companies organized in that island. Our failure to act upon the treaty has created hopes there which will never be realized—the hope that some day it may become a part of the United States. It has produced irritation between the island and the Government of Cuba and has tended greatly to lessen the influence of the United States in Cuba, and also jeopardizes the cordial and friendly relations which should ever exist between these two Republics, and which it is to the interest of both to promote in every fair and proper way. Our broad trade relations, which are very important, affecting our many citizens and industries, have been prejudiced and injured by our delay and contention in this matter.

The Isle of Pines is situate south of the western part of Cuba, the nearest point being about 38 miles from the mainland of Cuba, and the farthest point about 68 miles. The water separating the Isle of Pines from the mainland of Cuba is shallow and not navigable by present sea-going vessels. The island is about the size of Rhode Island, containing about 850 square miles, has an equable climate especially suitable for the growth of citrus fruits, tobacco, and tropical fruits, and has an abundance of hardwood timber which is very valuable. By the official census of 1919 there were 4,288 inhabitants in the Isle of Pines, of which 3,012 were Cuban, 263 Spanish, and 953 were of "other and unknown citizenship." According to a dispatch dated January 13, 1923, from the American consul at Nueva Gerona, Isle of Pines, to the Department of State of the United States, there were about 700 Americans resident permanently on the island.

Immediately following the Spanish-American War several land companies were organized and obtained charters in America to purchase from the holders of the old Spanish grants large tracts of land there, and the stock of these companies was sold to American citizens, and tracts of land were also sold to American citizens. It is estimated that about 90 per cent of the land in the island belongs to American citizens. It is estimated by a report of General Crowder, the American ambassador to Cuba, dated January 26, 1923, that the investments in the island amounted to about $15,000,000. While only about 700 reside on the island, it is estimated that about 10,000 Americans are interested, directly or indirectly, by the ownership of either stock or land in the Isle of Pines.

The influence of these Americans has been sufficiently strong to prevent any action by the Senate on the pending treaty. The time has arrived when the Senate owes it to itself to reach a conclusion and take official action on this treaty. Further delay is neither creditable to our Government nor promotive of the best interest of all concerned.

This Senate should do what is right and honorable in this matter regardless of any special influences sought to be exercised upon us by any of our constituents. The American Government, which stands in the world as a sponsor for fair, just, and honorable international relations, should especially be guided by what is right in dealing with a weaker sister republic who must accept without the power to resist our final decision. The very fact that we are dealing with a weaker nation should make us more resolute and more determined to decide this matter according to full justice and honorable dealing which should obtain between nations.

In order to reach a conclusion as to what should be our decision, let us examine impartially the facts as disclosed, all of which are matters of public record and can not be disputed.

For years the people of Cuba had made a valiant fight to overcome the arbitrary, tyrannical, and despotic Government of Spain, which controlled the island. The record made by the Cubans in this fight for liberation is one of heroism, sacrifice, and endurance of which any nation might well be proud. They were powerless to obtain that liberty for which they so valiantly fought. The conduct of the war by Spain became so barbarous, so inhuman, so revolting, that America could no longer remain a silent spectator of such infamies as were being perpetrated almost within sight of her shores. The misgovernment in Cuba, its lack of sanitary regulations and its perpetual violence and unrest had become a menace to our own well-being as a Nation. America could no longer permit such oppression and inhumanity to exist within the sphere of her influence. Impelled by an almost unanimous sentiment in America, on April 20, 1898, the Congress of the United States passed the following resolution:

Resolved, etc., First, that the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States hereby does demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

It should be noted that the first paragraph of this resolution, "that the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent," clearly and definitely declares on the part of the United States the freedom and independence of the Cuban people. The date of this resolution marked the date, as far as we are concerned, when the people of Cuba became free and independent and were entitled to the possession of their territory as a free and sovereign people. That declaration committed us to this policy, and, as previously stated, as far as we are concerned, the freedom and independence of Cuba commenced on that date.

It will be noted that the second paragraph stated that the United States Government demands that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces. Therefore, when Spain under the second resolution did relinquish its government and sovereignty in Cuba immediately under the first resolution it descended to the people of Cuba, whom we had therein declared to be free and independent. This can not be controverted unless we impeach the integrity of the first resolution establishing the freedom and independence of Cuba.

The third resolution directs and empowers the President of the United States to use all the land and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary to carry into effect these two resolutions, namely, to establish the freedom and independence of the Cuban people, and, second, compel Spain to relinquish all of her sovereignty over the people of Cuba thus declared free and independent and to withdraw from the island.

Congress thus declared a clear, distinct, and honorable policy, which should and must control us in our dealings with Cuba. To make more specific the purposes contemplated by Congress in thus declaring the independence of Cuba and requiring Spain to relinquish her sovereignty over Cuba to the people of the island, and in directing the President of the United States to make effective these two resolutions, a fourth resolution was added, namely:

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

Thus we clearly and distinctly assured the world, and assured the people of Cuba, that when we declared war with Spain our only purpose was, first, to establish the freedom and independence of the Cuban people, and, second, to make Spain surrender her sovereignty over the Cuban people; and, third, that when this was accomplished and the island was pacified we would "leave the government and control of the island to its people," and that we would not "exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof."

Whether this was a wise or unwise policy is not for us now to consider. Congress, the constitutional spokesman of this Nation for all purposes of war, distinctly and clearly declared this policy, and it is for us, as an honorable people, to adhere to it and not deviate from it, whatever might be the influences or selfish temptations that may be presented to induce us to do so.

When peace was declared between the United States and Spain the terms were drawn with a view to accomplishing the purposes thus outlined. The cessation of hostilities between the United States and Spain occurred in pursuance of a pro-

tocol or agreement for the establishment of peace, entered into August 12, 1898, signed by William R. Day, Secretary of State, for the United States, and Jules Cambon, Ambassador for France, for Spain. Articles I, II, and IV are the only provisions in the protocol affecting this controversy. They are as follows:

I. Spain will relinquish all claim of sovereignty over or title to Cuba.

II. Spain will cede to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies, and also an island in the Ladrones to be selected by the United States.

IV. Spain will immediately evacuate Cuba, Porto Rico, and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies; and to this end each Government will, within 10 days after the signing of this protocol, appoint commissioners, and the commissioners so appointed shall, within 30 days after the signing of this protocol, meet at Habana for the purpose of arranging and carrying out the details of the aforesaid evacuation of Cuba and the adjacent Spanish islands; and each Government will, within 10 days after the signing of this protocol, also appoint other commissioners who shall, within 30 days after the signing of this protocol, meet at San Juan, in Porto Rico, for the purpose of arranging and carrying out the details of the aforesaid evacuation of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies.

This was followed by the treaty of peace ratified April 11, 1899, containing the following articles:

ARTICLE I. Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation for the protection of life and property.

ART. II. Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies and the island of Guam in the Marianas or Ladrones.

Accordingly peace was established and the purposes outlined in the resolution declaring war against Spain made by Congress on April 25, 1898, were fully accomplished. Spain relinquished her authority and government in the island of Cuba in pursuance of the second resolution in the declaration of war. As Congress by its first resolution had declared the people of the island of Cuba to be free and independent, that sovereignty immediately descended to the people of Cuba.

The occupation by the United States, as outlined in Article I of the treaty of peace, could only be temporary as expressed in the fourth resolution of the declaration of war, which says:

The United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said islands except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the islands to its people.

Thus the declaration of war and the treaty of peace clearly and distinctly convey to the people of Cuba all that was known as Cuban territory at the time of the declaration of war and the establishment of peace. This can not be controverted. Thus the only question left for us to determine in the ratification of this treaty in pursuance of right is the determination whether the Isle of Pines at the time of the declaration of war and the ratification of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain was a part of Cuba. If it was a part of Cuba so recognized and understood at that time, this treaty should be promptly ratified and Cuba should not be deprived of any part of the territory which at that time constituted and was recognized as a part of Cuba. To do so would be to violate the assurances positively given by us to the world and to the Cuban people. We declared war against Spain and pledged ourselves to give to the Cuban people all the territory that constituted what was known and recognized then as Cuba. To refuse to do so would be a breach of faith, of which this Nation can not afford to be guilty, and which in the long course of our history would be productive of far more evil than any possible good. The best asset a nation can possess is a stainless reputation for honorable dealing and strict adherence to its pledges and promises. When national faith is broken and national pledges unfilled a nation creates distrust, forms enemies from fears and apprehensions which will ever beset its pathway. Especially would it be discreditable in us to fail to keep our faith with a weaker power like Cuba, which is compelled to accept our decision whether it is right or wrong.

It is sought by those who oppose the ratification of this treaty to insist that we acquired rights under Article II of the treaty of peace, which provides:

Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies.

They contend that Spain conveyed the Isle of Pines to the United States under the provision reading, "and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies." But this must be read in connection with Article I, wherein "Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over or title to Cuba," which sovereignty immediately descended to the people of Cuba, whom we had declared free and independent. We had also distinctly disclaimed any intention of exercising any sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over Cuba, except for the pacification thereof, and when this is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to the people.

Faith must be given to both articles in all interpretations or written documents; and hence the question reverts, as previously stated, to whether the Isle of Pines was at that time and at the time of the declaration of war against Spain a part of Cuba. If it was at that time a part of Cuba, it indisputably remained as such and belongs to the Cuban people and not to the United States. This matter became a subject of dispute soon after the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain. All the contentions against ratification that are now presented have been repeatedly given to the Senate and to the country, and all were contained in the minority report presented by Senator Morgan and concurred in by Senator Clark, of Montana.

The controversy in this matter was so acute that it finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States for determination as to whether the Isle of Pines, under Article I, became a part of Cuba or whether under Article II it was ceded to the United States and hence became a part of our territory. The matter was presented to the Supreme Court and argued fully and ably by distinguished counsel. Everything that is contended for now against the ratification of this treaty was presented to the Supreme Court of the United States for determination. The American citizens in the Isle of Pines insisted that they were a part of the United States and became such under Article II of the treaty of peace with Spain and that, as such, the territory was entitled to be treated as a part of the United States and that consequently all products produced in the Isle of Pines were entitled to admission into the United States free of all customs duties, which could only be imposed upon foreign territory. As previously stated, the case was ably and fully argued on both sides, and all that is now presented to the Senate was then fully presented, considered, and determined by the Supreme Court of the United States.

On April 8, 1908, Chief Justice Fuller delivered the opinion of the court, as follows (see Pearcy *v.* Stranahan, 205 U. S. 257):

By the joint resolution of April 20, 1898 (30 Stat. 738), entitled "Joint resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the United States disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty or control over Cuba, except in the pacification thereof, and asserted its determination, when that was accomplished, to leave the control of the island to its people. What was the signification of the word "Cuba" at that time?

The record of the official acts of the Spanish Government from 1774 to 1898 demonstrates that the Isle of Pines was included in the political division known as "Cuba." The first official census of Cuba, in 1774; the "Statistical Plan of the Ever Faithful Isle of Cuba for the year 1827"; the establishment by the governor general in 1828 of a colony on the island; the census of 1841; the budgets of receipts and expenditures; the census of 1861, 1877, 1887, and so on, all show that the Isle of Pines was, governmentally speaking, included in the specific designation "Cuba" at the time the treaty was made and ratified, and the documents established that it formed a municipal district of the Province of Habana.

In short, all the world knew that it was an integral part of Cuba, and in view of the language of the joint resolution of April 20, 1898, it seems clear that the Isle of Pines was not supposed to be one of the "other islands" ceded by Article II. Those were islands not constituting an integral part of Cuba, such as Vieques, Culebra, and Mona Islands, adjacent to Porto Rico.

Thus, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in delivering the opinion in the case, holds that the Isle of Pines went to Cuba under Article I of the treaty of peace and not to the United States under Article II; that the "other islands" therein referred to were such as Vieques, Culebra, and Mona Islands, adjacent to Porto Rico. Chief Justice Fuller further, in his opinion, cites the fact that in August, 1899, when the President ordered a census to be taken of the people of Cuba, the Isle of Pines was included in the census as a part of Cuba and as a part of the municipal district of the Province of Habana.

He further shows that in that year the military governor of Cuba appointed a mayor and first assistant mayor for the Isle of Pines; that on June 16, 1900, an election was held throughout the island and that the inhabitants of the Isle of Pines participated in this election as a part of the people of Cuba; that on September 15, 1900, a constitutional convention was called, to be participated in by the people of Cuba, and that the inhabitants of the Isle of Pines participated in the election to that convention; that after the convention concluded its work, on October 31, 1901, an election was held to choose governors of the Provinces and that the inhabitants of the Isle of Pines participated in such election as a part of the Province of Habana.

Further, in delivering his opinion, the Chief Justice said:

> We are justified in assuming that the Isle of Pines was always treated by the President's representatives in Cuba as an integral part of Cuba. This was, indeed, to be expected in view of the fact that it was such at the time of the execution of the treaty and its ratification, and that the treaty did not provide otherwise in terms, to say nothing of general principles, of international law applicable to such coasts and shores as those of Florida, the Bahamas, and Cuba.

Thus the Supreme Court of the United States has distinctly decided that the Isle of Pines is and always has been a part of Cuba, and as such continued to constitute a part of Cuba under Article I of the treaty of peace, and did not become a part of the territory of the United States under Article II of said treaty. This decision is so conclusive that the opponents to the ratification of the present treaty have sought to obviate the effect of this decision by saying it is obiter dictum and that it was not necessary for the court to reach this conclusion as to the de jure right of Cuba to the Isle of Pines, since there was no dispute that the de facto government of Cuba was exercising authority over the Isle of Pines, and the establishment of that fact would prohibit the importation of goods.

Of course, under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States if a foreign government was de facto exercising authority and the territory of the de facto government was recognized by us as in control, admission of goods from that territory would not be permissible under our customs laws. But if, as contended by the opponents of the present treaty, this territory was conveyed to the United States under Article II of the treaty of peace with Spain, there is no authority under our Constitution for the lease or disposal of the territory of the United States except the Congress of the United States or a duly ratified treaty. If this was real territory of the United States conveyed under Article II of the treaty of peace, it became absolute territory of the United States and could not be leased or disposed of by any Executive authority but only by treaty or the act of Congress. The Executive department of the Government has no authority to consent to the creation of any foreign de facto government within territory belonging to the United States. If the Isle of Pines de jure belonged to the United States, the President had no authority to consent to the formation of a de facto foreign government. There can be no question that the Chief Justice of the United States in delivering the opinion of the court clearly and distinctly decided the case de jure, that the Isle of Pines was a part of Cuba, and as such belongs to Cuba.

This decision, despite the contrary contention, is in full accord with many decisions heretofore made by the court, that what territory belongs to the United States is a political question to be decided by the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and not by the court. The acts and will of the legislative and executive control and not the will of the court. The function of the court is to interpret the acts and the expressed will of the legislative and executive departments. The court adhered to this course in this case. The legislative and executive wills had expressed themselves in the resolution declaring war against Spain, in the proctocol for cessation of hostilities, in the treaty of peace with Spain, and in the Platt amendment. The court was called upon in that case to interpret the will as thus expressed. In making this interpretation, which was clearly within its province, it decided that de jure the Isle of Pines belonged to Cuba.

Justice White, in concurring in the decision of the court, delivered a separate opinion, stating it was not necessary for the court to interpret the treaty and decide that the Isle of Pines de jure belonged to Cuba, and that the decision de jure went beyond what was necessary in order to dispose of the case. He expressed no opinion as to the de jure status of the Isle of Pines.

But Justice White admits that the majority of the Supreme Court definitely decided that de jure the Isle of Pines belonged to Cuba. The opinion of the court was concurred in by six of the nine justices, Justice Moody not sitting and Justice Holmes concurring with Justice White that it was unnecessary to decide the case de jure. Thus, after this matter was fully and ably presented by all parties to our Supreme Court, six of the nine justices decided that the Isle of Pines de jure belonged to Cuba, two of the justices were silent on that question, saying it was not necessary in disposing of the case, and one did not sit. Not one of the nine justices expressed an opinion that de jure the Isle of Pines belonged to the United States.

The decision in this case becomes far more conclusive when we reflect that Justice Day, who was a member of the court and concurred in the opinion, had as Secretary of State signed the protocol for cessation of hostilities and was chairman of the American commissioners who negotiated and signed the treaty of peace. He better than anyone else knew the just interpretation to be given to Articles I and II of the treaty. The clause "the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies" contained in Article II of the treaty, and under which the opponents of this treaty claim the sovereignty of the United States, was first used by him in a communication to the ambassador of France stating the conditions upon which the United States would make peace. He included the clause in the protocol for the establishment of peace, which was literally reproduced in Article II of the treaty. He was the author of the expression "the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies," and knew its import and real intention and purpose more than all others. He was also the author of Article I of the treaty, to wit: "Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba"—this being a reproduction of the terms used in the protocol signed by him. The peace commissioners, upon the matters affecting this controversy, simply affirmed what Day as Secretary of State had agreed to. He also included in Article IV of the protocol signed by him for the United States and the French ambassador for Spain provisions which prove conclusively that the Isle of Pines was not considered as included in the cession of "the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies." This article provides for the immediate evacuation of "Cuba, Porto Rico, and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies," and directs that each government should appoint commissioners, who shall meet within 30 days at Habana, to carry out the details of the evacuation of "Cuba and the adjacent Spanish islands," and within the same time other commissioners shall be appointed and meet at San Juan, Porto Rico, to carry out the details of the evacuation of "Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies." Thus, under Article IV of the protocol, Cuba and the adjacent islands were treated entirely different from "Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies. Separate commissioners were appointed and acted—one for "Cuba and the adjacent islands" and one for "Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies." This separation was maintained by the creation of two separate, distinct military governments—one for Cuba, "consisting of the geographical departments and Provinces of the island of Cuba," and the other the department of Porto Rico, embracing the adjacent islands. In all of these transfers and transactions the Isle of Pines was treated as a part of Cuba, and not as embraced in the term "other islands" named in Article II of the treaty.

Justice Day as former Secretary of State conducted the negotiations, signed the protocols and treaties affecting this controversy, and was fully cognizant of all the surrounding circumstances and transactions, hence more competent than anyone else to speak authoritatively upon this subject. His decision upon the matter, speaking as a Supreme Court Justice, should be conclusive upon the United States.

Every President of the United States and each of the Secretaries of State we have had since the treaty was negotiated have favored its ratification as a matter of right and justice to Cuba. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate by overwhelming majorities has four times favorably reported this

treaty to the Senate for ratification, namely, November 21, 1903, January 24, 1906, December 11, 1922, and February 11, 1924.

If the Isle of Pines became a part of the United States under the terms of the Spanish cession through the use of the words "and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies," hundreds of other islands both on the northern and southern shores of Cuba would also under the same term become parts of the United States. The United States is as much entitled to these islands under the terms of this treaty as she is to the Isle of Pines. The fact that the Isle of Pines is larger and more valuable than the other islands furnishes no excuse why it should be claimed and the others not. It is safer to presume that if the Isle of Pines was sought to be conveyed under Article II of the treaty its size and importance would have been sufficient for it to be named distinctly and not by implication. The Supreme Court of the United States is justified in reaching the conclusion that it enunciates that this island was not included in the words "other islands" named in Article II of the treaty, but that that term intended to include Vieques, Culebra, and Mona Islands adjacent to Porto Rico.

The facts alleged by the opponents of this treaty that President McKinley directed the Land Office for two years to include the Isle of Pines as United States territory on the maps published by that bureau; that Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Meiklejohn, in writing a letter to some party answering an inquiry stated that the Isle of Pines was conveyed to the United States under Article II of the treaty of peace; and that General Pershing, assistant adjutant general, by direction, also wrote a letter of similar import; and that Senator Davis, one of the commissioners who negotiated the treaty of peace, stated the island was included in the conveyance of "other islands," were all considered by the Supreme Court of the United States, weighed by it, examined by it, and despite every fact alleged by the opponents to the ratification of this treaty, the Supreme Court reached the conclusion, as previously stated, that the Isle of Pines de jure belonged to Cuba and not to the United States. All of the reasons which have been asserted against the ratification of this treaty were contained in the minority report presented by Senator Morgan, of Alabama, against the resolution ratifying the treaty in February, 1906. No other reasons have since been urged which were not contained in the very elaborate and learned report which he presented. Senator Morgan in that report recognized the strength of the argument of Cuba to ownership of the Isle of Pines and stated:

> The Senate should therefore reject the present treaty and leave the civil rights and political status of the people of the Isle of Pines to be adjusted by Congress on the determination of the question of title to the Isle of Pines by our Supreme Court or by act of Congress.

Thus, Senator Morgan clearly was willing to acquiesce in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upon this controverted question. When he made this statement the case was pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, and the court, as previously stated, has decided that the Isle of Pines de jure belongs to Cuba, and I have no doubt but that if Senator Morgan were living to-day he would acquiesce in the decision of that court and favor the ratification of this treaty. No nation can afford to ignore the decision of its own Supreme Court upon a question of law and right.

The opponents to the ratification of this treaty, recognizing the weakness of their own case under the treaty of peace with Spain, have sought to justify the rejection of the treaty under what is popularly known as the Platt amendment. The part of this amendment which affects this controversy is as follows:

> VI. That the Isle of Pines be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty.
>
> VII. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the Government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.
>
> VIII. That by way of further assurance the Government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States.

It should be noted that there were two questions left to be disposed of by agreement and treaty between Cuba and the United States under the Platt amendment. First was a treaty for the adjustment of the title to the Isle of Pines. The second was an agreement to be made for the acquirement by the United States of necessary coaling and naval stations at certain specified points to be determined. Cuba desired to perfect beyond controversy the title to the Isle of Pines. The United States desired to obtain a suitable naval base and coaling station to protect the Panama Canal and her interests in the West Indies.

It is contended that under Article VI of the Platt amendment, which amendment in its entirety was included in the Cuban constitution and afterwards incorporated in a permanent treaty, the Isle of Pines ceased to be a part of Cuba.

Article VI of the Platt amendment neither adds to nor detracts from the title of either the United States or of Cuba to the Isle of Pines. It simply recognizes a controversy as to the title to the island and provides "the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty." If the United States had no title to the Isle of Pines prior to the Platt amendment she acquired none thereby. If Cuba possessed one prior to this amendment she never lost it by entering into this agreement. The controversy was agreed to be deferred for adjustment by treaty. The Platt amendment and the full effect thereof was considered by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case heretofore mentioned, and the court decided, despite the Platt amendment, that the Isle of Pines de jure belonged to Cuba. This decision should dispose of all contention based upon the Platt amendment. The only effect of the Platt amendment is that Congress authorized the controversy to be adjusted by treaty. Thus a treaty duly ratified legally disposes of the matter. Congress selected a treaty as the agency to accomplish the settlement. This should satisfy those who believe that under the Federal Constitution property and territory of the United States can only be alienated by Congress. Congress in the Platt amendment has given authority to make this treaty, and thus all constitutional objections that might be urged to the ratification of this treaty are eliminated. If this treaty is ratified both Congress and the treaty-making power have acted in disposing of any title the United States may possess to the Isle of Pines. The constitutionality of the proceedings is beyond dispute.

But, Mr. President, the Platt amendment instead of lessening our obligation to ratify this treaty and confirm Cuba's title to the Isle of Pines, the amendment and the transactions thereunder make far more imperative our duty to do so promptly and willingly.

To carry out the two purposes sought to be accomplished in this amendment, the Government of Cuba, through its secretary of finance and acting secretary of state, José M. Garcia Montez, and the United States through its envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, Herbert G. Squires, on July 2, 1903, entered into an agreement by which the Government of Cuba leased to the United States areas of land and water for the establishment of naval and coaling stations at Guantanamo and Bahia Honda. This agreement was promptly ratified by the Presidents of the United States and Cuba. The agreement did not require the consent of the Senate under Article VII of the Platt amendment, the President being authorized to make the agreement under this section.

Thus the United States obtained a splendid naval base at Guantanamo, which is our chief base in the West Indian Islands, which is our chief protection for the Panama Canal, and upon which we have expended about nine millions of dollars. This was a coaling station and naval base desired by our Government and the best that could be obtained for our purposes. This naval and coaling station was obtained from Cuba at a nominal lease of $2,000 a year, which annual amount had to go to the payment of the cost of the condemnation of the land and buildings necessary for the station. A nominal sum was named in the lease as recognition of the sovereignty of Cuba, except for the purposes contained in the lease. Cuba has never received anything under this lease, and the time is far distant when she ever will, as the money will for many years be absorbed in payment of the costs for the lands and buildings of Cuban citizens taken for the base, which amount under the lease was advanced by our Government.

On the same date and as a part of the same transaction the same parties representing their respective Governments entered into a treaty which is similar to the present treaty pending in the Senate for ratification, with the exception that the treaty of July 2, 1903, required it to be ratified within seven months. There is no such limitation in the present treaty. The former treaty was not ratified within the seven months as specified therein, therefore it expired.

Thus the United States obtained this vital and important coaling station and base at Guantanamo in Cuba and failed to ratify a treaty which was a part of the same transaction of the same date and made by the same parties, confirming Cuba's title to the Isle of Pines and which our Supreme Court has decided de jure belongs to Cuba.

This first treaty being rejected, John Hay, Secretary of State, on behalf of the United States, and Quesada, on behalf of Cuba, on March 2, 1904, made another treaty of identical tenor, with the slight changes as noted, which treaty is the one now pending in the Senate for ratification. Even if Cuba had no right to the Isle of Pines and it was conveyed to the United States by Article II of the treaty of peace with Spain, yet for the United States, after having obtained an agreement conveying to her an important coaling and naval station at Guantanamo, to reject the treaty confirming the title to the Isle of Pines in Cuba, which treaty was the consideration for which Cuba consented to give the naval base and so expressed in the treaty, is a breach of faith and fair dealing that this Nation should refuse to perpetrate. The treaty and agreement were made the same day as a part of the same transaction and by the same parties, and they both should have been ratified or both rejected. It was not fair dealing worthy of a great Nation like the United States to ratify one and fail to ratify the other when it was understood they were part of the same transaction and each was the consideration for the other.

This agreement and treaty, viewed as one transaction, accomplished the two purposes sought in the Platt amendment. Cuba obtained undisputed title to the Isle of Pines, and the United States obtained a splendid naval base. Each gave and received a consideration. The terms of the agreement and treaty clearly indicated this. The understandings were put into two documents because the agreement as to the naval base under the Platt amendment could be made effective by the President, not requiring the consent of the Senate, but the disposition of the Isle of Pines must be by treaty, which requires the consent of the Senate.

If the United States does not ratify this treaty, it should have the justice to return to Cuba the rights obtained under the contemporaneous agreement, the consideration for which is the pending treaty. If we withhold the Isle of Pines, we should return Guantanamo. We can not in honor retain both. We can not refuse to keep the faith in this transaction pledged by our representatives. We will not consent that Cuba shall be loser by faith in our fair dealings, conveying to us a great and valuable naval base and trusting to our fairness to ratify a treaty which was the consideration which impelled her action.

Some contend that if this treaty is ratified and the Isle of Pines under it becomes a part of Cuba the provisions of the Platt amendment imposing certain obligations upon Cuba will not apply to the territory thus acquired, as it is excluded under the original constitution of Cuba. This is wholly untenable. All the obligations of the Platt amendment are obligations imposed upon and assumed by the Government of Cuba, and not dependent upon any of its territory. They are governmental and not territorial obligations. The Isle of Pines, if this treaty is ratified, remains a part of the original island of Cuba, as our Supreme Court decided it to be and that it has always been, and subject to all of its obligations. The treaty ratified only extinguishes our claim but does not alter the status of the island, which is and always has been a part of Cuba. It would only extinguish a claim which our Supreme Court has decided does not rightfully exist.

The Isle of Pines has always been treated by our Government as a part of Cuba, entitled to the same rights, and encumbered with the same obligations. Our citizens have the same rights in the Isle of Pines that they have in other parts of Cuba. We accord to the citizens of the Isle of Pines the same rights we extend to the citizens of Cuba. Our products imported into the Isle of Pines are given the preferential rates of duty that are given in other parts of Cuba. The products of the Isle of Pines imported into the United States receive the same reduced rates that we give to the other parts of Cuba. The Governments of the United States and Cuba have always treated the Isle of Pines as a part of Cuba.

Mr. President, this treaty should be ratified, and the larger and greater interests of the entire Nation should not be surrendered to the clamor and self-interest of a few. We have invested in the Isle of Pines about $15,000,000 and in other parts of Cuba more than two thousand millions of dollars, which would be seriously prejudiced and imperiled by failure to act favorably on this treaty. We have in the Isle of Pines about 700 American citizens, and in other parts of Cuba about 15,000 who would be adversely affected by the rejection of this treaty. Thus, if we should discard all sentiment of right and justice in the settlement of this matter and be controlled by considerations of self-interest alone, the treaty should be ratified and the larger interest prevail over the smaller.

National honor and performance of national faith are more important to a nation than the enrichment of a few. If our citizens were induced to go to the Isle of Pines to invest and acquire homes and lands by any representations of our governmental authorities or officials and if they are due reparation for thus being misled, the Government should make full reparations, but they should not be made by spoliation from Cuba. The citizens of the United States who went to the Isle of Pines—and no doubt some went there misled by representations of some of our officials and which representations were grossly exaggerated by promoters—the Government of the United States should make just and proper amends to them in all reasonable cases for the losses incurred. The Government of Cuba was not responsible for any representations made by officials of the United States and should not be penalized and made to incur losses to sustain these representations. This Nation is strong enough and rich enough to be responsible for its own acts and to make amends for its own acts without despoiling weaker nations. If American citizens in the Isle of Pines or the investors in property there have any cause or grievance against this Government, let them present the facts in their cases, and Congress will give them full and fair consideration.

This Government will meet all of its obligations and can itself discharge all of its responsibilities. This Government will protect to the fullest extent the rights and property of every American citizen in the Isle of Pines. No Cuban Government would dare to interfere with these rights or refuse to accord American citizens there a full measure of justice. Our treaties with Cuba guarantee to all American citizens, as long as they remain American citizens, the rights possessed by all foreigners. Under the Cuban constitution foreign citizens have the same right of property, of liberty, and personal rights as are possessed by the citizens of Cuba. Therefore, if this treaty is ratified the personal and property rights of American citizens there will be equal to those of the citizens of Cuba. We have a strong, active, vigilant Government to see that all the rights of person and property are accorded our citizens to the fullest extent.

I believe it is to the best interests of the American citizens in the Isle of Pines and those who have invested there for this treaty to be ratified and the status of this island definitely and permanently fixed. Cuba has no idea of signing any treaty surrendering her sovereignty over this island. She insists it is a part of Cuba and she will never surrender by agreement or treaty her rights. She can not be expected to do so when our own Supreme Court has rendered an opinion establishing her right, and the only way the United States can ever obtain the Isle of Pines is by force or war. The people of this country will never consent to wage war on Cuba to assert a claim so unrighteous as is sought to be presented in this matter. Force, and only force, can tear the Isle of Pines from Cuba. This Nation will never vote to use this force to perpetrate this injustice. War, except to obtain definite and just objects, is no longer countenanced and will not be indulged in by the American people to obtain territory to which they are not entitled. Patriotism and love of country are not manifested by urging our country into acts of aggression and wrong, but are better manifested in desiring that our country always acts honorably, fairly, and justly, and to keep, without equivocation and without hesitation, its honorable pledges and promises.

Mr. RALSTON addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time, with interruptions, he yielded the floor for the day.

[Mr. RALSTON's speech is published entire, beginning on p. 1950.]

The Senate having resumed legislative session,

THE SENATE MANUAL

Mr. CURTIS. As in legislative session, I ask leave to report a resolution from the Committee on Rules. I may state that it is the usual resolution in regard to printing a new edition of the Senate Manual. All the data for it have been prepared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the report will be received.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 300), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 3,500 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

LEASES UPON NAVAL OIL RESERVES (REPT. NO. 794, PART 3)

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, submitted a supplemental minority report (pursuant to Senate Resolution 147, providing for an investigation of the subject of leases upon the naval oil reserves), signed by Senators SMOOT, STANFIELD, BURSUM, CAMERON, and SPENCER.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8887) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations," approved November 7, 1918; to amend section 5136 as amended, section 5137, section 5138 as amended, section 5142, section 5150, section 5155, section 5190, section 5200 as amended, section 5202 as amended, section 5208 as amended, section 5211 as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and to amend section 9, section 13, section 22, and section 24 of the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RECESS

The Senate resumed its executive session.

Mr. CURTIS. In open executive session, I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m.) in open executive session, took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, January 16, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, *January 15, 1925*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God. Thou art able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think. O come to us and stimulate and encourage us in all good work. Give us light and wisdom that shall be as revelations to our limited understanding. May we give ourselves to our tasks with all industry and patience. In the hour of judgment look upon the bow of promise and remember how frail we are. Consider our country, O Lord, and direct all who do our thinking and lead our sentiment. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 518) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War, for national defense in time of war and for the production of fertilizers and other useful products in time of peace, to sell to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, nitrate plant No. 1, at Sheffield, Ala.; nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Waco Quarry, near Russellville, Ala.; steam power plant to be located and constructed at or near Lock and Dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., with right of way and transmission line to nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; and to lease to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 (as designated in H. Doc. 1262, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), including power stations when constructed as provided herein, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 6498) for the relief of May Adelaide Sharp.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 387) to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed Senate concurrent resolution of the following title:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 26

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed in the enrollment of the bill (S. 387) to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia, to strike out on page 1, line 3, of the engrossed bill the following: "on and after the 1st day of July, 1924," and insert "hereafter."

TO RESTORE GENERAL COMMERCE ON THE GREAT LAKES AND RELIEVE AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. PEAVEY. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order at this time, I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill H. R. 11541.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEAVEY. Mr. Speaker, the economic failure of the grain-growing States of the Northwest in the past five years has become a national problem. The President of the United States has selected a commission for the purpose of determining the cause and if possible to prescribe a remedy. Both national political parties and leaders in both branches of Congress have proposed legislative remedies, and dozens of farm organizations have sought for a solution, all to no avail. The economic condition of the whole Northwest, as shown by the continued failure of banks and business men and farmers, is as acute to-day as it was in 1921. An old sore becomes more tender with the application of each new remedy without a cure. There are those who say the remedy for agriculture in the Northwest lies in the power of the farmers themselves, that they should work more and spend less; there are those who tell us our best hope lies in cooperative marketing, that if we would combine all our products and standardize them we would solve the difficulty, but I want to say to the Members of this House and the people of the country, *that work as long and as hard as we may, cooperate as much as we will, it will not alter the fact that high transportation costs in the form of railroad rates is slowly but certainly strangling business, commerce, yea, even the very existence of the people living in the Northwest. This is a startling statement, I grant you, but bear witness in the three years, 1921 to 1924, we closed 2,000 banks and locked up 600 schoolhouses in nine Northwest States.* I would not say that my bill, No. 11541, creating a Government-owned and operated fleet on the Great Lakes would solve this great problem entirely. I do believe it would remove the largest single cause.

History, since the beginning of this country, shows that people and commerce have followed the channels of water to establish homes, business, and industry. The Great Lakes territory is no exception to this rule. Beginning with Father Marquette, who settled at La Pointe, Madeline Island, near Bayfield, on Lake Superior at the entrance to Chaquamegon Bay back in 1667–1669, there has been a steady and natural development in the cities and counties bordering on these great bodies of fresh water. This growth in the harbor cities, and the consequent increase in business and commerce continued on the Great Lakes until about 1915. On or about 1915 to 1922, with the advent of the United States Steel Corporation and the corporation known as the Lake Carriers' Association, harbor cities on the Great Lakes with the exception of Duluth, Superior, and Ashland, where iron ore is loaded into the association's vessels, and at Cleveland and Buffalo, where it is unloaded, showed a great reduction in volume of general commerce. Lake cities like Oshkosh, Sheboygan, Green Bay, Kenosha, Racine, Muskegon, Frankfort, Menominee, Bay City, Huron, and Grand Haven, have, in the period 1915 to 1922, suffered 30 to 40 per cent loss in lake commerce. In the great cities of Chicago and Milwaukee the commerce by water has dropped from 10,585,000 tons in 1915, to 6,473,000 tons in 1922.

WATER TRANSPORTATION PRIME NECESSITY

Students of this problem admit one of the major difficulties confronting the northwestern farmers is better markets, at less cost of transportation. There is no good reason why the major portion of the farmers' products raised in that section can not find their way to strong eastern markets with even more reason than the raw iron, copper, and lumber that now go east for their markets. In three of the last five years, the farmers in northern Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Dakotas left thousands of acres of excellent potatoes to rot in the ground. Transportation and marketing costs were so high as to prohibit their digging. All this time the consuming public of great cities like Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Buffalo, Rochester, and Albany were paying a handsome price for potatoes to eat. Butter, eggs, livestock, in fact nearly every product the northwestern farmer produces could be transported via Duluth, Superior, Ashland, Milwaukee, and many other harbor cities on the Great Lakes to the people of the East at water-transportation cost which on most commodities would be not more than one-fourth and as low as one-tenth the existing railroad rates on these same shipments. In order that other Members may secure a better understanding of the question involved, particularly as to the relative cost of water and rail transportation, let me give you the following illustration:

POWDER TRUST CAN SHIP RAW PRODUCTS HALFWAY AROUND THE WORLD FOR LESS THAN NORTHWEST FARMER CAN SHIP PRODUCE TO CHICAGO

I live in Washburn, Wis., a harbor town on Lake Superior. The Du Pont Powder Co. maintains a powder plant near this city and ships sodium nitrate from Chile, South America, for use in the manufacture of high explosives. This ingredient is brought from Chile via Cape Horn and the Atlantic and up the St. Lawrence River, reloaded into lake vessels at the Welland Canal and delivered *at the dock in Washburn, a distance of 6,000 miles, at the same rate per ton as that charged by the railroads for shipment by rail from Washburn to Gary, Ind., a distance of 478 miles.* Press notices inform us that the railroads in the Northwest are now proposing general freight increases to go into effect in February or March, 1925. If true, this would seem to indicate either lack of knowledge of or an utter disregard for existing conditions in that territory.

"PENNSYLVANIA PLUS"

The people of the Northwest are to-day required to pay coal prices based upon railroad freight rates of $5.41 to $5.96 when the average cost per ton in carrying the coal from mine to Buffalo and Cleveland ports is $2.60 plus water haul to Ashland, Superior, and Duluth of 40 cents per ton, makes the transportation cost of $3 per ton or $2.41 to $2.96 less than they are now required to pay. This charge when reflected in retail coal prices now being paid by the consuming public would mean $3 to $5 per ton on every ton purchased. *Government transport on this item alone would effect a saving of $30 to $75 per year to every home owner.* It would make possible the operation of industrial plants that now lie idle, they being unable to compete with like concerns in the East because of the difference in cost of fuel, a principal item of expense. This lake rate of 40 cents a ton on coal, however, is a cargo rate only and individuals or firms using coal in the Great Lakes States and western Canada are thereby effectively prohibited from having the advantage of this cheap and natural means in procuring coal owing to the fact that the average cargo of coal carried by the boats of the Steel Corporation fleet varies from four to fourteen thousand tons.

Automobiles could, by Government transport, be delivered from Detroit and near-by manufacturing centers to northwestern buyers at Superior and Duluth at a cost of $11 to $16 per car where existing freight charges via Chicago approximate $56 to $112 for the ordinary touring car.

Government or other boats carrying this commerce to the East can readily find return cargoes in the form of manufactured goods from the East thereby benefiting the East and West alike. Such arrangement in commerce would not, in my judgment, injure the railroads; it would, I believe, increase their business as lines of support and in the consequent increase in general business that would be bound to accrue as a result of putting the farmers and business houses of the Northwest back on a self-supporting basis, the railroads would be bound to participate in the era of prosperity that would follow.

Man-made law now in operation on the Great Lakes has supplanted the natural law under which God intended that the Great Lakes should serve the people of America as a channel of commerce. I respectfully submit to my colleagues in this House and the people of the whole country that this substitution under which the United States Steel Corporation, through the agency known as the Great Lakes Carriers' Association, has subsidized and converted the Great Lakes as a channel of commerce to their own use, thereby removing all competition as between rail and water transportation as well as between the railroads themselves. This, I maintain, has brought about the economic failure of the great Northwest.

COMPETITION BETWEEN RAIL AND WATER BORNE TRANSPORTATION BASIS OF FUTURE PROSPERITY

The fact is that some degree of prosperity has prevailed during the past five years in the lower Mississippi or Gulf coast section, likewise in the Atlantic and Pacific Coast States, the further fact is also that all these sections of the United States so mentioned enjoy reduced railroad transportation costs due to competition from water carriers.

The influence of water transportation along the Atlantic seaboard, Gulf coast, and Pacific Coast States, also on the Mississippi as far north as St. Louis and Kansas City, by competition between the water and rail lines has reduced transportation costs to about 60 per cent of the rates that now prevail in the Northwestern States. This is not only grossly unfair and destructive of all prosperity in the Northwest but the people of that section, including myself, believe that the railroads in order to recover some of the losses and reduced earnings in the seaboard States mentioned, have increased their rates and tariffs in central and northwestern America to recoup these losses.

This is shown quite clearly in the incomprehensible system of rates and tariffs that prevail on all of the northwestern railroads at this time wherein scarcely any person or shipper can find out or determine in advance what the freight charges on a given shipment is to be. Traffic experts are themselves often confused and unable to tell. A shipper inquiring from his local agent is often quoted one tariff and later it may be increased or diminished upon reference to the division manager of the same road. If the shipment is to be continued or is large enough in itself to warrant such action, an appeal to the general manager of the railroad will often bring a still different tariff quotation. State rate commissions when appealed to in such cases often submit a finding quoting a still different price, which may be higher or lower, than any of the previous estimates. This has brought about a condition during the past five years whereby hundreds of experienced traffic accountants have opened offices and engaged in the business of auditing the freight bills paid by the shippers in the several localities upon a commission basis. Such accountants usually receive for these services from 20 to 50 per cent of the amount that they recover from the railroads in overpaid rates or tariffs. All of which shows quite conclusively the truth of the above assertion, *to wit, that the railroads of the Northwest are to-day operating without a fixed system of charges or rates on their shipper patrons and that they do in fact charge almost any rate, and the helpless shipper under these circumstances has no alternative but to pay. In view of this condition of affairs I believe the people of the Northwest are fully warranted in their belief that they not only pay the high rates exacted by the railroads in that section of the country but that they are being required to pay additional tariffs and rates to make up in part to the railroads in revenue for the low competitive rate established by such rail lines where brought in competition with water transportation in the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific Coast States.*

I ask you to take one glance at a map of the United States. Note the position of the Great Lakes in relation to the stricken areas of the Northwest and I believe the truth of my statements and deductions will be clear to you. The one, if not the only, remedy lies in restoring to the people of the Northwest that which the favored sections of the United States already enjoy, to wit, water transportation for general commerce and competition between rail and water carriers as the best means of securing the best transportation service at the lowest possible cost.

Development of the great States of Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, the two Dakotas, Montana, Nebraska, Iowa, and Illinois has already been retarded 20 to 30 years by this unfortunate and illogical conversion of the Great Lakes to private use and corporation profit. Zeal for immediate and larger dividends can only account for this reactionary and short-sighted action on the part of those men, managers, and concerns who would thus curb and retard the development of a great empire that a higher transportation price be secured on the small volume of commerce that must by necessity for a time overflow the dam of prohibitive transportation cost rather than to accept a fair or reduced return on the great volume of commerce that would naturally flow through the Great Lakes to the whole United States were it left unobstructed.

Remove the clutch of reaction that now controls the commerce on the Great Lakes, require the railroads of that section in their own interest and the general public interest to establish and maintain physical connection with the boats carrying general commerce on the Great Lakes, and the people of these States and the several cities and towns bordering these waters will experience an era of business prosperity and expansion that will attract the attention of the Nation. In place of rotting wharves and dilapidated warehouses, we would again hear the shrill whistle of hurrying tugs. Watching the ore boats as they pass from Duluth and Ashland to eastern ports would no longer be a novelty to all the other harbor cities on the Lakes. But they would soon become but a part of the great concourse of boats carrying what the farmers of the Northwest produce to the consuming toilers of the cities in the East, and returning bring to the people of the Northwest the manufactured goods they require in the form of clothing, machinery, and the thousand and one other necessities of life.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY IDLE DREAM UNLESS GENERAL COMMERCE IS RESTORED TO GREAT LAKES

There is another proposal that offers some relief to the people of the Northwest from the conditions described, but of this I can only say:

The St. Lawrence-to-the-sea waterway has long been used to divert the people's attention from the subject of the passing of general commerce on the Great Lakes. It has been held out

and tendered to the people of the Northwest as the "savior to be" of that section of America. People in that section have been made to lose sight of their immediate and greater injury in the rainbow-hued colors of what is to happen once the Great Lakes are connected with the sea via the St. Lawrence.

The future hope of vessels flying foreign flags tying up to the docks of small-harbor cities like the one in which I live—Washburn, Wis.—in places like Bayfield, Port Wing, Cornucopia, Green Bay, Oshkosh, Sheboygan, Kewaunee, Racine, Kenosha, and the dozens of other like cities on the Great Lakes is indeed an alluring picture on which to fix one's future hopes. But, gentlemen of the House, let me call your attention to the plain though unpleasant fact *that long before the St. Lawrence Channel is opened to the sea and many years before any ship carrying foreign flags enters a Great Lakes harbor nearly every dock, wharf, warehouse, and other harbor facility in the cities on the Great Lakes, other than those five or six places necessary to the operations of the United States Steel Corporation, will from nonuse and neglect have rotted into the waters of the bays on which they stand.* I am a firm supporter of the St. Lawrence waterway, but a mere cursory glimpse of commerce or harbor statistics on the Great Lakes will show the most optimistic supporter of the St. Lawrence seaway route that long before this channel can be promoted and built general commerce on the Great Lakes will have depreciated and disappeared from our several harbors. When that time comes there will be neither general commerce nor harbor facilities with which to receive or support our foreign visitors.

STATISTICS OF COMMERCE OF BUREAU OF ENGINEERS OF UNITED STATES SHOW PROGRESS OF NORTHWEST RETARDED

Statistics of the United States Bureau of Engineers show conclusively the truth of these assertions. Eliminating so far as possible the iron and coal carried by the United States Steel carriers, these figures on all of the Great Lakes harbors show that general commerce on these Lakes increased from 1904 to 1909, 46.16 per cent, from 1909 to 1915, 23.13 per cent, and since the advent of the present noncompetitive system or arrangement between the United States Steel Corporation's carriers and the northwest railroads lake commerce from 1915 to 1922, including the World War period, has decreased 24.52 per cent. I ask you to bear in mind in this connection the startling information that the population of these several harbor cities and adjacent territory from 1904 to 1922 has increased by leaps and bounds and the volume of general business transacted has increased accordingly. To continue the present conditions means that, for all practical purposes, in 30 years' time general commerce will have disappeared entirely from the Great Lakes.

SEPARATION OF RAIL AND BOAT LINES CAUSE OF PRESENT CONDITION

General commerce has been driven from the Great Lakes. The greatest known inland channel of commerce in the world has been converted to private use. The tremendous volume of shipping of general freight on these inland seas that existed 10 years ago is fast disappearing. Students of this problem tell us that the reason for it is the divorcement of the railroads from the lake carriers under the Panama Canal act which provided that those railroads owning steamships that used the Panama Canal and thus competed with the railroad should dispose of their ships; that is, divorce themselves from the water carriers. It was thought that a railroad ought not to compete for business with itself. Consequently, the railroad-owned ships on the Great Lakes were disposed of to private owners. Now, the railroads no longer have any interest in lake carriers and they do not make any attempt to make physical connections with lake shipping lines, so that private owners of lake vessels were soon driven out of business, due to the fact that there were no railroad connections with their warehouses and wharves. The only lake shipping that could possibly survive was that carried on by the big corporations like the Steel Trust that had enormous amounts of freight to ship, terminal facilities of their own, and physical connections with their own railroads. The result is that out of 121,000,000 tons of freight carried on the Great Lakes in 1923, 66,000,000 consisted of iron ore, 34,000,000 of coal, 12,000,000 of grain, 9,000,000 in rock ballast (crushed stone and gravel), all of which was carried in bottoms owned by the Lake Carriers' Association, a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation.

The general commerce, private in nature, carried on the Great Lakes in 1923 was so small in volume as to be a negligible factor.

The steel corporation does not solicit nor does its boats carry any considerable cargo other than iron ore and wheat. Coal is simply a return cargo for the ore freighters that would otherwise have to return empty from Cleveland and Buffalo to Duluth. The rock and gravel ballast mentioned is for the most part used for the maintenance and improvement of the harbors used by the corporation's boats.

There is not a single harbor on the Great Lakes to-day where physical connections between water-borne commerce and that by railroads is encouraged, maintained, or, for the most part, permitted. Nineteen northwest railroads centering in Chicago in no way compete for or solicit the transportation business now being carried by the Lake Carriers' Association, nor does the steel corporation's carriers try to obtain the freight or solicit the transportation business for central North America which is now being carried exclusively by the railroads. Whether this condition between the railroads and these lake carriers exists by virtue of a written agreement or by a tacit, mutual understanding, I am not here concerned.

Were the interested parties to bring this matter before the courts, it might be proved that an illegal arrangement existed; but as for myself and the people I represent, we are not so concerned with the legal phases of this great question as we are in its economic result. We believe this conversion of the Great Lakes as a channel of commerce into a privately operated transportation system for the United States Steel Corporation is contrary to public policy and indefensible from the standpoint of the individual rights of the people residing in States bordering on the Great Lakes, on the one hand, and the holders of United States Steel securities on the other. We believe its continuance to be an economic crime. We believe the Government is permitting unjust discrimination against the people of the Northwest by allowing the United States Steel Corporation or anyone else in this manner to secure reduced transportation charges, to ship the natural resources of iron, steel, copper, and wood belonging to Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and adjoining States such as Illinois and Ohio, via the Great Lakes to States on the Atlantic seaboard, there to be manufactured and in a great many instances the finished product shipped back by rail to the people of the States mentioned and purchased in the form of necessities at price increases of 100 to 1,000 per cent, a very large part of the increased price being due to the double transportation charges. I believe the farmer and business man of the Northwest have just as much right to the advantage of low transportation cost as have the owners of steel.

WE SEEK RELIEF, NOT PUNISHMENT

Gentlemen, neither myself nor the people I represent hold any prejudice against the United States Steel Corporation or the railroads as such; but we do believe that neither of these great organizations, nor any other for that matter, should be permitted to usurp the natural rights belonging to the people of that section of the country. We are perfectly willing that these organizations shall be paid for the service they actually render to the people, but we are absolutely opposed to being deprived of a natural means of cheap transportation and of being forced to use the artificial means offered by the railroads at an enormously increased cost. We are willing to pay and support any concern or industry that promotes the development of our country and our prosperity, but we are unalterably opposed to any system, combination, or trust that restrains and obstructs the progress of our people and the development of our resources.

Millions have been spent in the past for improving harbor facilities, building docks, wharves, and so forth, by these great cities and the United States Government. Is the progress of the Middle West to be stifled by killing general commerce on the Great Lakes? Are we to permit the United States Steel Corporation and the railroads to padlock the door to the world's granary? The people of this territory ask only a fair chance to develop their communities, and are willing that every legitimate industry should have a like chance to develop, but the opportunity is not afforded them, nor can it ever be so long as their natural outlet by water transportation is denied them.

GOVERNMENT ONLY CAN RESTORE THAT WHICH IT HAS PERMITTED TO BE DESTROYED

In the second session of the Sixty-first Congress, 1910, an amendment was offered and adopted to the rivers and harbors bill then being considered by the House out of which grew the act creating the Inland Waterways Corporation. I refer to this matter as furnishing a necessary precedent for the proposal which is to follow, namely, my bill, No. 11541, which provides that the Government of the United States shall be authorized, through this corporation, on an increased capital stock of $12,000,000, to take over and operate the 320 vessels now belonging to the United States and in the possession and

under the control of the United States Shipping Board or Emergency Fleet Corporation. These vessels are now stationed in the several harbors on the Great Lakes and Hudson River, where they are floating idle at the docks and fast deteriorating in value. They were constructed by the United States Government during the war especially for lake service. They were of immense practical value in such service, but will of necessity become of little or no value if left to rot at their moorings. I therefore propose that the said Inland Waterways Corporation be authorized and empowered to put into actual service in the carrying on of general lake commerce as many of these boats as may be found practicable and necessary and that the number of boats so used shall be increased as rapidly as such Government corporation shall be able to use them in the transportation service; that the said Government corporation be given the necessary authority by Congress to secure and enforce physical connection or contact between the boats of the corporation and any and all railroads operating in the territory adjacent to the Great Lakes.

I believe that such Government corporation should be given the power and authority to expend reasonable amounts of money from their receipts for such dissemination of information and knowledge regarding its service as will enable it to secure general public support and business, and in this manner restore general traffic to the Great Lakes.

I sincerely hope that Congress and the people of the United States will restore the Great Lakes to the people of that section of America as an unrestricted, unobstructed channel of commerce, restored to its proper plane as the greatest natural inland waterway in the known world.

I append herewith a comparative statement for the several harbors on the Great Lakes, showing the total tonnage of each harbor as to general commerce, with notations as to those harbors in which steel and coal are included. These figures are taken from the Report of the Bureau of Engineers of the War Department for the years 1904, 1909, 1915, and 1922. Note the rapid decline in general commerce for the years 1915 to 1922 as referred to in the remarks.

That you may realize the extent and effective manner in which the United States Steel Co., through the Lake Carriers' Association, has subsidized the Great Lakes as a channel of commerce and converted them to its own use, I submit the following compilation prepared by the Secretary of the Lake Carriers' Association:

Net tons of freight carried on Great Lakes in 1923

Iron ore	66, 121, 108
Coal	33, 137, 028
Grain	11, 850, 446
Stone	9, 920, 422
Total	121, 029, 004

Ports	1904 commerce, in thousands of tons				1909 commerce, in thousands of tons				1915 commerce, in thousands of tons				1922 commerce, in thousands of tons			
	Iron ore	Coal and sand	Others	Total	Iron ore	Coal and sand	Others	Total	Iron ore	Coal and sand	Others	Total	Iron ore	Coal and sand	Others	Total
Duluth and Superior	655	3,892	2,210	16,617	22,479	5,663	4,387	32,529	26,316	8,344	5,835	40,495	26,904	5,934	5,364	38,202
Milwaukee				[1] 5,406	4,193	192	1,352	[1] 5,737	213	4,859	2,264	7,326		2,790	826	3,616
Milwaukee ferry traffic										212	582	794		430	1,149	1,579
Kenosha				45				84				73				25
Racine				412		133	127	260		199	48	247		226	20	246
Waukegan				220		143	37	180		204	25	229		78	18	96
Sheboygan				5,725		460	59	519		591	74	665		459	17	476
Manitowoc				[1] 1,504		642	687	[1] 1,329		365	55	420		226	106	347
Manitowoc ferry traffic										144	1,023	1,167		285	1,017	1,302
Kewaunee				[1] 558				[1] 177				7				1
Kewaunee ferry traffic												189				235
Green Bay				1,524		141	545	686		680	141	821		692	156	848
Menominee				312	6	16	180	202		197	81	278		97	137	234
Grand Haven				[1] 471				[1] 560				209		38	23	61
Grand Haven ferry traffic												454		146	480	626
Muskegon				157				115				115				382
Ludington				[1] 1,631		449	1,291	[1] 1,740		70	389	459				264
Ludington ferry traffic									27	675	620	1,322		408	1,357	1,765
Manistee				319				439				90				42
Charlevoix				113	63	2	162	227	111		61	172		26	16	42
Gladstone				494	23	145	301	469						78	12	90
Chicago				4,446				4,234				3,259				2,857
Michigan City, Ind				68				20				15				2
Cheboygan				131				349				139				18
Alpena				202	95		553	648		871	295	1,166		24		24
Saginaw River				277				342				156				86
Toledo				3,115	1,507	3,591	187	5,285	1,298	5,394	729	7,416	1,383	7,737	304	9,424
Sandusky				1,436		1,413	174	1,586		3,177	57	3,234		3,469	28	3,496
Huron				502	272	608	1	881	779	621	6	1,406		1,113	1	1,114
Lorain				2,393	3,125	2,083	12	5,220	3,940	3,068	2	7,010	3,114	2,358	27	5,498
Cleveland				9,359	6,768	4,059	1,565	12,392	8,405	2,619	1,528	12,631	8,048	2,421	469	10,925
Fairport				1,781	1,942	656	105	2,703	2,241	698	370	3,309	1,157	517	279	1,953
Ashtabula				[1] 5,664	9,668	3,469	17	[1] 13,154	8,751	5,711	1,059	[1] 15,521	8,669	3,321	1	11,991
Ashtabula ferry traffic																402
Conneaut				[1] 4,548	8,409	1,274	64	[1] 9,747	9,602	2,133	55	[1] 11,790	7,331	1,874		9,109
Conneaut ferry traffic																243
Erie, Pa				2,510	1,383	1,170	581	3,114	795	1,656	845	3,296	746	1,298	168	2,212
Buffalo				10,783	5,324	3,052	5,769	14,145	6,019	3,864	8,837	18,720	4,334	2,127	11,118	17,679
Tonawanda				906				990				967				163
Charlotte				[1] 554				[1] 873				[1] 1,073				79
Charlotte ferry traffic																562
Oswego				712				669				753				224
Ogdensburg				[1] 898				[1] 646				633				415
Ferry traffic												417				706
Agate Bay, Minn				5,350	10,283	292	53	10,628	8,643	238	1,082	9,963	6,667	157	27	6,851
Ashland, Wis				3,435	4,322	636	438	5,396	5,772	694	68	6,534	6,510	529	25	7,064
Washburn, Wis														34	5	[2] 39
Bayfield, Wis																[2] 10
Port Wing, Wis				44				29				1				1
Total				94,613				138,294				164,941				143,617
Total, less iron ore, stone, sand, and coal [4]								28,164				34,681				29,858
Less car-ferry traffic [4]												31,396				23,709
Per cent increase or decrease								+46.16				+23.13				−24.52

[1] Includes commerce later handled by car ferries. In these years freight arrived by railroad to this port was unloaded onto lake carriers, carried across the lake, and reloaded onto railroad cars. Ferries now handle much of this traffic, railroad cars being carried across the lake without unloading.

[2] Statistics for 1904, 1909, and 1915 not available. Commerce for 1920, 82,000 tons.

[3] Statistics for 1904, 1909, and 1915 not available. Commerce for 1920, 7,000 tons.

[4] Less iron ore, sand, stone and coal to get the total of *general* commerce. These products have been taken from the ports where they form the principal items of commerce.

Commerce for 1904 not separated by commodities because statistics are not available for a number of ports. The same is true of ferry traffic for 1904–1909.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House Resolution No. 400, a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 400

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11472, entitled "A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the bill, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule, and that the provisions in all paragraphs of said bill shall be in order. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the present resolution, if adopted by the House, simply provides for the consideration of bill (H. R. 11472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, commonly called the river and harbor bill. It provides for two hours' general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and equally divided between those favoring the bill and those opposing the bill.

At the proper time I shall ask to change the rule so as to have the time controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and by the ranking minority member of that committee. I shall do this because I understand there is no member on the committee that is opposed to the bill in its present form.

In lines 11 and 12 this rule makes provision that all the paragraphs of the said bill shall be in order. I am not entirely sure that it was necessary to put that provision into the rule, but in the past at various times objections have been made and points of order have been raised as to whether the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction of canal projects. I find on looking over the RECORD that chairmen have decided each way, and each decision has been supported by the House, depending on whether there were more men in the House at that time in favor of the project in question or opposed to it. And in order to provide against any such condition, we have therefore provided by the rule that all paragraphs of the present bill will be in order.

The balance of the rule is what is usually presented and provides for the consideration of the bill under the regular rules of the House.

I simply desire to say at this time in regard to the bill that it is the first river and harbor bill in three years. It authorizes 33 new projects, at an aggregate limit of cost of $39,150,000, the work to be done over a period of five years, at an average of about $8,000,000 per year, and not to exceed $10,000,000 in any one year. The probabilities are that the average expense per year for the next six or seven years, as the result of this bill, will not be to exceed $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 per year.

I feel that this bill is in every way in harmony with the policy adopted by Congress to make Federal appropriations at this time as low as is consistent with good business, and as low as possible and not interfere with the efficiency of Government or in a general way with the convenience of our people. While I appreciate the fact that probably not every man in the House will be in favor of every individual item in this bill, as a whole the bill has been very carefully and thoughtfully considered by the committee, and it is believed that each project in this bill is not only very necessary to the locality in which it is located but also that it forms an important part of the general development of our national waterway transportation system.

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

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the gentleman indorse the form in which the bill is brought in, where reference or citation is made to certain reports? Does the gentleman think that is a good legislative policy to adopt that form?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know that I catch exactly what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. McKEOWN. Well, for example, you say, "Glencove Creek, N. Y., in accordance with Document No. So-and-so, Sixty-seventh Congress."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman's permission, I will say that as the result of long experience in the framing of these bills appropriations are based upon reports by the Corps of Engineers. Many of these reports are very voluminous and include a number of provisions and conditions; conditions as to the depth of the channel and the width of the channel and local cooperation, and so on, and it would be utterly impracticable to set them forth in the bill.

Mr. McKEOWN. I so understand; but does that include the amount recommended in the report?

Mr. BURTON. I think in this bill the amounts are not set forth in the bill.

Mr. SNELL. They are in the engineers' reports on the projects.

Mr. BURTON. They are set forth in the reports of the engineers and in the reports offered by the committee. It would be impossible to set forth even a fraction of the material set forth in these reports.

Mr. McKEOWN. What I desired to know about was whether that was the usual form and whether, without giving the amount of the appropriation, the Members of the House could intelligently determine the amount they authorized in those particular projects.

Mr. BURTON. That is generally covered by filing a report on each individual project included in the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The reports are all now available at the desk.

Mr. SNELL. I feel at this time that the people of the United States are taking a great interest in the conservation of our national resources. Our people have turned toward that proposition in the last three or four years as never before, as is shown by legislation pertaining to the conservation of oil, minerals, coal, water power, and timberlands; and it seems to me that the conservation principle is carried out still further in providing for the use to a larger degree of our national resources in connection with the transportation system of the country.

There is a desire among all of our people that at the present time we must do everything we can to bring down the transportation costs of the heavy, bulky, nonperishable products, not only the products of the manufacturers but the products of the farmers, and anything that can be done along this line is for the benefit of the whole people. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government recognized this need when it established the two barge lines that are now being operated by the Government—one on the Warrior River and one on the Mississippi River. This is being done to develop the water-transportation idea, to arouse interest, and to cause the people to understand that this is one of the cheapest methods of transportation and should be developed to a greater degree in this country. It seems to me this bill, in a very reasonable way, is carrying out the general principle advocated by the President in his message at the opening of Congress as to river and harbor development, and I feel the House can consistently pass it at this time. It comes with the complete recommendation of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and also of your Rules Committee. I trust the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may change the provision for the control of time. There is no member on the committee who is opposed to the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the time may be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] and the ranking minority member, Mr. MANSFIELD, of Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SNELL: Page 1, line 9, after the word "by" strike out "those favoring and opposing the bill" and insert "the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] and the ranking minority member of the committee."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is against the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has asked unanimous consent for the consideration of his amendment.

Mr. SNELL. I asked unanimous consent because I thought we could arrange it in that way much easier.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I do not think that any bill of this kind ought to come on the floor of the House with the entire time of debate controlled by Members who are heartily in favor of every provision in the bill.

Mr. SNELL. I am sure the gentleman can get reasonable time from either Member.

Mr. BLANTON. I know, but the rules of the House, and the rules of debate in every parliamentary body, contemplate that those who are opposed to even some parts of the bill should have control of half the time. I do not seek to control time, but if there is some other Member who claims that right he should control half of the time of debate. I am opposed to a few of the projects that will be authorized by this bill, and half the time of debate ought to be controlled by some Member against the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKEOWN. I object.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the amendment and move its adoption.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment, that it contravenes the rules of the House which provide that time for debate shall be divided equally between those for and against a measure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the Chair hear me a moment on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House provide that debate on every proposition that comes on the floor of this House shall be equally divided, half in the control of those in favor of the bill and half in the control of those who are against it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This is not Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it is not. I am referring to the general rules of the House, and the general rules of all debates. It seems to me this is a proposition which would require a suspension of the rules and would require a two-thirds vote to carry the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York has not moved to suspend the rules and he has not been recognized by the Speaker to move to suspend the rules. The rule as sent here by the Committee on Rules provided for an equal division of time, which is contravened by the amendment offered from this floor. This comes up therefore as a matter of course, just as any other general proposition. It is a dangerous precedent to establish in this House, that you can take away from any minority, however small and however insignificant, the right to be heard for half the time on any proposition that is presented for passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 46, noes 3.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to use any time?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; but I would like to say this: The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who is a member of the Committee on Rules, had indicated to me a desire for a few minutes on the rule, and I think he wished to discuss the bill. However, the gentleman from Alabama is unavoidably called from the Chamber upon official business. I simply wished to make that statement in order that when debate is reached on the bill and if the gentleman from Alabama should desire any time that liberality may be shown him so that he may make the remarks he desires to make.

Mr. SNELL. I think that can be satisfactorily arranged. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the gentleman from New York give me three minutes on this rule?

Mr. SNELL. Well, the gentleman has already had three or four minutes, but I will give him three minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. I will appreciate it. Mr. Speaker, we have embarked on a very dangerous precedent, as just established in the House. Here is a bill that authorizes appropriations to the extent of $39,151,000 out of the Treasury. The bill is brought in here by a committee specially selected because of their peculiar fitness for bringing in legislation for rivers and harbors. The entire membership of the committee is heartily in favor of the bill, and they are expected to be in favor of it. There are some provisions in the bill to which some Members object, and unless the men who are designated in this rule as being in charge of the time shall see fit to give them some of the time in debate, they will be deprived of being heard on the floor with reference to their objections to the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; but I have just three minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I will give the gentleman more time. Has the gentleman requested any time for debate in opposition to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. What time have we had to request it?

Mr. SNELL. What is the gentleman finding fault about if he has not made any request for time?

Mr. BLANTON. The bill was only called up a few minutes ago. This is the only opportunity we have had to request time.

Mr. SNELL. But they are willing to give the gentleman time, and he can get all the time he wants.

Mr. BLANTON. Members not on the committee could not be expected to know what was going to be in the rule until the gentleman took it out of his hip pocket.

Mr. SNELL. It was reported and filed and has been on the calendar for three days.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that; but as so reported it provided for an equal division of time, and Members who are engaged in committee hearings and committee work night and day have no opportunity to look up every rule the gentleman passes in his committee, and certainly can not presume to know how the gentleman is going to change same by amendment. Now is the time to claim our rights—when the matter is called up.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has not claimed any rights and has not asked for time.

Mr. BLANTON. I am asking now.

Mr. SNELL. Ask the gentleman from Texas and I am sure the gentleman will give you some time.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure he would if he has any left, because he is one of the finest gentlemen in my State, but he has likely already promised it to committeemen favoring the bill; but I am just talking about the principle of a rule that puts in the hands of two men, both of whom are in favor of a $31,151,000 bill, all the time for debate and does not give to any man in this House, with a membership of 435, who opposes any part of the bill, any time in his own right. He has to go to somebody in favor of the bill and beg for it in order to get it. Of course, we get it but we have to beg for it. That action is not fair and not right and must not be deemed an established precedent of this House.

Mr. McKEOWN. If the gentleman will yield I want to suggest that all the time is taken and the gentleman will not get any chance to get any time.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that, and for such reason I am adding my protest to that of my friend from Oklahoma against such action.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the rule.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question for information? I came in just a bit late and I am not quite sure I understand the situation. Do I understand that the matter now before the House under the special rule has been so arranged that no Member of the House may speak on the subject without procuring consent of somebody in favor of the legislation?

The SPEAKER. No; the bill will be open to discussion by every Member of the House who gets recognition.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11472, with Mr. CRAMTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, with the understanding by the gentleman and the committee that the bill will be printed in the RECORD so that the country will know where this $39,000,000 is going, I have no objection. If I did object, the bill would have to be printed in the RECORD anyway, but if the

gentleman will just let it be printed without reading, I have no objection to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York accept the modification?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to delay the gentleman's bill, but I want to know whether the few of us here who have some opposition to the bill will be given any chance to offer a few remarks on the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is every expectation of giving everybody an opportunity. The House is very anxious to have the bill disposed of as promptly as possible.

Mr. McKEOWN. I understand that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But there will be no disposition to limit the rights of those who wish to debate the bill in opposition to it.

Mr. McKEOWN. It is very nice to say that gentlemen can be heard if they can get recognition, but I have sometimes found it is very difficult to get recognition.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think the gentlemen will be given time without any question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill referred to is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following works of improvement are hereby adopted and authorized, to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans recommended in the reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That no money shall be expended on the projects herein and hereby adopted during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and that not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be expended thereon in any fiscal year thereafter:

Glencove Creek, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 207, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Hudson River, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 350, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Flushing Bay and Creek, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 124, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Delaware River, between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 228, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Wilmington Harbor, Del.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to modify the plans for the improvement of Wilmington Harbor in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of War, dated December 20, 1923.

Salem River, N. J., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 110, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Cambridge Harbor, Md., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 210, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Onancock River, Va., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 219, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Norfolk Harbor, Va.: Channels in southern and eastern branches of the Elizabeth River, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 226, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to purchase, as a part of said waterway, the existing Lake Drummond Canal, together with all property rights and franchises appertaining thereto, at a price of not to exceed $500,000, in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 5, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session: *Provided*, That before entering into negotiations for the acquisition of said canal local or other interests shall be required to contribute the sum of $125,000, which amount shall be deposited with the Secretary of War and applied on the purchase price of the said canal.

Waterway from Charleston to Winyah Bay, S. C., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 237, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Shipyard Creek, S. C., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 288, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Fernandina Harbor, Fla., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 227, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Miami Harbor, Fla., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 516, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Bayou La Batre, Ala., in accordance with the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 4, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said report.

The Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway, from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La., to Galveston Bay, Tex., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 238, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document: *Provided*, That the amount hereby authorized to be expended upon said project shall not exceed the sum of $9,000,000: *Provided further*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any lands required for the purpose of this improvement: *Provided further*, That not more than two Government dredges shall be constructed for use in prosecuting this project.

Houston Ship Channel, Tex., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 93, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Mississippi River, between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: At Nauvoo, Ill., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 112, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: At Fort Madison, Iowa, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 96, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

The improvement of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to the northern boundary of the city of St. Louis, in accordance with the existing project, with a view to completion within a period of five years from and after the passage of this act in accordance with the general provision herein made as to completion of projects, and for the purpose of securing a navigable channel with a minimum depth of 8 feet and a minimum width of 300 feet, with sufficient additional width around the bends in said river to afford convenient passage for tows of barges now in use upon said river.

The improvement of the Mississippi River from the northern boundary of the city of St. Louis to Minneapolis, Minn., in accordance with the existing project, with a view to completion within a period of five years from and after the passage of this act in accordance with the general provision herein made as to completion of projects, and for the purpose of securing a permanent navigable channel with a minimum depth of 6 feet and a minimum width of 200 feet, with a reasonable additional width around the bends in said river.

The improvement of the Missouri River from its mouth to the upper end of Quindaro Bend, in accordance with the existing project, with a view to completion within a period of five years from and after the passage of this act in accordance with the general provision herein made as to completion of projects, and for the purpose of securing a permanent navigable channel with a minimum depth of 6 feet and a minimum width of 200 feet, with a reasonable additional width around the bend in said river.

The improvement of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Cairo, in accordance with the existing project, by the construction of locks and dams with a view to completion within a period of five years from and after the passage of this act in accordance with the general provision herein made as to completion of projects and for the purpose of securing a navigable channel with a minimum depth of 9 feet.

Tennessee River from Dam No. 2 to Florence Bridge, Alabama, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 1262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, make such modifications in the plans presented in the said report as he may deem advisable in the interest of navigation: *Provided further*, That funds for the prosecution of this work may be allotted from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by Congress for the improvement, preservation, and maintenance of rivers and harbors.

Tennessee River and tributaries, N. C., Tenn., Ala., and Ky.: The completion of the survey recommended in House Document No. 319, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, is hereby authorized, at a cost not to exceed $315,800 in addition to the amount authorized in the river and harbor act approved September 22, 1922.

Green Bay Harbor and Fox River, Wis., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 294, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Muskegon Harbor, Mich., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 494, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.

Frankfort Harbor, Mich., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 208, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Great Sodus Bay Harbor, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 192, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 289, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 349, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document: *Provided*, That the amount hereby authorized to be expended shall not exceed the sum of $6,500,000.

San Diego Harbor, Calif., in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 2, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Petaluma Creek, Calif., in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 3, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Siuslaw River, Oreg., in accordance with the report submitted in Senate Committee Document No. 1, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.: The Columbia River between the mouth of Willamette River and Vancouver, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 126, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Deep River, Wash., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 218, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Port Orchard Bay, Wash., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 109, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Seattle Harbor, Wash.: Duwamish Waterway, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 108, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Cowlitz River, Wash.: Survey, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 225, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 235, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session.

Ponce Harbor, P. R., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 532, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that all river and harbor projects heretofore, herein, and hereafter adopted shall be completed within five years from the passage of this act or of subsequent acts adopting such projects, if physically practicable: *Provided*, That in any case of such impracticability the Chief of Engineers shall clearly set forth the reasons therefor in his annual report.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, such investigations as may be necessary for the preparation of a general plan for the most effective navigation improvement in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power on those navigable streams of the United States and their tributaries where such power development appears feasible and practicable, together with an estimate and report of the cost of conducting such investigations as to all such streams and tributaries, at a cost not to exceed $500,000, with recommendation that $250,000 be immediately appropriated.

SEC. 4. That section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors, passed between March 4, 1913, until and including the laws of the second session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, shall be compiled under the direction of the Secretary of War and printed as a document, and that 600 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the War Department."

SEC. 5. That hereafter a per diem of $7 in lieu of other travel allowances shall be paid to officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Army for the actual time consumed while traveling by air, under competent orders, in connection with aerial surveys of rivers and harbors, and a per diem of $6 for the actual time consumed in making such aerial surveys, to be paid from appropriations available for the particular improvement for which the survey is being made.

Hereafter, when in the opinion of the Secretary of War the changes of a station of an officer of the Corps of Engineers is primarily in the interest of river and harbor improvement, the mileage and other allowances to which he may be entitled incident to such change of station may be paid from appropriations for such improvements.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made at the following-named localities and a sufficient sum to pay the cost thereof may be allotted from appropriations heretofore made, or to be hereafter made, for examinations, surveys, and contingencies for rivers and harbors: *Provided*, That no preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate for new works other than those designated in this or some prior act or joint resolution shall be made: *Provided further*, That after the regular or formal reports made as required by law on any examination, survey, project, or work under way or proposed are submitted no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law: *And provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this act until funds for the commencement of the proposed work shall have been actually appropriated by law:

Gotts Island Channel, Me.

Nantucket Harbor, Mass., with a view to securing a channel from the head of the harbor to the ocean.

Edgartown Harbor, Mass.

Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass., with a view to securing a channel 30 feet in depth and of suitable width to Squantum.

Boston Harbor, Mass., with a view to the elimination of the bend to the eastward of Finns Ledge at the entrance of Broad Sound Channel.

Weymouth Fore River, Mass., from Hingham Bay to Quincy.

Shore at and near West Chop, Marthas Vineyard, Mass., with a view to preventing its erosion.

Salem Harbor, Mass.

Housatonic River, Conn., up to the railroad bridge at Milford.

New Haven Harbor, Conn., with a view to the construction of a harbor refuge in Morris Cove.

Park River, Conn., up to Front Street, in Hartford.

Quonochontaug Inlet, R. I.

Hudson River, N. Y., with a view to deepening the channel in and near Haverstraw Bay.

Hudson River, N. Y., with a view to removing rock in front of the town of Poughkeepsie.

Hudson River, N. Y., below Hudson.

Fort Pond Bay, N. Y.

Hempstead Harbor, N. Y.

Mattituck Harbor, N. Y.

Tarrytown Harbor, N. Y.

Swan River, Long Island, N. Y.

Ship canal or connecting waterways from Flushing Bay or the headwaters of Newtown Creek to Jamaica Bay.

Three Mile Harbor and Gardiners Bay, N. Y.

Debs Inlet, N. Y.

East Rockaway Inlet, N. Y.

Manhasset Bay, N. Y.

Freeport Creek, N. Y.

Jones Inlet, N. Y.

Long Beach Channel, N. Y.

Hackensack River, N. J., from the Central Railroad Hackensack River bridge to a point about 2,000 feet north of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad bridge, with a view to securing a depth of 30 feet with suitable width.

Leipsic River, Del.

Little River, Del.

Delaware River, N. J., in the vicinity of Camden.

Absecon Inlet, N. J.

Shore near Cold Spring Inlet, N. J., with a view to preventing its erosion.

Wicomico River, Wicomico County, Md.

Honga River and Tar Bay (Barren Island Gaps), Md.

Choptank River, Md.

Elk River, Md.

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.

Nansemond River, Va., including the Western Branch thereof.

Norfolk Harbor, Va., with a view to deepening, widening, and extending the channel in the Western Branch of Elizabeth River.

Scotts Creek, Portsmouth, Va.

York River, Va.

Pungoteague Creek, Va.

Nandua Creek, Va.

Occohannock Creek, Va.

Monroe Bay and Creek, Va.

Channel from Newport News Channel, Va., to Municipal Boat Harbor in Newport News.

Horn Harbor, Va.

Cockrells Creek, Va.

Lumber River, N. C. and S. C.

Morehead City Harbor, N. C.

South River to Sloans Bridge, N. C.

Neuse River, N. C., from New Bern to Raleigh.

Edenton Harbor, N. C.

Belhaven Harbor, Belhaven, Beaufort County, N. C.

Beaufort Harbor and Beaufort Inlet, N. C.

Knobs Creek, N. C.

Newport River, N. C.

Cashie River, N. C., below Windsor.

Mouths of Roanoke River and Mackay Creek, N. C.

Channel connecting the harbor at Manteo, N. C., with the Norfolk-Beaufort Inland Waterway.

Lockwood Folly River, N. C.

Elizabeth River, N. C.

Channels from the inland waterway, Beaufort, N. C., beginning at a point where Gallants Channel connects with the inland waterway (PS to BI Channel) and via Gallants Channel and in front of the town of Beaufort through Bulkhead Shoal to the main inlet, with a view to providing a depth of 12 feet with suitable width.

Shallotte River, N. C., from Whites Landing to the town of Shallotte.

North River, Carteret County, N. C.

Mudd Slue, N. C., from Corncake Inlet to the Cape Fear River.

Smiths Creek, N. C., with a view to securing a channel 10 feet deep and suitable width to the wharves at Oriental.

Port Royal Harbor and Beaufort River, S. C.

Savannah River, Ga., from the foot of Kings Island to the Coastal Highway Bridge.

Oconee River, Ga.

Ocmulgee River, Ga.

The Altamaha River System, Ga., with a view to improvement for navigation in cooperation with local interests.

Canaveral Harbor, Fla.

Melbourne Harbor and Inlet, Fla.

New River Inlet, Fla.

Fort Pierce Inlet, Fla.

Kissimmee River, Fla.

Channel connecting the St. Johns River, Fla., with the Florida East Coast Canal, at or near Jacksonville.

St. Augustine Harbor, Fla.

Tampa Harbor, Fla., with a view to widening the Ybor Estuary Channel.

Pithlachascotee River, Fla.

Anclote River, Fla.

Flint River, Ga.

Mobile Harbor, Ala., with a view to securing increased depth and width in the channels through the bar, bay, and river.

Pass Manchac, La.

Bayou Des Ourse, La.

Mississippi River, La., between Baton Rouge and New Orleans.

Channel from Galveston Harbor to Texas City, Tex.

Colorado River, Tex.

Galveston Channel, Tex.

Guadaloupe River, Tex.

Red River, La., from Fulton to the mouth.

Spring River, Ark.

Boggy River, Okla.

Rock Island and Moline Harbors, Ill.

White River and West Fork of White River, Ind., up to Indianapolis.

Big Muddy River, Ill.

Headwaters of the Mississippi River above Bimidji, Minn.

Lake City Harbor, Minn.

Cass Lake and Leech Lake, Minn.

Allegheny River, Pa. and N. Y., with a view to enlarging the present adopted project for the improvement of said river.

Youghiogheny River, Pa., up to Fifteenth Street, McKeesport.

Ohio River, with a view to the construction of an ice pier on the south side of said river in the vicinity of Covington and Newport, Ky.

Bear Creek, Ky.

Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.

Fox River and connecting waters from Green Bay, Wis., to Portage; the Portage Canal; and the Wisconsin River; with a view to providing a waterway 9 feet deep from Green Bay to the Mississippi River.

Stockbridge Harbor, Wis.

Highcliff Harbor, Lake Winnebago, Wis.

Green Bay Harbor, Wis., with a view to widening and straightening the outer channel.

Oconto Harbor, Wis., with a view to providing a depth of 18 feet.

Chicago River and its branches, to determine whether fixed bridges should be permitted and, if permitted, what clearances for navigation should be observed in their construction.

Illinois River, Ill., with a view to protecting the bank at the northern part of the town of Naples.

Holland Harbor and Black Lake, Mich.

Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.

Great Lakes from Duluth, Minn., to Buffalo, N. Y., with a view to such improvements as may be required for a through channel suitable for vessels drawing 20 feet at lake stages corresponding to a Lake Huron level of 578.5 feet above mean sea level.

Michigan City Harbor, Ind.

Sandusky Harbor, Ohio.

Fairport Harbor, Ohio.

Inner harbor at Lorain, Ohio.

Deeper waterway from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River suitable for vessels of a draft of 20 or 25 feet: Preliminary examination and survey to be made by a board of Engineer officers.

Charlotte Harbor, N. Y.

St. Lawrence River, between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Lake Ontario.

Ogdensburg Harbor, N. Y.

Morristown Harbor, N. Y.

San Diego Harbor, Calif.

Channel from Redwood City, Calif., to the main channel in San Francisco Bay, with a view to securing a depth of 30 feet and width of 300 feet.

Sacramento River and tributaries, California, with a view to protecting the navigable channel of the Sacramento River from deposits from the melting glaciers of Mount Shasta.

Humboldt Harbor and Bay, Calif.

Oakland Harbor, Calif.

Petaluma Creek, Calif.

Klamath River, Calif.

Coquille River bar and entrance, Oregon.

Yaquina Bay and entrance, Oregon.

Port Orford Harbor, Oreg.

Skipanon Channel, Oreg.

Coos Bay, Oreg.

Columbia River, above and below the city of Kalama, Wash., with a view to providing a ship channel to the wharves at Kalama, Wash.

Grays Harbor, Wash.

Grays River, Wash.

Bellingham Harbor, Wash., with a view to the removal of Star Rock.

Duwamish Waterway, Seattle Harbor, Wash., above Fourteenth Street.

Puget Sound and tributary waters, Washington.

Saxman Harbor, Tongass Narrows, Alaska.

Hyder Harbor, Alaska.

Ketchikan Creek, Alaska.

Port Alexander, Alaska.

Wrangel Harbor, Alaska, with a view to the extension of the breakwater.

Yukon River, near Fort Yukon, Alaska.

Yukon River, near Holy Cross, Alaska.

Honolulu Harbor, Kalihi Harbor, and connecting channels, Hawaii.

Mayaguez Harbor, P. R.

Arecibo Harbor, P. R.

San Juan Harbor, P. R.

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit the War Department to take earth, stone, and timber from the national forests for use in the construction of river and harbor and other works in charge of that department, subject to such regulations and restrictions as he may prescribe.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is a general misundertanding, in the press particularly, as to the nature of this bill. It has been assumed in the discussion by the press, notably by the metropolitan press, that this bill is one appropriating money and that it is in conflict with the Budget, and the discussion of the bill has been based upon those two false premises.

It should be understood by the press and the public, as it is well understood in the House, that there are two kinds of bills in regard to the improvement of the waterways of our country.

In the history of our country and up to the present time we have adopted several hundred projects, many of which are incomplete, and from year to year appropriations are made for the maintenance of those projects and for the completion of the improvements. This is what we call the appropriations bill and this appears from year to year necessarily in the items of appropriations. The press of the country understand that situation thoroughly, but does not understand the situation as to a bill of this nature. They assume, erroneously, that this bill is of the nature of the annual bill and that it is simply a bill to appropriate money.

This shows complete ignorance as to the nature of river and harbor improvements. No set of appropriations has the securities and safeguards thrown about them that our river and harbor appropriations have.

The first thing that must be done, if any harbor or any river of the United States is to be improved, is for the locality which desires the improvement to call the attention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to the subject and see that a survey of that project is made under the direction of United States engineers. If that passes the House in a legislative bill it is sent by the Chief of Engineers to the district engineer. He makes an investigation and reports either that the survey is advisable or that it is inadvisable. If he reports adversely, that ends the matter right there with the resident engineer. If, on the other hand, he reports that the project is one which should receive consideration and attention by the House, then it goes successively to the division engineer, and if it receives his approval well and good. If not, it ends there. If it receives his approval then it goes to the Board of Engineers in Washington, composed of United States Army engineers, the

most eminent in the service, men of long experience, men of splendid attainment, men of high education, and men fitted in every way to study the questions involved.

And if it receives the approval there then it goes to the Chief of Engineers, and again, if it is disapproved, that is apt to end the project. Finally it must run the gauntlet and scrutiny of the Chief of Engineers, and again it may be approved or disapproved; and after that, if it is approved it goes to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and if it is disapproved, that ends it. So that all these steps must be taken before it reaches the committee. And then it must receive the scrutiny of the committee. All these steps are taken and oral testimony is taken before the committee in addition to the report.

So I say if you go through all the list of appropriations made for the support of the Government you will find it impossible to discover any set of appropriations that have the safeguards thrown about the Treasury, that protect the Treasury from any raid, as do those in regard to rivers and harbors. It is well that that is so because one bad project does more harm to the cause of river and harbor improvement and the cause of water transportation than 500 good projects can do.

Take an illustration. You hear continually about the Brazos River, but how many speak about the transportation on the Great Lakes, the most wonderful transportation of all time of any system. Who speaks about the transportation of the Monongahela, the most wonderful of any inland river in the world? You decry and do decry from year to year the Brazos River on which a small amount of money was spent, but you forget your Great Lakes system on which we have developed the greatest commerce the world has ever known—121,000,000 tons on the American side and 7,000,000 on the Canadian side, at the very lowest rate the world has ever known—1 mill per ton per mile as against 3 mills per ton per mile on the ocean. Transportation on the Great Lakes is at one-third of the cost of that on the ocean. The rate is three times as great on the ocean, and yet from the time man began to exist we have endeavored to perfect navigation on the ocean. Man has been engaged in that problem ever since man existed, but we have only been engaged in transportation on the Great Lakes a very limited time. In spite of that, as a result of the marvelous system of loading and unloading, perfecting the kind of vessel to be used for freight purposes, deepening the channels of the Great Lakes which the United States has contributed toward the solution of the problem—as a result of all these things we have this wondrous development.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this matter is very important, involving the expenditure of many millions of dollars, and I think there ought to be more here to hear it. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. SNELL. And on that I demand tellers.

The question was taken, and tellers were ordered.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. DEMPSEY and Mr. LANHAM.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported that there was 1 in favor and 106 against.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers report 1 in favor and 106 against the motion to rise. A quorum is present. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I was saying that the measure of the importance and the vastness of the undertaking to produce the unequaled volume of commerce on the Great Lakes at a less rate than the world has ever known is measured, not alone by these facts but also by the fact that it has been done in such an incredibly short time.

Now, let us take the question not alone of the vastness of the commerce, but let us see what it means to the country. Up to the time the United States discovered the tremendous ore deposits in the Northwest and reduced the cost of commerce on the Great Lakes, the United States bought its steel rails in Europe, and bought them there despite the fact that this was the greatest railroad building nation the world has ever known. We continued to buy them until we perfected the transportation on the Great Lakes. So at the bottom of the steel and iron industry of the United States one of the great basic industries in commerce and business is the commerce on the Great Lakes, which could not be had except by the improvements in the channels and harbors made by the United States.

Now, passing from this, the best example of what has been done by improvements made by the United States, let us come to the relation that commerce by water through improvements made by Congress bears to all the transportation in the country.

We find, roughly speaking, that last year there was transported in the United States by rail 2,300,000,000 tons of freight, and we find that more than one-sixth as much tonnage was carried by water. We must remember that an enormous sum of money running into many billions of dollars have been spent upon the railroads of the United States, and if we examine into the state of waterway improvement we find it will only cost a trifle over $200,000,000 to complete all of the improvements which have been approved by the Congress. So that the cost which has been incurred and the cost yet to be incurred by the country for the improvement of our waterways is trifling, is insignificant, if we compare it with what the railroads have cost. Then if we turn to see what the railroads are doing we find last year the railroads appropriated over a billion dollars for betterments, and on the same basis, if we are to appropriate on the basis that the volume that shipments by water bear to the volume of traffic carried by rail, we should appropriate annually $200,000,000. We are appropriating this year but $40,000,000, and the average annual appropriation is not anything like that sum. Throughout the war period, not only through the actual existence of the war, but for two or three years subsequent to the war, we appropriated annually an average of only twelve or thirteen million dollars a year, an utterly insignificant sum. Then we must remember something more. The railroads have high-priced, highly paid, skilled, trained executives, men of the very greatest caliber, who constantly advance the interests of railroads, and we have simply the hit or miss enthusiasm of the people and their feeling of the necessity of our use of water transportation. We find that in times when factories are running full, when products are large upon the farms, that the railroads in the United States are utterly unable to carry the shipments of freight, and we know that the problem of carrying all of our shipments is not being solved. We know that railroad building in the United States has practically stopped. We know that no new mileage is being created. We know that all that is being done to solve the railroad problem is this: New devices are being adopted from time to time to make more efficient the existing mileage and no new mileage is being built. What, for instance, is the outstanding feature of improvement in railway administration? Why, we find that the freight car travels in the open country in the United States 13 miles per day. We find in congested centers it travels 1 mile per day. So the simplest and easiest way to help solve the railway problem was to avoid sending any cars which could be dispatched in any other way through congested centers. That has been done.

In the last four or five years all the railways have been adopting the practice of sending through freight in both directions around instead of through congested centers, and right in this bill we are aiding commerce in that way because we improve two great harbors on the Great Lakes—Frankfort is one and Muskegon is the other. We improve those two harbors to enable freight to be sent around Chicago and Milwaukee instead of being sent through those congested centers. Now, without that improvement—the outstanding improvements in railway administration within the present generation—we would be utterly unable to carry the freight of the country even when factories are partially down and crops are light. So we find in order to carry the commerce of the country we need and must have transportaion by water. Now, that is the first problem. It is far more important to have the facilities to carry your commerce than anything else. Next in importance and far behind, although it is of great importance, is the question of carrying at a lower rate, and of course the natural way, the way provided by nature, the way which it furnishes, transportation by water, always has been and always will be cheaper than any artificial way for carrying commerce. The Great Lakes, as I said, are an outstanding illustration of that fact because they are able to carry at one-third of the cost upon the ocean. You say all that is true. It is true that we need water transportation, but we have passed through 150 years of national existence, we have been improving the waterways from time to time during that period, and how is it that you happen still to be coming in and asking for authorization for new projects? The answer to that is very simple. How is it you need improvements in everything that goes on in this world. Why, it is because this is comparatively a new Nation. It is a Nation whose resources have not yet been developed. We have only scratched the surface. We find where

we have provided in some part of the United States what we deemed and what upon the evidence at the time seemed to be sufficient and adequate facilities for commerce, we find some city like Los Angeles, which 20 years ago was a small place, and which grows suddenly, overnight into an important place with seven or eight hundred thousand souls, and develops its commerce from 2,000,000 tons a year to 2,000,000 tons a month, and we find the facilities furnished it at the present time are utterly inadequate to meet its growing and rapidly expanding demands.

Then we find that in a measure all of our waterway development in this country has been sectional. It has been piecemeal. That has not been because Congress has been narrow in its vision, because it has not seen into the future as far as it was possible, but it is because until the Panama Canal connected the two great oceans you could not have a national system, you could have simply the Atlantic and the Pacific and the interior rivers; but with the opening of the Panama Canal it is possible to have a connected, a unified system of waterway improvement throughout this Nation.

Take as an additional example, the city of Miami. Twenty years ago there were simply a half dozen houses there. Go down there to-day and you will find anywhere in that city the same congestion, the same signs of energy and growth and development that you find in the great city of New York. You will find as great congestion on the streets of Miami as you will find at Forty-second Street and Broadway in New York City at 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. They have to-day at Miami, with all that wonderful growth, with all that splendid future, with the development not alone in the city, but in the surrounding territory, a depth of 18 feet in her harbor. Of course that is utterly impracticable for ocean navigation. Miami is not even a port of call for ships going from New York and Philadelphia south to South America and the West Indies and Central America. It is easy to understand, it is not difficult to comprehend, why you must have new projects from time to time to meet the needs of a great and rapidly developing Nation like this.

Let us come now to this particular project bill. I started to and partially did point out the difference between a project bill and an appropriation bill, and I want to complete what I have to say in that respect. What does this bill do? First, what does it do in a general way, and then in items. First, in a general way, this bill authorizes the improvement of waterways in the United States at a future cost of about $39,000,000. How and when is the $40,000,000 to be expended? The $40,000,000 begins to be expended in 1927. There will be no appropriation for these projects in either this year or next year. The first appropriation will be in the year 1927. Then how fast will the $39,000,000 be expended? We provide in this bill that all projects shall be completed within five years. That is a declaration by this Congress. It is an important declaration; it is a solemn declaration; and it should be given all of the weight to which a declaration of that nature is entitled. Even if this were binding upon succeeding Congresses it does not follow, because of that declaration, that all projects adopted by the Congress shall be completed in five years, or that that will or can be done. You have the physical problem. You have the question of whether it can be completed as an engineering feat within that time, if you have ample funds. So at best let us call it five years. Of course two years go without any appropriations at all.

If you call it five years, then you will appropriate, beginning with 1927, providing these improvements then meet the approval of the Committee on Appropriations and the House, $8,000,000 per year for a period of five years. That is what this bill means in money. First, your aggregate amount is something like $40,000,000; second, you spend nothing for the coming two years; and, third, you begin then to expend not to exceed $8,000,000 a year, and I think myself that the sum will probably be nearer $6,000,000 than $8,000,000.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. When does the five-year period begin?

Mr. DEMPSEY. In 1927.

Mr. ALLGOOD. And there will be nothing paid until 1927?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No. The bill provides by its terms that no appropriation is to be made until 1927, and, as a matter of fact, aside from that declaration that there could be no appropriation until 1927. It is impossible for this bill, therefore, to be in conflict with the Budget. The Budget does not deal with future appropriations. The Budget deals only with appropriations for the fiscal year with which it treats. It can not deal with something in the future. It takes up the problems presented to it by the various departments of the Government from year to year as they are presented to the Budget officer, and deals with them and sends its report to the Congress, instead of various reports being received from various departments as they were before the Budget Bureau was established.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Does the Budget Committee approve of this line of action?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Of course, we have no Budget Committee. The Budget officer will not deal with the question except beginning with 1927, as the various items are presented by the War Department, emanating, of course, from the office of the Chief of Engineers. As he sends in his estimates in 1927 he will include the items in this bill, and then the Budget officer will take those up from year to year as they are presented. He can not deal with the matter until that time.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Suppose the Director of the Budget in 1927 wants to veto the 1927 appropriation, which would result from this action. What would then be the situation?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The situation would be this: The action of the Budget officer, whatever it might be, would be sent to the Congress. The Congress would send it to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Appropriations would act in accordance with all of the information before it, including the report of the Budget officer, and then the Committee on Appropriations would send its bill to the House, and the House would deal with the whole matter, taking into account the report of the Budget officer and all of the other evidence before it.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Of course, it is contemplated, however, by this bill and the terms of it that certain projects are to be completed within the period of five years.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman construe that as a mandate upon the Budget officer to recommend the appropriation of the necessary amount of funds so as to make possible the completion of this program?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think it does.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And if it is not done, it is simply an endeavor to set aside the express will of Congress.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think that is true.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It has been the policy of the Committee on Appropriations since I have been the chairman of it, wherever a project has been legislated on which is to be finished in a given period, to appropriate the money to complete the project within the period.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. But it has not always been the policy of the Director of the Budget to follow the recommendation of a committee.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it has been.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I can not yield, because I have not the floor.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. But I would like to have stated the relation between the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations as to legislation already enacted. When the time comes for that legislation would the Director of the Budget recommend the expenditure?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I tried to explain that to the gentleman, and if he will follow me I will explain it again. The gentleman should remember that the Budget officer is simply an agent of the Executive. The legislative branch of the Government is coordinate with the executive branch, and the legislative branch is not bound by the action of the executive branch, whether that action is taken by the Executive himself or some agent, like the Budget officer. We give weight, of course, to the opinion of the Budget officer, but we are not bound by it, and we will give the same weight to it in a matter like this that we would give to the recommendation of the Budget as to any other item.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. I understood that the able chairman of our committee, in reply to a question propounded by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON], said that our action as to the policy on this bill, for example, at the present time, would be a mandate on the Budget officer. But is it not a fact that it would not be a mandate unless future Congresses reenacted that mandate?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would say that this five-year program provision continues in force until repealed by Congress. It

would not have to be reenacted by successive Congresses, but any succeeding Congress could, of course, disregard it.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I simply wish to clarify the statement. In this bill, as the gentleman knows, there are several paragraphs making appropriations as recommended by the Board of Engineers; that is, a specific amount is indicated by Congress. If that passes, to be appropriated each year, does the gentleman believe that the Director of the Budget will, and that he should, Congress having expressed itself in favor of that proposition, be governed by the action of Congress and make a recommendation as contained in that paragraph?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say to the gentleman that I believe the Director of the Budget will be governed by what he believes to be the necessities, from year to year, of those projects for improvement and maintenance, and by the State of the Treasury; that he will, if possible no doubt, recommend such appropriations as are necessary to carry out the projects efficiently and expeditiously, because if you delay them unduly you are increasing the cost extravagantly. You are increasing far beyond the original estimates of cost.

One of the great troubles with appropriations in the past has been the fact that we have delayed in these projects, and thereby increased the cost enormously. And that is not the only aspect of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has used seven minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will take seven minutes more.

Take, for example, the Ohio River and see what the evils of dilatoriness and slowness in doing the work have been and are. The Ohio River is about a thousand miles long, and we have improved it to Louisville up to the present time, a distance of about 600 miles. That is just like a railroad leading to a great center, which is useless until you put on the last rail and can go over the entire distance. Until you have done that you have no use of your money. We have expended $87,000,000 thus far, and we need to complete those last links.

We have just authorized the expenditure of $5,000,000 by the Mississippi Barge Line, which can not function properly until the Ohio is connected up with the Mississippi River system. The Ohio River is by far the most important link in that system, apart from the Mississippi itself. On the Ohio we have located the great steel industrial center of the country, at Pittsburgh. You can tell what the steel industry means to a waterway when you realize that as much as 25,000,000 tons of freight are carried in a year on the Monongahela River. These great steel industries are now building fleets of boats for use on that river. I understand they are building great fleets of barges—among the concerns participating being the Jones-Laughlin Co. and the Carnegie Co.—and they are anxious to use that river, but they can not use it profitably and continuously and safely without the completion of the river improvements; and just as long as we dawdle along, just as long as we delay the completion of that river improvement, we are losing the interest on the huge sum of $87,000,000, whereas we need to expend only $25,000,000 in order to complete it and make it useful to the country and to that great industry. That is only one, although perhaps the most important, of the industries that will use it.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am in favor of the gentleman's bill; but the thought that I have in mind is that we are not appropriating anything now to complete the old projects. Will these old projects get any more when these new ones are all finished? We are getting now on the old projects at the present time scarcely enough for maintenance.

Mr. DEMPSEY. During the war we appropriated only about $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 a year. That was because of war necessity. In the last few years we have appropriated as high as $58,000,000 in a year, or about five times what we appropriated during the war. We have been giving all that could be economically expended in the last few years. I do not think there will be any disposition on the part of Congress, if it understands the subject—if those whose duty it is to do so call it to Congress's attention—to fail to appropriate what ought to be appropriated from year to year.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As to Baltimore Harbor, I do not think we are getting more than enough for purely maintenance purposes at the present time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The contrast between $12,000,000 and $13,000,000, the amount expended during the war period—that is, during the war and for three or four years afterwards—and an amount as high as $58,000,000, which was the amount three years ago, is sufficient to show the gentleman that there is a genuine desire on the part of Congress not merely to maintain existing projects but to complete them.

I am sure that Congress in passing this new project bill will take into account the limited amount that is involved—$39,000,000—adding that to the $200,000,000 which is the amount necessary to complete all of the adopted projects, and will have in mind that a small addition only will have to be made annually to the appropriations in order to complete these new projects as well as the old ones.

I want to say in addition that there are adopted projects which, as time has developed, have turned out to be of no immediate importance. While places like Los Angeles, while places like Miami, Fla., have grown like a weed, other places have gone back and commerce has fallen off, so that what appeared to be a necessity at the moment has disappeared. Therefore I do not believe we are really adding to the amount which it will be necessary to expend annually to complete all projects.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As to Miami, the railroads have a case here now through which they are trying to get a reduction in rates so that they can drive the boats out of Miami Harbor.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, the best answer to that is to improve the harbor so that we can use it, and that is what we provide for in this bill.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. In connection with what the gentleman has just said, as I understand, this bill does two things. It approves certain projects which have been heard by the engineering department of the War Department and thoroughly investigated, and which have a very definite amount of money attached to them.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. For instance, the Cambridge Harbor, Md., project, on page 8, is a project which should carry with it, when approved, a certain definite appropriation for its completion.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Then I understand there is a second part of the bill which authorizes the Secretary of War to make an investigation, through the engineering department, of certain proposed projects, such, for instance, as the Wicomico River, Honga River, Choptank River, Elk River, and Baltimore Harbor, in Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has used seven additional minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I will take 10 minutes more.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I want to ask the gentleman if this is not the case, that there is a certain definite sum—which I understand to be about $40,000,000—which attaches to the approved projects?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. But what I wanted especially to ask was this: Is there any definite sum attached, or in the mind of the committee, to the enumerated projects which are to be investigated?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; and that, as the gentleman will readily see, would be impossible.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. That is my understanding.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will come to that in a moment. I am going to make a rapid survey of the bill as a whole before I finish.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Just one more question in reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM]. This year $308,000 was asked for the continuation of the Baltimore Harbor. As I understand it, that did not come in the appropriation bill and does not come in this bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Well, the Baltimore Harbor must have received some amount in the appropriation bill.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. It received an amount for maintenance, but not for any new project that is to be studied.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It should have received some sum for improvement as well. We will get those figures and see what they are before this bill is finished.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I was wondering whether this item on page 15 was to be considered as a new project.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; that is simply a survey.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The Baltimore situation is an already established project and does not require any more authorization in this bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is a request for an additional survey to straighten out certain things there which are in the upper

harbor. I think that is a survey, for instance, which will be approved and that it undoubtedly will come before the House in the form of a bill for the project.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. That has already been recommended in your hearings by the Chief of Engineers?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; because the Baltimore Harbor is a great harbor. It is one of the harbors which has a great and rapidly increasing commerce, and any reasonable improvement asked there is in the interest of commerce not alone there but in the whole country.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. BARBOUR. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether there is any provision in the bill for contributions by local communities toward the expense of these various projects?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; and I am going to deal with that in a few minutes.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. I want to ask the gentleman about the Ohio River improvement. As the gentleman knows, the present Ohio improvement project authorizes appropriations to carry on the lock-and-dam construction and give a 9-foot, all-year stage of water?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. THATCHER. What effect would the provision on page 7 of the bill have with reference to the improvement of the Ohio River, and was this provision inserted in view of the law which already obtains on the subject?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The purpose of that provision is one with which I am going to deal generally in just a minute or two. There is a similar provision with regard to certain other rivers and with regard to other projects.

Mr. THATCHER. Will this serve to expedite the improvement?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. THATCHER. I wish the gentleman would make that clear.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am going to come to it in just a moment. Now, gentlemen, after having discussed the nature of the bill I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that the President in his annual message to this Congress referred specifically to this bill and commended it. He said, however, that the bill should be reduced to a certain extent. The bill as originally introduced carried an appropriation of over $53,000,000; since that time the bill has been reduced to its present amount of a trifle over $39,000,000; and as it is now before the House in this modified form, it has, as I am informed, the approval of the Executive, in the terms in which it was given in his message, and it has the approval of the War Department.

It is regarded, as the President said in his message, as a means of creating wealth, because it is commerce which leads to wealth, and therefore it is one of the most important things that Congress can do. Having spoken as to the nature of the bill, let me very briefly sketch the items in the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Does the present bill contemplate the completion of the Ohio River project within a period of five years?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; and in less time than that, I think, but it provides for its completion in that period, in any event. I am coming to that also in a moment.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood the gentleman to say that the bill authorizes about $40,000,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; a trifle less.

Mr. TREADWAY. Just where does the aggregate item appear in the bill? I fail to find it unless it is the addition of all the various items.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The original report contained a summary of the items and I am coming to that now and am going to give the more important items in detail.

Mr. TREADWAY. The various items that the gentleman recommends the adoption of would, under the recommendations of the engineers, in the aggregate amount to about $40,000,000?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; a trifle less than $40,000,000.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will there be any provision for the use of specific sums for each project, or will it be within the jurisdiction of the engineers as to how much is allotted to each project?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The House has adopted the principle of simply appropriating a lump sum, and that will be done with these projects, just as is now done with all projects.

Let me very briefly sketch what is done by this bill. First, I will take up the larger items in it and then the general provisions. The first large item is the Hudson River, N. Y., item. The Hudson River is one of the great streams of the United States. It is improved up to a place called Hudson. Hudson is 117 miles above the city of New York. Hudson is not an exchange point. Hudson is a small place. The improvement of that river might just as well be stopped in the woods. It might just as well end in the open country as to cease where it does to-day. If you go there, you have not a demand for anything that you bring there and no commerce originates there to take back. On the other hand, if you go on to Albany, Albany is one of the great exchange points of the country. It is the gateway from the West to the North and to all New England, and it furnishes the means of getting down to the metropolis and all through the South. It is the connecting point to all the points of the compass in the United States. It is a center where they have six great trunk-line railroads. It is bound to have a tremendous local commerce, and it is bound to have great through commerce which will come by water as far as Albany and then take to the rails. A tremendous saving will be made by carrying the deep channel instead of 117 miles, this 25 miles additional up to the city of Albany.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] asked if there was local contribution in this bill, and I will call his attention to that situation. There is local contribution on this item. Between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000 is to be spent by the vicinity on terminals and improvements in order to make this deepened channel available. Not only that, the State of New York has spent the tremendous total of about $200,000,000 on its barge canal for the use of the Nation, and that was taken into account by the engineers, and they regarded that as a contribution just as if it was to be spent locally to make the improvement available.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is there local contribution as to all of the items in the bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; there is not.

Mr. BARBOUR. If it is a good thing, and I think it is, in connection with the Hudson River development, why would it not be a good thing in connection with all of these projects?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think probably the time will come when we will have to adopt a uniform practice with regard to local contributions, but the gentleman can see how hard it is to do it. A locality comes in and asks for the adoption of its project. It is so tremendously interested in the project that it is willing and offers and urges, in order to have the project adopted, and adopted speedily, to contribute such and such proportion of the improvement.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is not that also an evidence of good faith and evidence of the importance of the project?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. So it is impossible for the committee to say, "No; we will not receive it"; but that is the obstacle to a uniform policy in that regard.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not a fact that, so far as the Hudson River project is concerned, it is not a local project, and the locality has no more interest in it than the country at large?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true. It is a part of the general improvement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I will yield myself five minutes more.

Gentlemen, I want to pass over these items rapidly, and I ask that I may speak for five minutes without interruption, because I ought to stop in that time.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. I am very much interested in the Hudson River between Albany and Troy. Is that project incorporated in the bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; it was impossible in the state of the Treasury to adopt that project at this time. It would entail

an added cost, as I recollect, of $20,000,000, and it was utterly impossible to include it at this time.

Mr. BOYLAN. Have any studies been made?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; studies have been made as far as Watervliet, and the total cost to Watervliet would be $50,000,000.

Gentlemen, the next large item in the bill is a waterway along the coast of Texas and Louisiana, for which there is an authorization of $9,000,000.

This waterway will serve not alone the locality for the distribution of sulphur, one of the most important basic projects in the United States, and for the distribution of rice and salt, the distribution of timber, and of all the agricultural products that grow along its course, but it will serve also as a part of the Mississippi system and will bind and connect Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and all of the great cities on the Mississippi and on the Ohio with the Texas coast and serve their oil fields as well as their sulphur mines.

It will prove of incalculable benefit to the Nation as well. We can not do anything in this country without sulphur. The farmer needs it as a basis for insecticide. I am told that it strengthens concrete 1,000 per cent; that has only been discovered recently. You can go into the uses of it in 100 ways in which it is basically necessary. But you can not distribute sulphur economically throughout the country unless you have this canal.

The next item of importance is the Los Angeles Harbor at Long Beach, Calif. The growth at Los Angeles is simply a fairy tale; it reads like a fable. The growth of the commerce has kept growth with the population. We have seen the commerce jump from 2,000,000 tons a year to 2,000,000 tons a month. Ah, but you say that is oil. But oil is not something that comes to-day and goes to-morrow. It is an enduring commodity, and not only does it exist in Los Angeles and its vicinity, but long-distance pipe lines are bringing it from the outlying fields, and while the flow of oil has somewhat diminished in the past year, the outlying pipe lines will continue to supply it in great quantities for many years, far along into the future, long enough to justify this improvement. To-day they refine the oil and it goes out as a refined product. The general commerce of Los Angeles is growing by leaps and bounds, and the balance of trade in favor of the eastern part of the United States, between it and Los Angeles, is hundreds of millions of dollars in favor of the East; they are as much interested in the development of Los Angeles as Los Angeles itself.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has not the Panama Canal had something to do with that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The Panama Canal has had a tremendous influence on the development of commerce, and the commerce through it is going to grow.

Now, I am going to speak of one more project, and then about two minutes on the general provisions of the bill. I spoke about Miami having 25 feet, and that is what we give it in the bill.

We provide in the bill for a survey of all the rivers for water power so that the most efficient combined use can be made for navigation and water power. We find that of tremendous importance by the discovery in the Tennessee River, aside from Muscle Shoals, of 3,000,000 horsepower, which can be placed on the market at $15 per horsepower, and one horsepower is equivalent to 10 tons of coal. There are other provisions in the bill, but this last provision alone for a survey on the Tennessee River justify this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KINDRED].

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire in the very brief time I have at my disposal only to reiterate and emphasize the general principles which have been laid down in the very able address by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY]. I desire to emphasize one of the chief principles in this bill; that is, to establish a policy of the River and Harbor Committee.

One of the most important propositions—and there are many important provisions in this bill—is the principle of establishing an annual program of reasonable, systematic appropriations for the rivers and harbors of our great country. The President of the United States is authority for this idea, and in support of it I read in part from a message of the President, December 6, 1923, delivered at the last session of this Congress on this subject, as follows:

> These projects can not all be undertaken at once, but all should have the immediate consideration of the Congress and be adopted as fast as plans can be matured and the necessary funds become available. This is not incompatible with economy, for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment, which will be reproductive, as evidenced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress. They represent the protection of large areas from floods and the addition of a great amount of cheap power and cheap freight by use of navigation.

This bill is thoroughly safeguarded, not only in its final processes of elimination and economy, not only by the words of the President himself, but also by the attitude of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the House. So the bill has been pared of all unnecessary expenditures. I have personally followed the proceedings of our committee very fully, and I want to indorse every provision in the bill as meritorious and as tending to build up in this great country a system of intercoastal waterways and inland rivers and harbors which will save the shippers and manufacturers in commerce in this country over $2,000,000,000 annually in the 442,000,000,000 of tonnage shipped over our inland waterways and harbors.

I wish also to support earnestly one of the other meritorious principles in this bill which is laid down as a policy of developing our whole waterway system of 32,000 miles in the next five years, so that it may be developed to its full capacity, not only to facilitate the transportation of freight in case the railway system should break down, as it has in the past, but that it may also save the enormous sum of more than $2,000,000,000 to the shippers, manufacturers, and consumers of the country in the shipment of bulky and other classes of freight. [Applause.]

I have already stated that I as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House for several years can conscientiously say that the pending bill is one of the most meritorious that has ever been submitted by any committee to the Congress, not only because of the conscientious work of the members of the committee in the painstaking preparation of the bill but also for the reason that every item in the bill has been most carefully scrutinized by the district and division engineers of the War Department, by the Board of Engineers of the War Department, and by the Chief Engineer of the War Department. We have had also, in the final preparation of this measure, in the process of reducing the total amount of the authorizations carried in the bill, that they might be reduced to the very minimum, the aid and assistance of the President of the United States, the Budget Committee, and the House Committee on Appropriations. The bill has every safeguard and is therefore thoroughly defensible, both in general principle and as to its details.

I wish first, in presenting the general principles of this bill, to present some facts to prove conclusively that a comprehensive annual or biennial program of adequate authorizations and appropriations for the development of all the rivers and harbors in every section of the United States and its Territories should be adopted and carried out by the Congress. As authority for this position I quote, in part, President Coolidge's first message to the present Congress during the first session. The President declared December 6, 1923, in his concluding statement on this subject:

> These projects can not all be undertaken at once, but all should have the immediate consideration of the Congress and be adopted as fast as plans can be matured and the necessary funds become available. This is not incompatible with economy, for their nature does not require so much a public expenditure as a capital investment which will be reproductive, as evidenced by the marked increase in revenue from the Panama Canal. Upon these projects depends much future industrial and agricultural progress. They represent the protection of large areas from flood and the addition of a great amount of cheap power and cheap freight by use of navigation.

I submit the proposition that, regardless of whether these appropriations are for the benefit of any particular waterway or harbor in any particular part of this country, that there is no governmental activity more important or better safeguarded than authorizations and appropriations for this purpose, and that there is no sounder money investment that this Government could make in the interest of the American people than the carrying out of such a program as I have mentioned for river and harbor development over a long period, say, of 20 to 25 years.

This argument is further strengthened by the fact that at times an enormous congestion of freight has occurred and will certainly continue to occur with the reawakening of domestic and foreign commerce, following the adjustment of reparations and other difficulties resulting from the World War. Even if our railways should continue to prosper and expand, as I hope

they will, they will at best provide totally inadequate facilities to meet these growing needs, and then, unfortunately, the railways may, through widespread labor strikes and through other causes, utterly break down, as they have done in the past, subjecting not only our millions of shippers and producers to huge losses but subjecting the American people, the helpless consumers, to actual suffering and worse through a breakdown in transportation of food and fuel and other actual necessities of life.

But allowing the more favorable view that the railways will continue to build up and expand, the cost of railway freight is excessive as compared with the cost of water-borne freight, especially with respect to bulky and other classes of freight, as I shall conclusively show in the subjoined tables carefully worked out at my request under the supervision of Gen. Lansing H. Beach, formerly Chief of Engineers of the War Department and consulting engineer to the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives:

THE APPROXIMATE COST OF 100 POUNDS OF FREIGHT SHIPPED BY WATER AND BY RAIL

General Beach, in a letter to me, says:

"The approximate cost of 100 pounds of freight shipped by water for any given distance, varies over a very wide range, according to the nature of the freight, the depth of channel, the character and efficiency of the carrier, terminal, and interchange facilities, etc. Considering economical movements by established carriers, the following figures of cost per ton-mile may be taken as broadly typical. They were obtained in a recent cost study made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers and cover all items of cost, operating and nonoperating, including carrying charges on investment:

	Mills
Mississippi River, barge traffic, general cargo	4.4
Monongahela River, barge traffic, coal	4.6
Hudson River and New York State Barge Canal, barge traffic, general cargo	7.3
Great Lakes, steamers, package freight	4.2
Great Lakes, steamers, bulk freighters	0.8
Coastwise steamers, general cargo	4–6
Intracoastal steamer service (through Panama Canal), general cargo	1.5

"THE APPROXIMATE COST OF 100 POUNDS SHIPPED BY RAIL

"The railroad costs, as distinguished from railroad rates, are very difficult to obtain without elaborate study. The best information available here indicates that the average cost per ton-mile of freight in 1922 for 15 railroads in various parts of the country, including all charges of every character, and making certain necessary assumptions as to allocations of charges, was in the neighborhood of 13 mills. Variations in the assumptions made may reduce this about 25 or more per cent."

I interpret General Beach's comprehensive figures and comparisons as to the relative cost of water-borne freight and rail-borne freight to mean, taking into consideration the many elements entering into his computations, that the average freight cost per ton-mile on water is approximately 3.83 mills, and that the average per ton-mile of freight by rail, taken in 1892 as a typical year and as applying to 15 railroads in various parts of the country, to be approximately 13 mills, including all charges of every character and making certain assumptions as to allocations of charges.

The difference between 3.83 mills for water-borne freight and 13 mills for rail-borne freight shows a difference or saving of 9.17 mills in every ton-mile of water-borne freight.

Applying these authoritative figures to the approximate 442,000,000,000 tons of freight now carried over our 25,000 miles of rivers, canals, and intracoastal waterways, exclusive of ocean waterways, already developed and made navigable fully or in part, we would have a yearly saving of $2,000,000,000, which saving to the consumers, shippers, and manufacturers of our country could be greatly increased by the carrying out of our proposed annual program of authorizations and appropriations for the systematic full development of the whole navigable length—32,000 miles—of our rivers and waterways. In this connection it may be noted that only 25,000 miles of our 32,000 miles of navigable waterways have been fully or partly improved.

It will be seen in General Beach's analysis, and he and General Taylor, the present Chief of Engineers of the War Department, are the highest and safest authorities on this subject in this country and men of the highest integrity, that the geographical distribution of the $1,090,000,000 of total appropriation for our rivers and harbors since the beginning of this Government, or actually since 1824—a century ago, when the first appropriations were made for this purpose—has been essentially fair and equitable, according to the real river and harbor needs of the various sections of our country, and that the greater expenditures have been in the interest of our greater harbors and waterways scattered pretty equally over the whole country in proportion to the real needs of the more important waterways and harbors.

The following is General Beach's letter to me as to the total appropriations for rivers and harbors since the beginning of the United States Government, and their approximate distribution:

Hon. J. J. KINDRED,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KINDRED: 1. In compliance with your telephone request of the 8th instant for a statement of the amounts required to be appropriated for the completion of existing projects, I take pleasure in inclosing herewith four photostat copies of a tabulation prepared from the data given in my annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923. If you will look at the report, you will find at the end of the financial statement for each project the figures given in this tabulation.

2. The total expenditure of the Federal Government for the construction, maintenance, and operation of works for the improvement of rivers and harbors and all related works since such improvements were first instituted nearly a century ago has been approximately $1,090,000,000. Of this amount, up to June 30, 1923, there have been spent, in round numbers, $385,000,000, or about three-eighths of the total, for the improvement and maintenance of harbors on our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts and in Hawaii and Porto Rico; $15,000,000, less than 1 per cent of the total, had been spent on coastwise channels and intracoastal canals along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts; $142,000,000, or one-eighth of the total, on the connecting channels and harbors of the Great Lakes; $445,000,000, or a little less than one-half of the total, on our interior rivers and lakes other than the Great Lakes, this amount being exclusive of the amount expended for the construction of levees on the Mississippi River and for flood control on the Sacramento River; $60,000,000 or about one-sixteenth of the total, had been spent for levee construction on the Mississippi River and for flood control on the Sacramento. In addition, some $20,000,000 had been expended for investigations, surveys, and contingent expenses not susceptible of classification; and another $20,000,000 for projects which have been abandoned, have proven obsolete, or have been otherwise dropped from the reports. It is interesting to note that nearly three-fourths of the total expenditure of $385,000,000 for harbors was expended on the improvement and maintenance of 30 of the most important ports of the United States. Of the $445,000,000 expended on inland waterways, more than one-half has been spent on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers alone, this not including some $60,000,000 expended on the levees of the Mississippi. It should be remembered that the figures given are the total disbursements of the Federal Government on river and harbor work and that these figures include expenditures for upkeep, maintenance, and operation of works extending over nearly a century of time, as well as their capital cost.

Very truly yours, LANSING H. BEACH,

Major General, Chief of Engineers.

DEEPENING OF THE HUDSON RIVER

The authorization in this bill of $11,000,000 for the deepening and improvement of the Hudson River, N. Y., as far as Albany is one of the three larger projects carried in the bill. Although this project will probably be conspicuously attacked on the floor of the House as being chiefly in the interest of the city and State of New York, this attack will be fully met by Members who have informed themselves as to the far-reaching beneficial results that will come in a nation-wide way by opening the Hudson River to commerce in a larger sense than is possible under the present conditions. I, as a member of the committee, wish to point out the splendid results that will come from this improvement in the exchange of commerce between the Pacific States through the Panama Canal and the six big railroads converging at Albany and New York and New England and the country south and west of Albany. This means the cheap transportation of the millions of tons of lumber and other bulky freight from several of the Pacific States, and cheap freight rates to those States on manufactures of the products of New York and New England.

Another important principle covered by this bill proposes to stop the most wasteful and unbusinesslike methods that have prevailed in the river and harbor appropriations in the past, in that important projects have been authorized and only partial appropriations made, resulting in failure to complete projects and consequent large losses to the Government in interest on the large amounts invested.

This is illustrated in a number of projects in which the Government has invested now and locked up under previous authorizations approximately $175,000,000, as is shown, and which projects it will require approximately $200,000 to complete because of the uncompleted stretches in these waterways, such

as in the Ohio River project. In the Ohio River project, authorized some 15 years or more ago, we have spent approximately $87,000,000, and yet this large amount is locked up in that improvement because a stretch of approximately one-third of that great river is not yet improved for through navigation.

As bearing further on this wasteful and inexcusable policy of authorizing beginning these projects and leaving them incomplete and unnavigable, I refer to the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army for the year 1924, indicating that approximately $175,000,000 would be required to complete and make useful all these projects heretofore authorized, including secondary harbors, coastwise channels, principal seacoast harbors, principal rivers, lake harbors and channels, and secondary rivers.

One of the most important and meritorious features of the pending bill carrying out our proposed program is section 2, declaring it to be the policy of the Congress that all river and harbor projects heretofore, herein, and hereafter adopted shall be completed within five years from the passage of this act, or of subsequent acts adopting such projects, if physically practicable.

Another most meritorious feature of this bill of far-reaching importance not only in the matter of commerce and navigation but in the matter of preparedness in case of war is section 3 of the bill, which provides such investigations as may be necessary for the preparation of a general plan for the most effective navigation improvement in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power on those navigable streams of the United States and their tributaries where such power development appears feasible and practicable, together with an estimate and report of the cost of conducting such investigations as to all such streams and tributaries, at a cost not to exceed $500,000, with recommendation that $250,000 be immediately appropriated.

This bill embodies the general principles referred to in the outset—the principles of true economy and an investment by the Government in the interest of the people of all sections of our great country and its territories.

As to the amounts carried in detail for the 39 projects provided for in the bill, they have been, as already stated, most carefully scutinized and reduced to the very minimum compatible with the river and harbor needs of the country.

The most urgent and worthy projects in many States and sections of the United States and in its territories, including the Hilo Harbor in Hawaii, and Ponce Harbor in Porto Rico, have been provided for, all with a view of expending gradually over a period of five years such amounts as have been estimated by the United States Board of Engineers and the Chief of the Board of Engineers as being actually necessary to complete the projects authorized in this and previous river and harbor bills to the end that we shall unify, coordinate, and fully complete a magnificent system of intracoastal canals, inland rivers, and harbors to facilitate navigation and the increasing waterborne commerce of our great country and all its territories, with a saving to the shippers, manufacturers, and consumers of the country of more than $2,000,000,000 annually in water-borne freight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and I understand the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], will also extend five minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank both these gentlemen for their courtesy. The pendency of this bill brings to mind recollections of long years of laborious effort in this branch of legislation. For 14 years, from 1895 to 1909, I was a member of this committee, and during the last 10 years of that time I was the chairman. There is not now a single member who served then on that committee now serving. The majority have passed into the great beyond. There is only one reminiscence of that time—the faithful service of the industrious clerk, Mr. McGann, who was appointed in 1902. [Applause.]

During those years the committee sought to establish certain principles. First, there was the wiping off of the river and harbor map of numerous projects which had been dragging for many years, chestnuts as it were. I regret to say that in the interval from 1909 on some of them have come back. Another was to finish a project when once adopted, within a limited time, by the adoption of what was called the continuing contract system. Another was the establishment of the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors, in order to have more critical consideration of projects and to create general standards. For instance, under the prior system one engineer would take up a project with an appropriation of, say, $500,000, and he would commend it, while another engineer would take one far more worthy, costing $200,000, and reject it. The Board of Engineers introduced uniformity.

That committee did not shy away from generous appropriations. In the year 1907 I brought in a bill appropriating and authorizing $85,000,000. That was the river and harbor bill. It provided for the great projects in the country.

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

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In 1910 there was a bill introduced and passed by the House for $263,000,000.

Mr. BURTON. A good deal of that is dragging yet. There was no provision for completion, as in the act of 1907. I do not think the bill of 1910 was made up of so choice items as the one of 1907. We provided for the harbor of Boston, the harbor of New York, of Philadelphia, of Baltimore, for the mouth of the Mississippi River leading to New Orleans, for the Mississippi River, and for improvement upon the Great Lakes. I am frank to admit a discouragement, based upon examination, both in this country and in Europe, of results from the improvement of most of the rivers of the country. The traffic of the Mississippi had almost disappeared in the upper reaches, and the traffic on the Missouri consisted mainly of sand, and for a very few miles. Since 1909, however, great changes have occurred in the country. First, I would mention the enormous increase of freight traffic. Gentlemen should bear in mind this fact. Population increases, wealth increases more rapidly than population, production increases more rapidly than wealth; but transportation, the interchange of commodities, increases more rapidly than any of them. Then another factor of difference between 1909 and the present is the great increase in freight rates which did not really appear until about the second year of the Great War, in 1916. I am willing to consider with a degree not merely of candor but of favor projects that I did not regard as worth while in 1909 and to give some of those which were rejected a trial. I am enthusiastically in favor of the improvement of the waterways of the country, so far as they may give commerce an adequate return. Generally speaking, the improvement of the harbors has been far more profitable than the improvement of the interior waterways, with the exception of the Great Lakes, which stand in a class by themselves.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the Monongahela.

Mr. BURTON. And the Monongahela, which is also in a class by itself. It is a comparatively short river on which there are great iron and steel mills, with coal mines near it. For a short river it is the one having the greatest local traffic in the world. There are others, and with the consent of the House I shall print in addition certain classes of rivers that I think, under any and all circumstances, can be properly improved.

I repeat this list from one set forth in a report made some years ago. The following classes of rivers may be profitably improved: First, rivers which afford access to cities or centers of consumption located at no great distance from the sea, upon which the haul by river can be combined with the movement by sea. Of this class are the Delaware, reaching from the city of Philadelphia to the sea; the Patapsco, between Baltimore and the Chesapeake Bay; the Mississippi, between New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico; the Columbia and the Willamette, between Columbia and the Pacific Ocean. Second, rivers of considerable size upon which large cities or industrial centers are located and which can be made the means of transportation between producer and consumer in the shipment of heavy and coarse freights, such as coal, iron ore, or building material. In this class may be included the Ohio and the Hudson, with its canal connection with the Great Lakes. Third, short rivers in busy industrial sections, where the consumer and producer are located near to each other. The best illustration of a river of this class is the Monongahela in Pennsylvania. This tonnage consists almost entirely of coal carried from mines on or near to the river to mills or furnaces at or near Pittsburgh. Fourth, minor streams at or near great cities or thickly populated areas. There are a number of these streams tributary to the waters around New York City, to the Delaware below Philadelphia, and to the Chesapeake Bay. In the case of these streams a market for the products of the locality tributary to the river in question is not far away and freight can profitably be carried in boats of shallow draft. Fifth, shallow streams of considerable length in the interior flowing through level areas which can be made available or improved for navigation at compara-

tively small cost by snagging. There are rivers of this type in North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana.

I want now to say something in regard to this bill. If there are objectionable projects on the list for improvement I do not think they are in this measure. There are some that I would criticize, but as a whole they are of an excellent class, and certainly $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 a year is not an excessive sum to appropriate for new projects in rivers and harbors. I would especially commend that intercoastal waterway on the coasts of Louisiana and Texas. There has been a phenomenal development there, and certain commodities, oil, sulphur, lumber, salt, and rice require transportation facilities. When I say I commend that intercoastal waterway, I at the same time wish to voice opposition to a plan that has a great deal of support in this country, for the building of a deep channel suitable for deep-draft ships in the interior, such as is proposed upon the Atlantic seaboard. Your skipper considers himself as guilty of cowardice if he prefers a protected waterway of that kind to the open ocean. Then again there is the difficulty of manipulating great ships in such narrow confines, and conditions are such as to give advantage in all respects to the open ocean itself.

I would mention another project in this bill, the Los Angeles Long Beach Harbor, which is worthy of commendation, not only because of the enormous increase in traffic which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] has mentioned, but because of the very generous cooperation by the people of that community. I have visited that harbor quite a number of times, and I have noticed not merely its gradual growth but its phenomenal growth, and in view of the local cooperation I think that very decidedly worthy of adoption.

I must strike a discordant note, however, in regard to the Hudson River project. I am not so sure of that. It is difficult to manipulate ocean steamships within the bounds of a river. I recall three or four rivers in the world which afford facilities for even the largest ships.

There is first and primarily the Amazon. Next the Rio de La Plata, another river in South America; next the Yangtse, China, up which boats go for more than 700 miles with a draft of 27 feet. Then there is the St. Lawrence River. But for these four nature has provided a channel wide enough and deep enough for navigation by large ships. Oh, the Hudson River locality is in the midst of teeming hives of industry and commerce, and it may succeed, but I question whether large boats will go up as far as Albany. Possibly one motive behind this project is the creation of a deep waterway to connect with the Great Lakes. Now, in closing—how much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. BURTON. I want to say one thing of this whole river and harbor policy, that we ought to treat water as an entirety, navigation, water power, purification of water, prevention of floods, and there is nothing better that this House can do than to frame some system under which they shall be treated, not merely in reference to navigation, not treating it as a separate unit, but to bring all together as an asset of this people as important as the land. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO].

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the friends of our waterways who believe that water must become one of the important links of our transportation system and keep step with our railways and good roads would have been glad to see this rivers and harbors bill carry a larger authorization. But under the circumstances we are doing the very best we can, and hope that this bill will pass both Houses and be signed by the President at this session of Congress.

It is admitted by all that one of the most vital problems confronting the American people to-day is the problem of transportation. Our industries can not develop and will not grow beyond the limits of our transportation facilities. There must be more efficient transportation and cheaper rates for a proper distribution of the products of our farms, forests, mines, and factories. Nature has given us the most magnificent waterway system in the world, and we have done less, as an advanced people, to develop and use our waterways than any other people. I am glad to say that I have noticed quite a change of sentiment during the 12 years I have been here in favor of our waterways, and I am sure that the time will soon come when we will realize the importance of authorizing and appropriating enough to complete all our worthy projects.

During the short time for debate I can not go further into the general subject, because I wish to say a few words relative to one of the projects in this bill—the intracoastal canal.

We had hoped that the committee would give us $16,000,000 to complete the canal from New Orleans to Corpus Christi, but the committee in cutting down the other main projects also reduced us to $9,000,000, so that we will have to stop at Galveston instead of Corpus Christi, Tex. It is to be hoped that the Congress will keep this worthy project in mind and that later on it will give us the balance to finish it.

First. The proposed improvement is merely a standardization of the canal on the basis of a 9-foot depth and a 100-foot bottom width from New Orleans to Corpus Christi, a distance of 573 miles, in order that it may conform with the project depths of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and the Chicago-Mississippi waterway, making possible thereby through transportation by the use of the same equipment.

Second. The construction of the canal on the basis proposed will open up the entire Southwest, and the Republic of Mexico as well, for distribution by water of the manufactured products of the entire Mississippi Valley, and likewise provide cheap water transportation for the movement in return cargo of a vast tonnage of sulphur, oil, rice, sugar, salt, lumber, cotton, and various agricultural products to the consuming and industrial centers of the North and East.

Third. In a report upon the commercial possibilities of the canal, Gen. George W. Goethals estimates the present potential movement over it at from 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons annually.

Fourth. A special report made by the Board of Engineers by one of its members estimates the annual tonnage in excess of 4,000,000 tons.

Fifth. The construction of the canal is conditioned upon local interests providing terminals and floating equipment, including towboats and barges, sufficient "for the economical handling" of not less than 1,200,000 tons annually. The project document specifically provides "that work * * * shall not be commenced until the Secretary of War has received satisfactory assurances" that the facilities and equipment mentioned "will be available by the date of its completion." In other words, this obligation, which will require an investment estimated at from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 upon the part of the users of the canal, amply safeguards the interests of the Government by insuring in advance of the expenditure of a single dollar of Federal funds the actual use of the canal when it is completed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss briefly the proposed Hudson River project, the second item in this bill. I find on referring to the document relating thereto that some $11,000,000 are involved, and how much more than that no one knows.

The provision in the resolution reads:

> Hudson River, New York, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 350, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

This document contains a great deal of information; I want to read a portion of it into the RECORD; I want to call attention of Members to certain significant portions of it. And in the same connection must be considered the hearings of this project held before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives on June 3 of the last session.

House Document No. 350 is a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting together therewith a letter from the Chief of Engineers, also reports on the preliminary examination and the survey of the Hudson River from Hudson to the dam at Troy, with a view to securing a depth of 27 feet and a width of 400 feet. It is dated June 3.

Before this body proceeds summarily to approve this large project the facts contained in this document and in the reports of the experts therein contained, more than warrant a careful scrutiny of the immediate plan, of the recommendations of the engineers who have ably studied it and of the ultimate probable results and effects of the authorization of this project.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] who is as well informed on subjects connected with rivers and harbors legislation as any Member of this House, has just told you that he has been compelled to strike a discordant note with regard to the Hudson River project.

On page 41 in the report of the division engineer which accompanied the report of the exhaustive survey by the district engineer, I read:

> The division engineer does not consider the prospects of general commercial benefits to be derived from the proposed improvement sufficient to warrant the Federal expense involved, and accordingly recommends that the improvement be not undertaken at this time unless the State

or other local interests contribute at least 50 per cent of the cost of improvement. With such cooperation the work would probably be justified.

This is the syllabus, preceding the report by H. C. Newcomer, colonel, Corps of Engineers, and division engineer of the eastern division, to the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and is dated February 29, 1924.

Notice that he—

* * * recommends that the improvement be not undertaken at this time, unless the State or other local interests contribute at least 50 per cent of the cost of improvement—

and that, even with that provision complied with, he is only able to report that the work will—

probably be justified.

The chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] has just explained to you in detail the various and several steps that are taken. Permit me, in this connection, to review the steps as they have been taken in this project, as sketched in the report of the survey of the district engineer, on page 24 of the document, and elsewhere.

Following authorization by Congress of a preliminary examination and survey in the river and harbor act approved March 4, 1915, the district engineer made such an examination, and reported thereon to the Chief of Engineers on January 8, 1916. Since the district officer in this case was also the division engineer, this step was dispensed with, and the report accordingly went to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, which concurred in the findings of the district engineer recommending a complete survey, under date of January 19, 1916.

After study of these reports, the survey was authorized by the Chief of Engineers in a letter dated January 27, 1916, and the report thereon, also included in the document, is dated January 23, 1924, with the explanation that "report on the survey was, however, delayed at the request of local interests to permit more detailed studies to be made of the economic justification of the project."

The division engineer for the northeast division, in his report of February 29 previously referred to, forwarded the survey report of the district officer, together with his observations, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, which on May 6, 1924, after a review of the whole project, reported their findings to the Chief of Engineers. The chief, on June 2, reported with his findings to the Secretary of War, who on the same day reported to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Keeping in mind, then, this procedure, let us examine them in their order and see what the opinions of these engineers, expert and disinterested public servants that they are, reveal. Toward the project, from beginning to end, they evidence an unwillingness to give a cordial recommendation that is astounding; they support this reticence with an array of facts and evidence that can not but prove to any student the serious doubt as to the practicability of the proposed development.

In his preliminary report of January 8, 1916, found on page 11 of the document, the district engineer, William M. Black, since retired from active service, and the possessor of an enviable record among engineers, observes, in paragraph 39, page 23, of his report:

The extraordinary expenditures made by the State of New York during the past century for developing water-borne commerce on projects which were chiefly national in scope entitle the State to a corresponding consideration on the part of the Federal Government in the matter of ascertaining the cost of a projected improvement which is closely related to their completed projects. Congress has, three successive times, ordered a preliminary examination concerning the same project. In the two previous examinations it was reported that the project had merit, but that time had not matured for initiating work.

Then we come to the report of the extended survey by the district engineer, J. R. Slattery, lieutenant colonel of Engineers. On page 24 of the document his syllabus, preceding the report, reads:

The district engineer considers the upper Hudson as worthy of further improvement by the United States at the present time to the extent of providing a channel 27 feet deep and 300 feet wide from Hudson, N. Y., to the Albany-Greenbush Bridge at Albany, N. Y., at a cost of $9,675,000 under certain specified conditions of local cooperation. He considers improvement between the said bridge and Troy Dam as unjustified at the present time.

The fact that he calls attention to the "certain specified conditions of local improvement" is further borne out in his report, which, with the report of the division engineer and subsequent reports of superiors, have much vital information.

This report is largely based on and is an analysis of the report submitted in January, 1924, by the Technical Advisory Corporation, a New York firm of consulting engineers, to which I shall refer later. He gives as his reason therefor the fact that this is the leading and accepted brief of arguments of those favoring this project.

The corporation claims (H. Doc. 350, p. 149) that the following capitalized benefits would be derived from the proposed channel improvement and the accompanying creation of an upper Hudson port:

Reduction in flood drainage	$500,000
Reduction in boat-operating costs	400,000
Saving through lower land values	2,000,000
Reduction of freight-car time	1,250,000
Reduction of freight rates	18,300,000
Total	22,450,000

You will find that the district engineer has effectively proved that the first is unwarranted in its entirety; the second item is twice too large; the third "seems beyond the realm of possibility"; the fourth is warranted in part, although based on assumptions; and the last and by far the largest item is dismissed with the statement that—

in view of the assumptions that had to be made in arriving at the tonnage figures above it is not believed that they are sufficiently convincing to warrant the investment of such large sums in a new port as they indicate (p. 32).

Of the estimated savings in rates and tonnage charges on certain commodities he says:

The methods used in arriving at above tonnages were such that the figures are far from conclusive, except in the case of automobiles. The estimated savings are also far from conclusive (p. 38).

While he declares the Technical Advisory Corporation to have gone at the case as logically as anyone could and to have earnestly attempted to be fair in their predictions, he states that he—

is far from convinced as to actual tonnages and savings claimed and regards the estimates more as indices of the possibilities of a port on the upper Hudson than as reliable estimates of the commercial benefits to be expected from the creation of such a port (p. 39).

The conclusions of the district engineer are far from being an enthusiastic recommendation. He makes specific conditions that he declares local authorities must fulfill before the Federal Government should consider proceeding; they include ample terminal facilities and the complete arrangement of the details of execution of these provisions by local authorities, including appropriation of funds and contracts for completion within four years. Further than that, he urges against undertaking any development farther than Albany. This report of the district engineer is dated January 23, 1924.

Then follows the report of the division engineer, dated February 29, 1924, frankly hostile to the project as outlined. His syllabus has previously herein been quoted. His recommendation is that the work be undertaken from Hudson to Albany only if the local authorities assume at least one-half the cost. He states, in commenting upon the report of the Technical Advisory Corporation and the report of the survey by the district engineer in which the latter recommends Federal construction with certain conditions of local cooperation, that—

A seaport at Albany would probably result in substantial benefits to that locality and some other parts of the State. It is not clear whether there would be any widespread substantial savings effected by a seaport at Albany compared with New York. Even if there were, it is to be noted that such savings are already possible at their ports already serving the same great hinterland, and it is hardly likely that the savings at Albany would exceed those at Baltimore. There are, apparently, advantages in doing business through the port of New York that maintain its supremacy, notwithstanding the cheaper rates through other ports.

On the whole, therefore, it is doubtful whether the general public would derive benefits from a seaport at Albany sufficient to warrant the cost of the improvement. I, accordingly, recommend that the work be not undertaken by the United States at this time, at Federal expense alone, as proposed by the district engineer. If the project is adopted the State or other local interests should, apparently, bear a large part of the cost on account of special local benefits, as in the case of the inland ports at Houston, Beaumont, and Orange. In my opinion this local cooperation should cover at least 50 per cent of the original cost of the work, in addition to the other conditions recommended by the district engineer. Such local cooperation would constitute a powerful argument in favor of the project, and I believe would justify its adoption by the United States.

Please note that he recommends not only the payment by local interests of 50 per cent of "the original cost of the work,"

but that this is to be "in addition to the other conditions recommended by the district engineer," instead of concurring in the views of the district engineer that the "other conditions" referred to be considered as fulfilling the locality's share in the project. And remember the division engineer is the immediate superior of the district officer, an expert of more experience, better acquaintance with the entire project and its ramifications, and described by the late Hon. James R. Mann, a distinguished and eminent Republican statesman, as one who is—

a senior officer, with years of experience on river and harbor work, and has supervision over several districts.

The board thereupon, in its report, recommends the district engineer's idea despite the views of the division engineer, except that it makes minor changes in the conditions. In justifying the departure from the accepted procedure in similar cases of securing from local interested persons contributions in cash, the board states that the expense of the State of New York incident to the barge canal should be considered, inasmuch as this—

is a most important element in the success of an upper Hudson port (p. 10).

In this connection, let me call to your attention the annual message of Alfred E. Smith, Governor of the State of New York, delivered to the legislature January 7, 1925, wherein he says:

Interesting also is the history of the tonnage carried on the old Erie Canal by comparison with the new barge canal. Taking the six years prior to the abolition of the tolls—from 1877 to 1882—32,593,646 tons of freight passed through the old Erie Canal, or an average yearly of 5,434,474 tons. The new barge canal was not really opened for operation until 1919. Taking the six years from 1919 to 1924, we have 9,842,884 tons of freight carried, or a yearly average of 1,640,481 tons. In making a comparison of these figures it must be borne in mind that the new canal was designed to carry about four times the amount of freight that could pass through the old Erie Canal in a given period.

* * * I believe the people of the State are entitled to know whether all the purposes intended by this enormous expenditure or any part of it are being achieved.

The remainder of the portion of his address devoted to this subject bears out the grave doubt now existing in the governor's mind as to the practical value and the future of the barge canal. Its value, as stressed by the board, in the upper Hudson port, and the validity of the claim of the locality to exemption on that account from the usual procedure, is therefore highly questionable.

The board also, following its recommendations, adds the observation that the adoption of this project will, in addition to obligating the Government in other ways, mean the necessity for further projects below Hudson in the Hudson River.

The Chief of Engineers in his final report reiterates and reviews the above and concurs with the board in believing that the State of New York should be given credit for its expense in connection with the barge canal, and that this should be offset against the contribution which would otherwise be expected.

The letters and reports are transmitted by the Secretary of War without comment.

You will, on noting the facts outlined above and on giving them the more detailed attention that neither time nor space here permit, be forcibly impressed with the fact that these experts in their reports on the project have indeed "damned it with faint praise." Mr. Weeks has given no opinion, in spite of the favor with which the War Department is alleged to consider the project. The meaning, however, of the reports of these officers, high in the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, under direction of the War Department, is unmistakable; they deprecate this enormous expenditure of public money unless there is clearly an equal sharing by the locality of the expense.

The report by General Beach, the then Chief of Engineers—who on June 18, 1924, retired from active service, after a commendable career, because of the age limitations of the Army—is dated June 2. The hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors occurred on the next day, June 3. Before them appeared General Taylor, then head of the civil division and assistant to the chief. He has since been promoted to the Chief of Engineers' post.

The hearings establish nothing new in evidence or fact that has not in effect been brought out in the report. You will find on referring to them that a large portion of General Taylor's testimony consists of answering "Yes, sir," to questions propounded by the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY]. Where the questions of the chairman have been so constructed that the general could not agree, he has softened the sting of his reply by evading a direct unfavorable answer. The most unsophisticated lay mind will wonder, at reading the hearing, why. The same conditions exist; the same provisions are in the minds of the engineers; the same limitations as to practicability and feasibility exist.

Justification for the project is attempted as recorded on page 8 of the hearings. Estimates of the cost to the State of the local improvements is given and commented on. But the fact is not controverted or denied that, instead of definite contracts, in this case there are only words of assurance, incomplete plans, indefinite provisions to arrange for the raising of these large amounts of money locally.

Placed in its best light—set forth in detail in the report of the Technical Advisory Corporation—we find the exact status of the local participation referred to.

In the résumé of the report (page 147) we are told that—

The creation of an upper Hudson port district is the best means of creating a port authority to make use of facilities provided through channel improvements.

A majority of the political subdivisions in the upper Hudson port district have passed resolutions favorable to the establishment of such a district and agree to contribute toward its organization and continued administration.

On page 144, in the section of the corporation's report, No. 62, which deals with this port-district phase of the problem, I find that the corporation declares that because of the many municipalities and communities involved, such organization, instituted through unanimous petition of these localities, and achieved through legislative action, would be required. To this end the corporation prepared and submitted to the interested municipalities a resolution providing:

That the governing body (of the name of political subdivision) will, at the proper time and in so far as lies in its power, advocate and do its utmost to secure the enactment by the Legislature of the State of New York of legislation authorizing. * * *

But such legislation shall be conditioned upon a report being made by the United States Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in favor of the project, and the approval of the said report by the Secretary of War.

Oh, what little assurance! How little it means, Mr. Chairman. These interested localities within this restricted proposed port area have resolved, a majority of them, to urge the State legislature, "at the proper time" and "in so far as lies in their power," to enact the laws that will authorize the creation of this port and other things. Do you see—nothing is promised definitely. No real obligation. No certainty.

The proposed legislation would also provide for the creation of an advisory committee, which in turn will be empowered to select an upper Hudson port commission, said commission to have authority under the terms of this same problematical act of the legislature over the development, control, operation, and administration of the port, including the apportionment of obligations of the several divisions, and execute contracts.

Is that all? It is not. Recall, if you please, the quotation above given from the same resolution which predicates all this on the favorable report of the board and the approval of the Secretary of War.

And what have we? A series of reports that, while advocating a project that is but a part of the project these municipalities are working for, yet are filled with dismaying and disconcerting facts that indicate the doubt as to its feasibility and practicability and success. We have reports that demand participation by local authorities as a requisite, and here it is met in this vague manner.

What a flood of urgent appeals through these sources has not been brought to the ears of expert engineers! And even then we fail to find any cordial recommendation or support. Is it too much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, to ask that our stamp of approval of this project be held in abeyance until there is at least some arrangement approaching the definite assumption of responsibility and participation by the State for its share? What assurance is there that these efforts of these few cities to secure the contemplated legislation will be successful in the State legislature? Is the desire unanimous? I shall prove, through insertion in these remarks at a later point of letters from another section of the State of New York, that such is emphatically not the case.

Before you have looked very deeply into this project you will have forced upon your vision the enormous potentialities of

the plan—roseate estimates, exaggerated computations, savings estimated in terms of capitalization instead of actual returns, plans for scope of the project and for its probabilities that should instead be considered in the light of possibilities only.

Recall, if you please, right here a portion of the report of the district engineer on his survey, wherein he states (p. 39) that:

Merely because freight can be moved to or from a port at lower cost than to or from some other port, it does not follow that all freight so affected will seek that port. If it did, Baltimore would probably handle more commerce than any other port in the United States. The amount of business done through any port depends probably more on the relative facilities for doing business in the port than on freight rates obtainable to or from the port, terminal facilities and charges, or channel conditions.

And mark the testimony given before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on this matter April 22 last by the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the House. He says there:

Now, the city of Albany, which is interested in this project, has had it examined, as I understand it, by a company the head of which is in highest standing with you gentlemen who are engineers. I know nothing about him except his reputation. He tells you there is potential commerce—of course, in advance of an improvement you can not have anything by which to measure except potential commerce—you have not the commerce, but merely a belief that owing to a condition that will exist the commerce will develop; he tells you that the potential commerce, the commerce that you may expect by an expenditure of less than $10,000,000 and an annual cost of $150,000 you will save money by increasing your commerce, save $20,000,000 a year to the people of the United States. * * *

Yes, indeed. This enormous saving is "potential" and something that you "may expect."

But now I come to what is indubitably the most important point in this entire problem, more important than any immediate expenditure or authorization of the present proposed project, because it looks to something that is far greater. I refer to the conclusion that is so impossible to dodge, Mr. Chairman, the conclusion that the main reason, and one might almost say the only real reason for this project at this time, is to deal a death blow, if possible, to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project.

Oh, I know my friends who are proponents of this project now under consideration will hasten to call to my attention the statement of the Chief of Engineers (p. 4) that this project—

is not regarded as a rival to any other outlet existing or proposed from those sections [the entire Lakes area and upper Mississippi Valley] to the sea.

But look through their testimony. Look through the large amount of information included in the document I have been referring to and all the information you can obtain, reading between the lines, and find for yourself convincing proof that the proponents of this project are looking practically without exception to the ultimate creation of a deep-water channel through New York to the Great Lakes. For example, note the excerpt from the statement of Henry W. Hill, Esq., of Buffalo, N. Y., before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors at their hearing on April 22, 1924, found on page 57:

Gentlemen, from every point of view we think the West and the Central West and all of that territory is concerned in this. For instance, they are coming down from Toledo and from all of those cities with their products and they will want to reach tidewater. You can see by referring to the map that it will be better for them to come east and get ocean transportation at Albany or Troy than it is to go down the St. Lawrence, which is closed to navigation about six months of the year and befogged through many other months of the year, whereas the Hudson River will always be safe and it is within and under the control of this Government.

And have you failed to note that in this same bill, on page 20, there is an item asking for authorization of a preliminary survey of a deeper waterway from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River, and also of the Hudson River below Hudson, through New York territory? And do you know that this survey has been made three times already by three different boards of engineers, State and National, and each time has been declared to be unfeasible?

It is perfectly obvious, in the light of these facts, that the underlying purpose in trying to get these items into this bill is to provide an argument against a treaty with Canada for construction of the proposed St. Lawrence international deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the ocean.

If we here approve this item the State of New York will be able to tell the rest of the Nation to wait yet a while, because they hope to be able to offer an all-American ship canal to the Atlantic. This despite the inevitable conclusions one draws from the several reports of as many engineers that it can never be accomplished, especially through New York territory. And no engineer of any standing will risk his reputation by claiming the feasibility of such an achievement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. I regret I can not yield, because the gentleman has promised me time and has withdrawn it.

This is not visionary. It is definitely indicated time and time again in the reports and in the evidence submitted therewith. In the testimony of E. P. Goodrich, vice president of the Technical Advisory Corporation, before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, on April 22, the following is found:

Colonel NEWCOMER. Mr. Goodrich, you advocate improvement up to the Troy Dam?

Mr. GOODRICH. Yes, sir.

Colonel NEWCOMER. Do you mean that absolutely to be the limit, or where would be the proper terminus of the improvement? Go right up to the lock?

Mr. GOODRICH. That would depend entirely upon conditions at Troy; but while this is a matter that should not be made public, it is my opinion that connection should be made to the ultimate deep waterway. You might just as well spend the money now, I think, as to wait till the deep waterway to the Great Lakes is constructed, because this will be a good asset, it will be an incentive to go through with that particular deep waterway project. The value of such a waterway, I think, is almost unquestionable, and this would be a step in that direction.

We find, then, the significant facts that the plan, sub rosa with those who are proponents of this project, is to force through the completion of the project to Troy, which the engineers have again this time refused, and then to carry it still further, to the Great Lakes. "A step in that direction," indeed. Several steps, I should say.

And at the same public meeting of the board the chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], says:

It is not simply the Hudson River alone. There are two great interests to be benefited by the great improvement. One is the city of New York, where we had the most appalling congestion throughout the Great War. The port has spent to date five or six millions of dollars to relieve this congestion, and this will be just another step in relieving it. Then we look to the West and see the golden fields of grain and find that all the grain throughout the territory and the farmers of the country are clamoring for routes to the sea, and this will be an important link in the development, and one of the most important links, a long link, and a very valuable link.

All kinds of a link, it would seem. In the opinion of the gentleman from New York, accordingly, this project is an important link in connecting the grain fields of the Northwest with the Atlantic Ocean.

Do you need any further evidence, gentlemen, that the real purpose of this project is the defeat of the St. Lawrence deep waterway? There may be contributing reasons; rumor has it that a company of real-estate men have gobbled up the land south of Albany in anticipation of this appropriation by Congress. But defeat the St. Lawrence waterway. And if it can not be defeated, delay it as long as possible. That seems to be the plan of action.

The following letters are valuable in this connection, inasmuch as they voice the attitude of another group of municipalities in a section of the State which has not the intense local interest in the Hudson River project. The letters, quoted below, indicate that the movement for the project we have before us is not in any sense a statewide movement, and that its path through the State legislature—upon which its fulfillment is contingent—will be no path of roses.

In transmitting this copy of the letter of the organization, its president observes:

We desire to call your attention to the inclosed copy of a letter which we are sending to all New York Representatives in Congress, in an effort to prevent a futile and wasteful expenditure of public funds.

This league (Northern New York Development League), which is composed of the various chambers of commerce, the large industrial organizations and the banks of northern New York, is heartily in favor of the immediate construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterway. We know the river, its navigation, and the proposed improve-

ment. We see in the appropriation of $100,000 for a ship canal across New York from Oswego to the Hudson River, an attempt to defeat, or at least delay, the St. Lawrence project.

A comparison of the two proposed ship canals shows how much more desirable the St. Lawrence route is to the Oswego-Hudson route.

The St. Lawrence route will require only 31 miles of canal, divided into short stretches of 8–15–8 miles; while the Oswego-Hudson canal will be a restricted channel 168 miles long, climbing up and down over a divide, as shown by the report of the International Joint Commission. Both canals will be open for navigation for the same period each year, as shown by the United States hydrographic reports.

The cost of the St. Lawrence improvement for a 30-foot channel will be $269,000,000 as compared with $650,000,000 for the Oswego-Hudson canal, as set forth in the report of the Chief of Engineers, 1920, cited in inclosed letter, and in the report of the International Joint Commission.

And finally the Oswego-Hudson route will provide no hydroelectric power, while, as a by-product of the improvement to navigation in the St. Lawrence River, 1,500,000 horsepower will be developed, which under the direction of Congress can be delivered to New York or elsewhere, or sold by the Federal Government to recoup itself for the expense of the project.

So far as the advantage of opening the heart of the country to cheap ocean transportation, there is no comparison between the natural St. Lawrence River outlet and the artificial Oswego-Hudson ship canal.

NORTHERN NEW YORK DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE,
Massena, N. Y., January 8, 1925.

DEAR SIR: In the campaign for rigid economy for public expenditures urged by the President he declares it is not easy to stand in the gap and resist the passage of increasing appropriation bills which would make tax reduction impossible. May we point out how, in at least one instance, the New York delegation in Congress can appropriately join the President in his stand?

The old project of a ship canal across New York State from Oswego to the Hudson River has been revived and an appropriation of $100,000 is sought for a new survey. This project has been surveyed and reported upon many times, and a reference to the printed official report by the Chief of Engineers will show how futile and incredibly costly such a project would be.

This report, printed in 1920 as House Document No. 890, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, sets forth in full detail all the various previous surveys and all data. It is pointed out that the cost of the proposed route would be more than double previous estimates amounting to a staggering total of over $600,000,000. It declares that the question of a water supply for the upper level of this canal "remains most formidable, if not insurmountable." It points out that the building of this proposed ship canal would mean the duplication of the Welland Canal, now building by Canada, and amply adequate to provide all navigation facilities for many years to come. And it finally shows that such a project would mean the destruction of the present New York State Barge Canal, which now occupies the Oswego and Mohawk Rivers. Such a project would mean the assumption by the Federal Government of the huge sums expended by the State.

These official facts carry the emphatic answer to any demand for an appropriation for another survey. We deem it particularly fitting that New York should be the first to oppose any such action and to promptly refute the insinuation which it carries that the State is trying to unload on the Federal Government an unprofitable investment.

Trusting that you will see your way for a prompt protest against the proposed appropriation, we are,

Very truly,
THE NORTHERN NEW YORK DEVELOPMENT LEAGUE,
By G. W. BALL, *President.*

Who, then, are so interested in killing the St. Lawrence River project? They are the same interests that have for years filled the papers with the cry of "pork" and "pork-barrel legislation" when it was a question of providing cheaper transportation by water. They are the railroad interests of the Nation, who withhold their calamitous cries when any proposed legislation will result in increased benefits to them, as is in this case frankly admitted even by proponents of the measure.

Here is where the great Northwest and the West, irrespective of party, should stand together to protect their interests. I appeal here and now to all Representatives in this body from the States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado, and other Western States which have declared definitely and emphatically for a deep waterway to the ocean by way of the St. Lawrence River, to join in defending this project against the deathblow it would receive through the authorization of the deeper Hudson project.

There is reason to believe that Canada will soon be ready to come to an agreement with the United States looking toward the realization of the international waterway; an overwhelming majority of shippers, farmers, and citizens of the West are vitally interested in this matter. That their hopes and plans should be ruined through the adoption of this provision for a project to deepen the Hudson and benefit a locality of indefinite expanse to an undetermined extent, is eminently unfair.

Events of the past few weeks give sound basis for the belief that the State of New York sees in the proposed project the opportunity to rid itself of the white elephant it now has in the barge canal. Earlier in these remarks I quoted from the address of the Governor of the State of New York, Mr. Smith, showing that the barge canal, despite its enormous cost and elaborate publicity, is being operated by the State at an alarming loss; that as a commercial problem it is declining into decay, and that the State feels the necessity of taking some action very soon. If the State is to be given credit in payment on this project for deepening the Hudson for its expense on the barge canal, is it then fair to have already thrust on us the prospect of being forced to take over the canal and make it a part of the Federal project because the State does not wish to sustain further losses thereon, and thereby subject its citizens to higher taxes?

The absorbing question for the farmers of the West is no longer one of production. The western farmer is now making two blades of grass grow where one grew before; the soil is fertile, and is utilized to the utmost. But the question of distribution is the vital problem; it demands solution very soon. Trainloads of food are rotting on the ground merely because transportation rates are too high to warrant their carriage to markets; when rates are substantially lowered the problems of the Northwest are more than half solved.

And the one great step toward the solution is the St. Lawrence deep waterway. But of course this would at once diminish the lucrative income of the railroads, and therefore they fight it in every way and at every conceivable turn. Ostensibly, this deeper Hudson project is intended to help the western farmer. Oh, yes, some people have the faculty of being able to make the worse appear the better reason. In reality, however, and in fact, it will help the money power, and will be detrimental to the farmer and the average citizen of the Western States.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the House, "the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this is a bill that authorizes appropriations of $31,151,000. Two hours have been given to general debate. One half of it, under the special rule passed, is controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], a strong advocate of every part of the bill, and the other half is controlled by my distinguished colleague from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, than whom there is no stronger advocate of the bill.

Gentlemen, you may search Jefferson's Manual from the first word to the last and you will not find where that unfair modus operandi has ever been adopted in debate before. You may search every rule of this House and you will not find that procedure warranted.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I can not, my time is so limited. Under all the rules of debate, in every parliamentary body of the world, those for and those against a measure are entitled to an equal division of the time in which to be heard.

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

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman who controls the time will give me five minutes more I will gladly yield to him.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I can not give time.

Mr. BLANTON. Therefore I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I can not. I would gladly if I had the time.

There is not a fairer man in the United States than my colleague from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, or a finer gentleman. He is a past grand master in the State of Texas of a great Masonic body. He is absolutely fair and a perfect gentleman, as courteous as lives to-day. But he is strongly in favor of this bill and has already promised all of his time to advocates

of the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], who controls the rest of the time, is in favor of every portion of the bill. I am in favor of some of its provisions but unalterably opposed to some projects which I deem waste. It is just certain parts of it to which I have objected. But how is any debater going to be able to intelligently discuss in five minutes objectionable items embraced in this bill in such a way as would appeal to the membership?

When my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD] this morning got up and asked the Speaker if those who were in opposition to the bill would have an opportunity to be heard, the Speaker said "Yes." How are they to be heard? They can go and ask for time of the strong proponents of the bill who have promised every bit of the time already to other proponents. They could have promised ten times as much time as they have to strong advocates of the bill if they had had it. Hence they have not any time left for Members to oppose their bill.

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

Mr. BLANTON. I regret I can not yield.

Under the five-minute rule you can get time, if the gentleman from New York will let you have it—five minutes. But he could keep you from getting it, if he so desires. Do you think he will let you get five minutes more? No. Let my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. BOYLAN], whom I see before me, and to whom I would like to yield if I had the time—let him get up and move to strike out the last word, and the other gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] would immediately say, "Mr. Chairman," and the Chair would recognize him, a member of the committee, in preference to my other friend from New York, and he would debate for five minutes. Then my friend [Mr. BOYLAN] would rise and say, "Mr. Chairman," and then the Chairman would recognize our colleague, Judge MANSFIELD, another member of the committee, and he would speak five minutes, and then the distinguished former Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who is mostly in favor of this bill, would ask for five minutes in opposition, whereupon the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] would move to close debate on that amendment and all other amendments to the paragraph, and the motion would prevail, and my friend from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] could not open his mouth.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I could not refuse.

Mr. BOYLAN. I would like to invite the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Texas to the fact that——

Mr. BLANTON. Please be brief in asking the question, so as not take up all my time. It is fleeting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is as strongly intrenched at this session of Congress as it was in the seventies when Judge Reagan, of Texas, wrested from the Appropriations Committee the power to appropriate. A man opposed to an appropriation contained in this bill has just as much of a chance at this time as a crippled grasshopper has for his life in a pen of turkeys. [Laughter.] I was granted only five minutes. I have never been an obstructionist. I have raised at times, perhaps, a lot of questions here, but that has never created much excitement, although I have voiced my true sentiments, and I think every man opposed to these measures should do so.

But let me call your attention to what this bill does. In 1916 the Democratic Congress brought in a bill and named the amount in figures that goes to every project. What have you got here? You have got a bill here that says, "According to reports on file," and you can not find the reports. I will offer you a premium if you will find these reports. You can go out here and inquire for them, but you will be told that they are exhausted.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I want to suggest to the gentleman that we will furnish to the gentleman any reports he seeks.

Mr. MCKEOWN. There are about 14 projects in this bill that carry an authorization in the aggregate of $58,000,000. Why do you not put the figures here to show the public what is to be authorized? You have an appropriation here to deepen Deep River and an appropriation to deepen a channel for the benefit of the Gulf Refining Co. down here in some place in South Carolina.

I will tell you what is the matter with this river and harbor proposition. You ask the Congress to spend millions of dollars on the theory that it helps commerce, and at the same time Congress sits here and lets the Interstate Commerce Commission strangle out the people and make the freight rates so high that the people can not ship their goods to the ports which the Government deepens or to the harbors which the Government improves. In the name of God, what is the use in deepening the harbors and the rivers when the freight rates are so high that you can not ship your goods to them? I am for improving the rivers of this country. But I say to you, Why waste your money and spend your millions deepening your rivers and still let the railroads choke them to death? The railroads are trying to strangle the Panama Canal right now by cutting the freight rates so that you can not ship through the Panama Canal.

Why do you waste the people's money by going out and spending it in this way? I believe in a great river system, but you are going out and buying canals, digging canals, intercoastal canals. What do you want with these canals? Does it make you seasick to ride outside in the sea, so that you want to ride on an inside canal where you can have still water? I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. He is pretty level headed when he says he is opposed to digging a canal along the Atlantic coast for safety purposes, where you would get your battleships hung up and could not get them out. So you want to deepen it in order to protect the country.

Gentlemen, this is a monstrosity. This bill ought to be recommitted to this committee with instructions to set out the amounts, so that the people of the Nation may know the amount of money you are appropriating. I am not averse to improving the rivers and harbors of this country. You are bound to do it if you progress. But why bring in a bill that no man in this House can understand and from the contents of which no man can tell how much money is to be appropriated?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKEOWN. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman will examine the report made by the committee, he will find that item by item is given the amount necessary for improvement, and he will find by adding those amounts that they come to a little more than $39,000,000.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Why does not the gentleman put that in his bill so that the people of the country may know? They will never see this report; the report will never go out to the country, but the statutes of the United States, the laws which Congress passes will go out to the country, so why not put the amounts in the bill so that the Members of this House can vote intelligently?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRAMTON). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MCDUFFIE]. [Applause.]

Mr. MCDUFFIE. Gentlemen of the committee, I would not assume to know all about the question of developing rivers and harbors. There are probably many things about the various projects already adopted throughout the country with which even the members of the committee are not thoroughly familiar. I think, however, the committee fairly well understands this measure, and we agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who has approved this bill, and who, in my judgment, knows more about river and harbor development than any man who has ever sat in these Halls. I was delighted to hear him express his approval of this bill, because he is a master of the subject.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCKEOWN] complains that we have not set out item by item the exact amount that is to be expended under this legislation. If the gentleman had carefully examined prior bills he would have known that this is the usual form in which these bills are presented to the House. Every report on every project is on file at the proper depository and can be secured. If the gentleman is really in favor of developing rivers and harbors, as he continues to say he is, he might well have gone to a little trouble and found out the exact amounts to be expended under each project.

Gentlemen here have talked about wasting money. I want to call your attention to a few figures I have collated, some of which were given me by Mr. Sheild, clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, hurriedly gotten together, setting out the amounts expended upon this kind of governmental activity as compared with amounts that have been expended for other

departments of the Government. I will put in the RECORD some figures for the benefit of those who are told that this is "pork-barrel legislation." I have no patience with this cry of "pork." Many of the great newspapers of the country have seen fit to call this kind of legislation "pork-barrel" legislation. The newspapers of the District of Columbia—great papers that they are, some of them—have taken peculiar pleasure, seemingly, in attacking this bill and calling it "pork."

It is pork when we spend a paltry sum to develop all of the harbors of the country, the rivers, and our inland waterways, for the benefit of our growing commerce and increased transportation, but if a bill comes in here to spend $50,000,000 for public buildings in the District of Columbia it is statesmanship. [Applause.] You can see the difference.

Let us see what we have expended on the river and harbor improvements in this country. For the fiscal year 1920–21 the total appropriations by the Congress were $4,789,000,000; of that amount one-fifth of 1 per cent—not even the Volstead proportion—was devoted to river and harbor work. In the next year, 1922–23, we appropriated $3,909,000,000; of that amount one-third of 1 per cent was devoted to river and harbor development. The next year, 1923–24, we appropriated $4,218,000,000; of that amount about one-half of 1 per cent was devoted to river and harbor development. In the next year we expended $3,995,000,000 plus; of that amount about 1 per cent was devoted to river and harbor work. The next year, 1924–25, we appropriated $3,784,123,324, and of that amount we devoted nine-tenths of 1 per cent to rivers and harbors.

Oh, I grow impatient with those who sit here and vote hundreds of millions out of the Public Treasury for the Army, Navy, Post Office, and other departments, and yet protest against a one-half of 1 per cent appropriation for the improvement of these great arteries of commerce.

Again, let us compare the expenditures for this work with other governmental activities. Of the total appropriations made for carrying on the Government in the last five years, a little more than 1 per cent was devoted to agriculture, 7 per cent was devoted to the Army, 8 per cent to the Navy, 13 per cent to the Post Office Department, and about one-half of 1 per cent was devoted to river and harbor development. Now, gentlemen, I ask you, where is the pork? Where are we wasting the people's money to provide facilities to handle, if you please, 450,000,000 tons of commerce, worth about $20,000,000,000, which moved last year on our rivers and through our harbors? Let me call your attention to another fact. Last year the cost to the Federal Government was not more than 8 cents per ton for the vast improvements over which moved all this tonnage of such great value.

From 1896 to 1902 the increase in expenditures for river and harbor work was only 42 per cent, while increase for other activities mounted by leaps and bounds. Since 1902 the increase has been only a little higher while on other Government expenditures it has rapidly increased. Let us take the last 10 years, and we find the amounts expended for agriculture during the last 10 years have increased 98 per cent, the amount expended for the Navy has increased 90 per cent, for the Post Office 103 per cent, and for the Army 133 per cent, while the amount expended for rivers and harbors has increased only 48 per cent. Yet men see fit to call this legislation pork!

From the table below showing the appropriations for 1925–26 it will be seen that the per capita expenditure for river and harbor development is infinitely less than the amounts expended in other governmental activities.

This year we spend—figuring the population at 120,000,000—for—

The Department of Agriculture, $124,663,473, which is $1.038 per capita.

The Department of the Interior, $237,840,926, which is $1.98 per capita.

The Navy Department, $286,420,578, which is $2.38 per capita.

The War Department, $332,179,750, which is $2.37 per capita. (This amount includes the $40,000,000 appropriated for rivers and harbors, which was subtracted in arriving at the amount expended per capita for the War Department.)

Independent offices, $452,349,617, which is $3.76 per capita.
Deficiencies, $157,113,700, which is $1.30 per capita.
Rivers and harbors, $40,000,000, which is $0.33⅓ per capita.

I call your attention also to the fact that during the last 30 years we have expended for rivers and harbors $853,165,877, which means a yearly average of $28,438,862.50.

Within the last five years appropriations by the Congress for all expenses of the Government in all of its activities amount to $20,697,694,061.19. For the past 100 years we have spent a little more than $1,000,000,000 for the development of all the rivers and harbors of our Nation with its thousands of miles of coastline and its 30,000 miles of navigable waterways.

Comparative statement of original appropriations for the fiscal year 1916, exclusive of deficiencies, with appropriations as passed by the House for the fiscal year 1926, for the activities indicated

	1916	1926	Per cent of increase
Agriculture [1]	$22,385,317	$44,337,715	98
Navy	150,526,634	286,420,578	90
Post Office	313,364,667	636,269,415	103
Army [2]	110,942,234	258,214,693	133
River and harbor	34,192,260	[3] 50,800,000	48

[1] The figures for agriculture exclude appropriations on account of roads.
[2] The figures for the Army exclude nonmilitary activities.
[3] Includes flood control, Mississippi and Sacramento Rivers, $10,500,000.

Federal appropriations for years 1920 to 1925, inclusive

Year	Agriculture	Army	Post Office	River and harbor	Navy	Total amount appropriated during year
1920–21	$31,712,784.00	$392,558,365.00	$462,575,190.00	$12,400,000.00	$438,784,574.00	$4,789,300,920.35
1921–22	36,404,259.00	328,013,529.80	574,057,552.00	15,250,000.00	410,673,289.23	3,909,782,209.46
1922–23	36,774,173.00	256,411,169.67	564,171,966.50	27,815,661.00	289,336,577.00	4,218,653,834.99
1923–24	108,736,653.00	251,250,231.00	584,872,991.50	57,046,760.00	294,456,528.00	3,995,836,772.04
1924–25	58,575,274.00	255,615,279.13	613,645,195.25	37,600,000.00	275,105,067.00	3,784,123,324.35
Total	272,200,943.00	1,483,848,574.60	2,799,322,895.25	150,112,421.00	1,718,354,035.23	20,697,694,061.19

Of the total amount appropriated for the years 1920–21, 0.0028 was for rivers and harbors.

Of the total amount appropriated for the years 1921–22, 0.0039 was for rivers and harbors.

Of the total amount appropriated for the years 1922–23, 0.0065 was for rivers and harbors.

Of the total amount appropriated for the years 1923–24, 0.0142 was for rivers and harbors.

Of the total amount appropriated for the years 1924–25, 0.0096 was for rivers and harbors.

Of the total amount appropriated from years 1920–1925, over the five-year period:

The Department of Agriculture received $272,200,943, which is 0.0131 of total amount appropriated for all Government activities.

For rivers and harbors, $150,112,421, which is 0.0072 of total amount appropriated for all Government activities.

For Army, $1,483,848,574.60, which is 0.071 of total amount appropriated for all Government activities.

For Navy, $1,718,354,035.23, which is 0.083 of total amount appropriated for all Government activities.

For Post office, $2,799,322,895.25, which is 0.135 of total amount appropriated for all Government activities.

The truth is, gentleman, no department of the Government has been treated so niggardly by the Congress, from the standpoint of proper appropriation to carry on work and to have the engineers function properly in this great development, as has the river and harbor development. You can compare it with any governmental activity during the last 25 years and you will find this to be true. The cry of "pork" gets abroad in the land and people become frightened, it seems, and the Congress apparently is actually afraid to carry on this most important work effectively.

Gentlemen, you can not get the benefit of a channel if it has a shallow place, because it is like a chain—it is no stronger than its weakest link. Some one suggested here, I think the

gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON], what good the Southern Railway between here and New Orleans would be as a great commerce carrier if there were 10 miles of its right of way with no track laid upon it? The same principle applies in these great trunk-line waterways. Wherever they have been completed these rivers are to-day carrying commerce and effecting economies in transportation. This Congress has repeatedly refused to go ahead and complete the work so that the people of the country may get the benefit from it. In the Mississippi Valley we have millions of idle investment to-day because Congress has refused to complete the projects. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to see this Congress authorize bonds to the extent of $204,000,000 and put the engineers to work and complete every channel in the United States just as we built the Panama Canal so that the people of the country may receive the benefit of cheaper transportation. [Applause.] All will agree that water transportation is infinitely cheaper than any other kind. What is $200,000,000 as compared with the expenditures made by the railroads?

They are said to have expended more than $1,000,000,000 last year on equipment, and yet the rivers carried one-sixth of the amount of tonnage carried by the railroads in 1923. I say we could well afford to spend the $200,000,000, spread over a period of 5 or 10 years, preferably 5 years, and complete every one of these projects in the country. It would be economy in the end. There are great harbors yet incomplete because Congress has refused to furnish the money for the work.

There are several very important and meritorious projects involved in this bill. They have been well considered from every angle, and we invite your criticism of them. There is no effort here to put over something without merit.

There is no legislation that comes before this House that is more carefully scrutinized, more carefully handled, with the interests of the Treasury more properly safeguarded by a disinterested, nonpolitical lot of Government officials, namely, the Army engineers, than legislation for the improvement of rivers and harbors.

In this respect I direct your attention to the statement of the late James R. Mann, one of the greatest legislators of this age:

> Whatever men may think about the merits of particular propositions in a bill, there is no legislation which comes before Congress which is so critically scanned by experts as are the river and harbor bills before they reach the House. * * * There are more processes involved, and far more expert men, wholly disinterested, unbiased, uncontrolled by politics, in reference to a river and harbor item than for any other legislation provided by any legislative assembly in the world. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 22, 1917, pp. 1876–77.)

The engineers have no axes to grind. They are not in politics and have no calls to answer except those from their consciences and the good of their country. No one can successfully charge that they have been hasty in trying to throw the money of the people away or have wasted money on useless harbors. Of course, there have been a few mistakes, but very, very few, and none of us are infallible.

There may have been a time in the past when projects without merit found their way into river and harbor bills. The best men make mistakes. This Congress is not free from error. Since we have adopted a new way of handling river and harbor developments, by which the engineers take a lump-sum appropriation and allot it to the projects that are worthy throughout the country, we have absolutely destroyed the last vestige of ground for any man to stand on and call a river and harbor development "pork." We have destroyed the opportunity of the opportunist, if you please, to come here and have unworthy projects put over in this House.

There are several projects in the bill to which your attention has already been directed, the intercoastal canal, about which the gentleman from Ohio spoke, the Los Angeles project, and the New York project. They are all meritorious. The report of the engineers shows that.

There is another proposition involved in this bill, which I will not have time to discuss fully, and will not even undertake to discuss, except in a very general way in the few moments I have, and that is with reference to the development of hydroelectric power in the United States. I will extend in the Appendix of the RECORD to-morrow some remarks dealing more fully with this subject.

Gentlemen of the House, the development of hydroelectric power in the United States is the biggest thing affecting vitally our industrial progress that confronts the people of America to-day. An examination of the last census shows that 55 per cent of the industry of America to-day is run by electric energy. Hydroelectric energy, which is the development of energy by the use of the fall of the water on our streams, is comparatively a new field and a new venture, but that development has attained great proportions.

I say without fear of contradiction, that no one knows how much potential water power we have in the United States. There have been various estimates and various guesses. In 1908 Mr. Roosevelt ordered the Geological Survey to make an estimate. They made such an estimate and it was a pure guess. They estimated that there was probably 212,000,000 horsepower, primary and secondary, in the United States as a minimum and probably 265,000,000 as a maximum. I am giving these figures in round numbers and will put the correct figures in the RECORD later. They estimated on the Tennessee River, which is shown on this map, that there was probably 1,900,000 horsepower.

Two years ago this Congress authorized a careful study and survey of the Tennessee River, which, by the way, is one of the most wonderful streams in the world. I wish I had the time to discuss the natural resources of the valley or the watershed of 40,000 square miles of the Tennessee River. Suffice it to say that our United States engineer, Major Fiske, who has only half finished the survey with the $200,000 that the Congress gave him for this work, has already found, outside of the development at Muscle Shoals, 3,000,000 horsepower possible to be developed on this river. It had been estimated that there were only 28 power dam sites on the Tennessee and its tributaries. This engineer has already found 58 power sites on the Tennessee, and estimates that instead of 1,900,000 horsepower there are more than 4,000,000 horsepower to be developed on the Tennessee River.

There is no doubt this same condition exists on all our navigable streams where there is fall enough to generate power. Is it not our duty to investigate each stream and conserve that power? The Columbia River, which rises in Montana, is another great power-navigation stream. The question of the regulation of its head waters and building storage reservoirs, which aid largely in developing and regulating primary power on this great river should be carefully surveyed. We should have an international commission to study this stream for power, navigation, irrigation, and flood control development, both in British Columbia and the United States, with a view of getting the fullest development of the stream as a whole. It is the duty of this Government to take stock or make an inventory of our power resources in order that the people of the country may know exactly the potential water power of the Nation, and see that it is developed in the most efficient manner. The day is coming when we will need every ounce of energy that can be produced both by hydroelectric power and steam. The remarkable use of electricity in all kinds of industry has opened up the biggest field for industrial progress ever before presented to the people of any generation. The use of electricity will yet solve many of our economic and industrial problems. When we develop our power resources, build better highways, and open up our streams for better navigation; when electricity goes into every farmhouse, helping productivity on the farm and making it more attractive, then we will solve the great problem of congestion of our people in the vast centers and large cities of the country. The migration of our people from the farms to our cities is not a healthy and safe tendency. By keeping more of them in the rural sections will indeed help to perpetuate the institutions of this great American Government.

Instead of going on in a hit-or-miss and slipshod way which has characterized the planting of power dams on our streams for power purposes alone, let us conserve the full use of those streams by developing their potential power in conjunction with navigation, flood control and irrigation. In order to do this the Federal Water Power Commission and all agree that a careful study should be made of all streams all over the country where power possibilities appear to exist. Power companies are building dams on our navigable streams, but without a survey of the stream as a whole to ascertain its fullest development. Let us then commit the Government to the wise policy of treating our streams with a view of getting the most efficient development of which they are capable, and conserve their resources for the use and benefit not only for ourselves but for those who will come after us. Section 3, therefore, is most important and should be adopted.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The cost will be great it is true, gentlemen, but to show you the returns for the investment let me call your attention to the fact that the Aluminum Co. of America,

Mr. Mellon's company, has bought 4,000 square miles of flowage rights here on the Little Tennessee in North Carolina, and on it they have all the dam sites that you see here on this map represented by little red spots. They spent $250,000 to make a careful study and survey of that little area alone. The result was that they have invested $12,000,000. Gentlemen, industry seeks cheap power, and we will have hundreds of millions invested by private capital where we spend a paltry sum to point the way to this power development. [Applause.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WELLER].

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I trust that the gentlemen will not yield to the loose talk that has been delivered here this morning on a project which as a man coming, as I do, from the Empire State, knows has been the combined thought of engineers in the War Department and of those who understand freight facility in the Empire State.

The gentleman from Minnesota stated a few minutes ago that the railroads are in favor of this bill. The railroads practically parallel both banks of the Hudson River, and it is the deeper Hudson project that the railroads have not been in favor of. They have appeared at numerous hearings and protested. What will be accomplished by the project is a line of canals extending from the city of Buffalo to the city of Albany, known as the Barge Canal. The State of New York has invested $350,000,000 in the last 25 years in the Barge Canal. One hundred and ten million dollars has been expended in the last 10 years. So that there is an open waterway now available from the city of Buffalo to the city of Albany. The deepening project is a matter of approximately 30 miles, from the city of Hudson, on the banks of the Hudson River, to the city of Albany, and with the deepening of the river for that 30 miles the rest of the river from the Battery in New York to the city of Hudson has a depth of anywhere from 50 feet to 200 feet. The water is exceptionally deep and open to all sorts of coastwise vessels, to any grain carrier, to any boat that travels the ocean—all may utilize successfully this river. This project is simply to deepen that 30 miles extending from the city of Hudson to the city of Albany.

The State of New York, I might add, has also appropriated a large sum of money—I think $2,000,000 or $3,000,000—for the establishment of new warehouses and graneries. If this project is adopted, it will mean that freight from the Great Lakes can be brought to the seaboard, not via Montreal and the St. Lawrence but by Hudson River the port of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX].

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubts about the merits of this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to speak upon the pending authorization bill other than to say that while I am not enthusiastically impressed by it, and therefore can not grow as effervescent about its provisions as many of my colleagues, I am not disposed to oppose it, recognizing the futility of such a course. The fact that this bill has been reported out in altered form on four different occasions shows conclusively that it is before you to-day in a shape that suggests political expediency and administrative pressure. The mangling and crippling of the intracoastal canal proposition as originally presented is, in my judgment, indefensible. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], a recognized authority on waterways, in remarks that indicated he had in mind the original proposition and not the alteration of it, declared it to be a meritorious one, though condemning in no uncertain way the Hudson River and other projects which are not near so pressing and necessary for the commercial, industrial, and agricultural development of the country as is the intracoastal waterway. Another good reason for my not actively opposing this measure in addition to the one that I have already assigned, which is that I know its passage is among the cut and dried affairs that every legislator knows will go through like a "streak of greased lightning," as a result of combinations which are favorably and advantageously affected by the items of the bill, is that the New Orleans business men, whose views I desire to reflect here in my representative capacity, have determined in a spirit of self-abnegation, as it were, to voice no disapprobation of a bill which directly must adversely affect their commercial interests and can result advantageously only in an indirect manner by whatever benefits may flow from the development that may come to our neighboring territory.

There are many illuminating circumstances in connection with the bill, one of which will cause me to wonder for a long time to come. Many of us were lead to believe that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio was the arch enemy, opponent, and last-ditch foe of the intracoastal canal and a champion of the Hudson River proposition, and yet we find him generously commending the intracoastal canal while sharply criticizing the Hudson River item and, incidently, scoffing in a mild way at other measures contained in the bill. It is well to keep in mind that the gentleman from Ohio is not only one of the most distinguished Members of this House, but is generally regarded, as a result of commanding ability, to be a main pillar and chief support of the Republican temple, whose administrative officers are largely responsible for the uneconomic and unsound emasculation and curtailment of a waterway that should run from New Orleans to Corpus Christi and eventually be extended to the Rio Grande to be of any permanent value to the transportation scheme and the commercial development of our country. From New Orleans to Rio Grande would mean trade with northern Mexico and a full and complete development of the richest and most fertile country on the face of the globe. I regret that this once magnificent and dazzling proposition has been aborted and distorted by an alteration as politically brutal and stupid as it is economically unsound. Some day I hope that the administration will see the error of its way and go back to the original proposition in a spirit of contrition, restitution, and patriotism. No, Mr. Chairman, I can not grow enthusiastic over this bill, but I will not oppose it for the reasons orally assigned, as judges say, other than to utter my dissent over the bill in its present form.

What I rose for was to refer to another matter, which I trust may be of sufficient importance to the people of this country as to secure their attention and thoughtful consideration. It is in regard to the wonderful trade potentialities that lie for the United States in Mexico, rich, but as yet undeveloped industrially, commercially, and agriculturally, and the financial benefits that would flow from such a development.

Some months ago Tomas Garrido, Governor of the State of Tabasco, Mexico, invited Walter Parker, general manager of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, to select a committee of gentlemen to visit his State to investigate its resources and carry back their observations to those who might find them of interest. Mr. Parker invited gentlemen representing all lines of New Orleans commercial interests to accept the generous invitation of the Governor of Tabasco. As a result of that invitation: Walter Parker, general manager of the Association of Commerce (chairman); JAMES O'CONNOR, Member of Congress for New Orleans; Dr. Brandt V. B. Dixon, president emeritus Newcomb College of Tulane University; Paul Villere, representing the associated banks of New Orleans; A. M. Shaw, consulting engineer; Prof. Charles H. Stromberg, of L. S. U.; Dr. William Gates, director department of middle American research, Tulane University; Alan W. Payne, assistant to Doctor Gates; W. W. Allen, manager export department Albert Mackie Co.; J. B. Monteros, of Monteros & Co., exporters; J. C. Whilden, exporter of livestock; J. H. Kurth, manufacturer; and W. A. Burt, lumberman and importer, left New Orleans on November 7 last on board the steamer *Atlantida*, a Vaccaro vessel.

I might mention at this point that the Vaccaro brothers have been heroes in the strife in endeavoring to build up the port of New Orleans and establish the supremacy of American commerce. They are men from the ground up. Unostentatiously they go through life apparently unaware of the tremendous power they have won as giants in the commercial, financial, and transportation chapters of the country.

I am going to save myself considerable trouble and give you a picturesque and entertaining account of our trip from the facile pen of my brilliant, scholarly, and charming acquaintance, Alan W. Payne. It is more than an account. It is a pen picture. With masterly stroke he brings you along on one of the most romantic journeys I ever had the good fortune to make. Hard days and nights that are unforgetable, and scenes which will live until my memory is no more.

On board of the steamer were Gen. D. E. Calles, the then President-elect of Mexico, and his two daughters. This party left the ship at Tampico, where a great ovation was accorded General Calles. The streets were thronged with welcoming people, soldiers, marines, sailors, and the police lined up to make the official welcome. The air rung with the shouts of the populace who lined the festooned and gorgeously-decorated thoroughfares. Huzzahs and bravos were the order of the

day and were gladly shouted on the sidewalks and in the cafés. Our party regretfully had to leave the festive scene, however, for it was necessary to make Frontera before the next night, as it is difficult to get over the bar there after sundown, even in small steamers which are used as lighters to take the passengers from the larger vessel which has to anchor some distance out from the mouth of the river. This really beautiful river is named the Grijalva in honor of one of the crew with Columbus on the immortal voyage that resulted in the discovery of America. It is several miles up the river to the town of Frontera where the party located for a few nights.

Just above this city two great rivers, the Usumacinta and Grijalva, come together, and it seems quite a moot question as how to name the river from there to the sea. The mouth opens to the east, but some years ago a canal, about half a mile long, was dredged to the north, so as to give an entrance from that direction in case of easterly storms. The bar that has formed off these two mouths gives constant trouble, since only vessels of less than 7 feet draft can enter. When this bar can be removed, steamer traffic can go up both rivers for several hundred miles. At present, bananas, lumber, and other exports must be transshipped by means of barges. With the removal of this obstruction a great commercial development, advantageous as much to New Orleans as well as to the country, since this city is the logical market to which the people look, should open up.

VEGETATION LUXURIOUS

After a cordial banquet in the main hotel of the town, situated on a most picturesque plaza, the party was quartered in a beautiful private home near by. On awakening the next morning we were greeted by the calls of brilliant cardinals flitting through the trees of the patio. This garden was the most colorful spot imaginable. Outstanding among the bushes was the glorious bougainvillea, with huge clusters of purplish flowers that put to shame the feeble tints of its New Orleans kin. Plants of vari-colored leaves; high palms swaying in the breeze; orange and lemon trees; various colorful flowers whose names were as unfamiliar as their forms. In the center a great tamarind tree overspread all, keeping out the glare from a brilliant cloudless sky. And in the background an ancient red tiled roof, green in spots with age, framed in the straight white pillars of the royal palm. Surely, a garden fit for a princess.

During that day several side trips were made. One took us out in the country for a lunch on native products, that those who had never seen the Tropic countries should get an idea of the fields and woods. Another to a saw mill, where great rafts of mahogany trees, brought down many miles from Guatemala and the interior of Tabasco, were trimmed, cut into planks to some degree, and prepared for shipment to New Orleans. On the way, and in fact in many other places, we walked on sidewalks of wide mahogany planks that would have been worth their weight in silver in the States. Yet this wood is as plentiful as pine here, and found used as generally. Later we visited the headquarters of the International Petroleum Co., which has been drilling for oil farther inland for a year or so, and whose officials and field men are confident that oil will be found.

A banquet followed in the evening and a most enjoyable party afterwards, although most of the party had the night before enjoyed dancing until late at a ball given in our honor.

The next day, November 12, the party was taken up the Grijalva River on a "hind-wheeler" steamer, passing through the most verdant country, where banana trees 30 feet and more in height were seen. Birds of all varieties, including the snowy egret, white crane, many parrots, and others unfamiliar were seen in thousands. For nine hours the vessel pushed up this broad river, passing numerous cayucos, or dugout canoes, poled by men standing in bow and stern with great oars that are used both for paddling and poling. Villahermosa, "the beautiful city," capital of the State, hove in sight long after dark. And after a very sumptuous dinner Governor Garrido received the party, in company with the local chamber of deputies, in the city hall.

In his welcoming talk Governor Garrido stressed the desire of the people for peace and voiced their recognition of the need of developing the commerce and resources of the country. The Tabascans, he said, look to the United States for help, and particularly a market. The people have had more than enough of revolution and civil strife and are fully desirous of protecting foreign capital that should be invested for development.

Spokesmen for our party voiced the sentiment that the United States should lend a helping hand, since the Central American States are now our logical market for our manufactured products, as well as our best sources of raw materials. The meeting broke up with the most friendly relations established, and, in fact, this was the keynote of the entire visit. Both sides found that the others were not such bad people after all, and agreed that if more Mexicans visited this country and more North Americans visited theirs the most cordial relations of business and friendship would link the two countries firmly together.

SOME DANCE ALL DAY

The party was invited next day to a fête at the suburban home of the governor, where after arriving for early breakfast music was struck up and staid gentlemen from this city found themselves dancing for hours with many comely maidens of the town who had been invited to grace the occasion. Various of the Mexican dances were put on as exhibitions, and several singers, who had mighty good voices, too, sang the rather sad songs of that section. Dinner was served later, and we were told, even after we had gone back "home" for a rest, the others danced all day. These people find our fox trot, one step, and waltz the most enjoyable, but as their own dances are considerably slower than ours, this music also was slowed down to a point where most of us found it difficult to keep going.

In the evening the mayor and municipal officers entertained at supper on the balcony of the city hall, overlooking a most beautiful plaza, such as is the center of every Latin town, with an orchestra indoors and a military band concert outside to beguile the time. Here, again, the most friendly relations were voiced, and the party left for bed with the most fervent wishes to be of help to those people.

Here I might digress to say something about the meals that were lavished upon us. Usually, upon sitting down to table, one could gauge the number of courses to come by the number of plates stacked before him, often three and four. But oftentimes one got fooled, for the waiters would whisk away plate after plate as the courses went by and slyly return several more plates. There was always a good soup, fish, several different meats, chicken, turkey, or duck, rice, and potatoes in plenty, various wines, salads, fruits, other sweets, and dessert, with coffee and smokes topping off a belt-stretching list.

THINK OF THIS

Also, though it be lese majeste, one could recount the list of liquors served; beer always, champagne frequently, white and red wines, a brandy of the country, which various members of the party long will remember as "habanero," other cordials and whiskies, till the round came back to beer and the feasted one forgot just which he was drinking.

The following day members of the party drifted around town inspecting various sights in which they were interested. There were shops where live 'gators became everything from puttees to belts and holsters, hatbands, and trunks. Woodworking shops where furniture to rival the best output of the United States was made from the 32 different cabinet woods that grow in the section. One of the most interesting visits made by the writer was to a primary school, a private institution, for the State has no money any more to aid education, much as it wants to. Here there were 400 as bright and pretty tots, from the first grade to the seventh, as one could find in our own schools, all industriously at work under the eyes of earnest young woman teachers. Others visited a secondary law school, also a private institution, where a devoted principal is doing his best with few funds to start out his law students. It is a most unfortunate condition that no Federal funds are used to promote education, for, above all, the people need schooling.

SUGAR BY THE TON

The next day was devoted to a trip 30 miles farther upriver to inspect one of the largest, and said to be the oldest, plantations in the State. Here the cane was growing 15 to 18 feet high in a field that has been under intense growing for 63 years without fertilizer and with little cultivation. The cane is planted from 12 to 15 years and yields from 28 to 35 tons of sugar per acre. Other fields were producing up to 40 tons. The plantation had its own mill and a small refinery, where "plantation refined" sugar is sent to Yucatan, where it sells for 8 cents per pound. The grinding season starts in November and continues for seven months.

Cane here is afflicted to some slight extent by a borer worm, but not to any amount of damage, and was said not to harbor any diseases. The cane is allowed to flower, and we are told the growers get more sugar by this method.

BANDITS ACTIVE

The next day, after we had left, we were informed later, revolutionists, who are now little more than ordinary bandits, raided the plantation.

But that was nothing. The first evening in the country, we found later, one of the revolutionary leaders who had been caught that day was taken out in the near-by country, so as not to disturb our welcome, and shot.

Upon returning from this hacienda we returned to our river boat and at midnight started down the river, in company with the governor and a large retinue, to pay a visit to near-by Maya ruins. In the company was the governor's private orchestra, an honor never before falling upon any members of the party, I am sure. In fact, wherever we went we were fêted with music, at one time having a band, another military band, and the orchestra to tickle our ears.

Down the Grijalva, almost to Frontera, and up the Usumacinta we were taken, arriving at the small village of Monte Cristo late the second morning. Here various automobiles, loaded aboard at Villahermosa, were put ashore and the party was taken over a very rough train to the village of Santo Domingo de Palenque, where we stopped for the night, before visiting the ruins. By this time we were in the near-by State of Chiapas, also Mexican territory, but very near to the Republic of Guatemala. The various river systems spread a network of usable rivers and streams across all this territory; consequently there are no roads to speak of. Nor are there railroads, and telephones are conspicuous by their absence. There is considerable attempt to link the country with telegraph lines, but what is sorely needed are good roads where creeks do not avail and several lines of rail in various sections. One of the first things Tabasco is planning to do is to start railroads through this territory, but the funds are sadly lacking.

SLEEP IN CORN BIN

The road, if it could be called such, which took us to this small town owed its being to the operations of the International Petroleum Co., which has carted in much drilling equipment, but using great caterpillar trucks. Consequently deep bogs occurred wherever the forest drew in upon the road, and the machines were mired so many times no one could keep count.

At Santo Domingo sleeping and hotel accommodations were at a premium. These just were not any. However, we were bunked for the night in a corn bin of a local storekeeper, a German gentleman.

At this town was found the ruins of an ancient church, no one of the inhabitants knowing how many centuries old, but now gone to decay and used as a barracks for the sad-looking soldiers. In the front of the church were two wonderfully carved slabs of limestone, taken from the ruins of Palenque, an ancient esoteric center of the Maya civilization of long ago, that was near by.

In the morning stiffened joints were limbered to clamber aboard a group of small native ponies, and a terrible trail was taken to visit the ruins, some 9 kilometers distant.

Several horses slipped on the muddy tree trunks that served for bridges, several riders were thrown, and two ponies went into the streams. How the riders managed to free them was a mystery to us.

A description of these ruins hardly fits in here, but it can be said they date far back into or before the early days of the Christian era, and mark what must have been somewhat like a secluded monastery where ancient high priests performed the mysteries of their religion. The party clambered up steep artificial pyramids upon which are situated various temple ruins, and down into dungeonlike tunnels that ran underneath, then returned as they had come. The cars were boarded at noon, and after another hard trip landed us at the boat side after dark, after a journey during which many breakdowns occurred and several members swore they had seen several of the fierce native tigers of that section.

The steamer took us back to Frontera by late the next morning, where we were again fêted, were guests of honor at another ball, and then started on the last lap back home at midnight.

There were no steamers in port, and despite the anxious efforts of the governor to get one or a federal war vessel to take us to Vera Cruz, none was available. Therefore we started back as deck passengers of an ancient three-masted schooner, the *Nachi Cocom*. This boat, only 105 feet long and 23 feet wide, luckily had a powerful gasoline motor as auxiliary power.

BOAT IS CROWDED

Fortunately for us the sea was calm and we did not experience even a rain. For besides our own and the governor's party going to witness the inauguration of President Calles at Mexico City, there were several score of others. With only two cabin berths on the ship we were stretched out on deck for 30 hours.

Meals were served on deck, where there was not even space to move around in. But it was the very best that could be done as Governor Garrido was a delightfully thoughtful host and was tireless in his efforts to see that we had as much comfort as could be secured on such a trip. We all feel like singing when we think of him, "He is a jolly good fellow."

After a stop of several hours at Puerto Mexico, a free port destined for considerable development, especially since oil is exported there, the good ship finally landed us at Vera Cruz, where we were lucky enough to find a fruit boat on the eve of leaving for New Orleans.

Finding it impossible to accept the governor's kind invitation to be his guests as far as Mexico City most of the party took reservations for home. Therefore, after bidding a cordial and friendly adieu to Governor Tomas Garrido and many friends made on the trip, the party left that night on the Vaccaro steamer *Yoro*, landing at home Monday evening, November 24, after a little less than three weeks away.

The trip was most valuable in results to Tulane University and opened the eyes of the business men to the possibilities of commercial development in Tabasco. Plans have been formulated to start progress toward concrete work in this direction. These will be made public later.

The New Orleans Association of Commerce, made up of men who have won distinction in every walk of life, captains of industry, merchant princes, financial leaders, will do their part and blaze the way for closer, friendlier, and more profitable relations with our sister Republic. The big men, the tall men of our city are among the best friends Mexico has in the United States.

Let me close by saying that if there be any among the readers of this address who are blessed with the wanderlust and who long for the spell and lure of the jungle and the sublime awe of beholding the mighty ruins of a gorgeous past in the history of people who thousands of years ago played out their part in the grand drama of American life, let him make the journey to the great and inspiring temples that are to-day the lonely sentinels of the valleys of silence that lie between the mountain peaks which they adorn. They stand serene, far from the madding crowds, ignoble strife, and when a visitor does step from the jungle to behold them he wonders whether inanimate things can talk unto each other.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER].

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein certain correspondence and statistical data covering the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor project.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, it gives me pleasure to call public attention to the following correspondence and statistical data upon the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor project:

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Los Angeles, Calif., December 5, 1924.

Hon. WALTER F. LINEBERGER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MAJOR LINEBERGER: Your wire of December 3 has required so much statistical work that it has been impossible to get off the data which you desire until this hour.

Herewith I inclose detailed statistics of all commodities moving through this port for the first 10 months of 1924, which will show you the main commodities moving, both as to tonnage and value, and whether imported or exported, domestic or foreign.

I have also briefed information showing that this port is more than a mere local port, and I think you might especially emphasize the fact that by reason of having a port we have furnished a market for more than a third of a billion dollars' worth of eastern products in the last 10 months.

It has been difficult to work out any figures showing the increase in general merchandise passing through the port at the present time compared with previous years for the reason that up to this year there has never been any segregation of bulk oil as distinguished from general merchandise. Our bulk-oil shipments are very much less than they were in September, 1923, at which time we had such a flood of oil production and lack of storage and refining facilities that we had to ship it as fast as ships were available. Since then new refineries have been completed and additional storage facilities constructed, and the industry has become better organized so that production can be kept

more in line with the demand. So while we were exporting in excess of 2,000,000 tons of bulk oil per month in the fall of 1923, at the present time our bulk-oil exports are not averaging more than 1,250,000 tons per month. At the same time our facilities for refining oil have been greatly increased, and oil is going out more and more as a refined product.

Oil men tell us there is little possibility of oil exports going much below the present amount. I get this from a representative of the Standard Oil Co. A representative of the Doheny interests told me sometime ago that they had put $11,000,000 into a refinery, and $5,000,000 into other oil handling facilities, which indicates their faith in the stability of the oil business of this port.

As near as I have been able to estimate, our general merchandise cargoes, aside from bulk oil, are averaging about 100,000 tons per month more than a year ago, and I believe the coming year will see even a greater increase in general merchandise shipments. For instance, our exports to foreign countries in 1923 were approximately $35,000,000. This year they will be approximately $68,000,000, or nearly double those of a year ago.

The present indications are that we will make an even greater increase the coming year, but I can not, of course, produce figures to prove this.

I trust that this data will reach you in time to be of service, and that it will meet your needs, although I am unable to give any concrete statistics to prove the future growth along the lines of general merchandise. I presume that what you need is concrete statistics to bear out the estimates made by Major Leeds and other engineers in the hearing last spring to show that our inner harbor frontage will be exhausted within a few years.

With kind personal regards.

Very truly yours,

TRADE EXTENSION DEPARTMENT,
CLARENCE H. MATSON, *Manager*.

LOS ANGELES NOT A MERE LOCAL PORT

While it is true that the great bulk of the commerce passing through Los Angeles Harbor originates at, or is destined to, points within 100 miles of the port, the same may be said of nearly every other port of importance that amounts to more than a mere point of transshipment. In fact, ports that do not build industries and develop industries in their immediate localities are not fulfilling the full purposes for which ports are usually created.

Los Angeles has a growing commerce, however, which moves considerable distances, and the territory which it serves is developing rapidly, with water commerce as one of the reasons for such development.

Cotton, for instance, moves from Texas, Arizona, the San Joaquin Valley, the Imperial Valley, and Lower California, through the Port of Los Angeles to Japan, Liverpool, Germany, France, and China, as well as to the Atlantic seaboard.

Borax in the last few months has been moving through the port in large volume, and it practically all originates in the desert regions of the Southwest—including Nevada—to England, Germany, Japan, and other countries.

Hides from Idaho, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona move in large shipments to European countries.

During the last year tobacco has moved from as far east as Virginia, West Virginia, and North and South Carolina, to China. One such shipment filled more than fifty freight cars and was valued in excess of $250,000.

Inbound cargo likewise is distributed over a wide area.

Lumber goes to the mines of Arizona and other regions in the Southwest.

Hardwoods are shipped as far east as Denver and Omaha, and Central American cedar goes to Iowa from Los Angeles Harbor for making cedar chests.

Cement is imported through Los Angeles from Belgium for reclamation projects in Arizona and other construction work in the Southwest.

Oriental goods of every description and other imports are distributed from Los Angeles over much of the United States.

A port is only one terminal of a water route, however, and to measure its utility the other end of its shipping must be considered. For instance, in the 10 months of 1924, ending with October, the port of Los Angeles received general merchandise from other ports in the United States amounting to 2,831,583 tons, valued at $341,812,731. In other words, the existence of Los Angeles Harbor had provided a market for the products of other parts of the United States amounting to more than one-third of a billion of dollars in only 10 months.

The Panama Canal carried a total of 12,182,072 long tons of freight in the year ending June 30, 1924, according to statistics of the United States Shipping Board. Of this, Los Angeles originated or received 8,296,961 tons—more than two-thirds—leaving 3,885,111 tons to be distributed among 34 other ports on the Pacific, some of which are justly recognized as very important ports and great national assets.

Of this 8,296,961 tons of Los Angeles intercoastal commerce, 7,290,425 tons moved eastbound and was distributed among Atlantic and Gulf ports as follows:

	Tons
Baltimore	380, 629
Bayonne	106, 158
Boston	236, 080
Braintree	10, 000
Chester	75, 975
Everett	9, 000
Fall River	328, 526
Marcus Hook	43, 500
Newark	47, 417
New York	4, 421, 112
Norfolk	1, 535
Philadelphia	780, 123
Portland, Me	178
Poughkeepsie	20
Providence	123, 870
Wilmington, Del	411
Charleston, S. C	13, 195
Jacksonville	924
Savannah	1, 817
Baton Rouge	146, 100
Galveston	1, 696
Houston	1, 806
Mobile	135
New Orleans	579, 356
Port Arthur	17, 862

Westbound commerce coming to Los Angeles, made up entirely of general merchandise, aggregated 1,006,536 tons—more than 40 per cent of the total westbound intercoastal movement throught the canal—and came from Atlantic and Gulf ports, as follows:

	Tons
Baltimore	398, 302
Boston	27, 131
Newark	76, 164
Newport News	3, 400
New York	201, 283
Norfolk	15, 722
Philadelphia	154, 110
Portland, Me	4, 344
Wilmington, Del	3, 360
Charleston, S. C	79
Jacksonville	195
Savannah	906
Baton Rouge	459
Galveston	2, 214
Houston	111
Mobile	66, 897
New Orleans	40, 364
Orange, Tex	20
Port Arthur	16
Sabine	17, 460

In other words, the existence of Los Angeles Harbor made possible 8,296,961 tons of business in eastern ports. Los Angeles Harbor is therefore a great national asset. (Shipping Board statistics quoted are contained in Report No. 158 of the United States Shipping Board, issued September 30, 1924, by Virgil C. Miller, Chief Division of Statistics, Bureau of Research, United States Shipping Board.)

Domestic receipts
(Ten months of 1924)

Products	Quantity	Value
Animal products:	*Tons*	
Milk, canned	10, 153	$2, 031, 007
Fish, canned	4, 559	2, 732, 500
Lard	2, 396	959, 028
Dairy products	919	935, 402
Tankage	503	18, 126
Leather and leather goods	382	769, 620
Oleomargarine	206	122, 480
Hair manufactures	181	89, 766
All other	2, 931	2, 486, 922
Total	22, 330	10, 144, 851
Vegetable food products:		
Flour	44, 077	2, 645, 852
Cereals and mill feed	36, 361	1, 434, 410
Sugar	25, 900	4, 833, 279
Canned goods not otherwise stated	19, 621	5, 499, 931
Vegetables	6, 004	927, 375
Coffee, tea, chocolate, and cocoa	4, 213	4, 415, 248
Vegetable oils for food purposes	2, 732	1, 188, 350
Confectionery	2, 149	2, 148, 346
Fruit	900	307, 316
Nuts	878	540, 831
Spices	234	126, 506
Total	143, 069	24, 067, 444

Domestic receipts—Continued

Products	Quantity	Value
Other vegetable products:	*Tons*	
Rubber manufactures	5,395	$4,201,555
Linseed oil and other oils	1,838	445,455
Cigars and tobacco	1,473	1,969,752
All other	5,145	2,675,328
Total	13,851	9,292,090
Textiles:		
Cotton goods	8,318	7,412,377
Linoleum and oil cloth	5,113	2,183,395
Rope and twine	1,573	1,156,354
Bags and burlap	1,508	176,463
Rags	1,067	52,192
Rugs and carpets	931	1.396.028
Vegetable fibers and goods	776	168,971
Wool goods	242	1,327,821
Kapoc	50	5,018
All other	1,959	1,978,651
Total	21,537	15,857,270
Wood and paper:		
Lumber and lumber manufactures	1,710,462	36,504,208
Newsprint paper	43,609	3,488,759
Paper manufactures	35,138	4,911,166
Furniture	3,455	219,907
Wood pulp	567	39,711
All other	6,795	461,768
Total	1,800,026	45,625,519
Nonmetallic minerals:		
Glass and glassware	10,336	3,096,391
Coal and coke	7,246	48,375
Clay, tile, brick, etc	3,542	1,159,286
Cement	3,332	53,495
Earthenware, chinaware, etc	2,320	1,671,508
All other	24,911	2,006,063
Total	51,687	8,035,118
Metals and manufactures of:		
Iron and steel products	364,825	21,892,874
Metals, not otherwise stated	108,858	10,885,808
Hardware	14,802	1,480,319
Copper and manufactures of	4,529	2,364,601
Lead and zinc manufactures	2,472	1,235,995
Brass and bronze manufactures	2,466	1,232,501
All other	26,797	2,679,816
Total	524,749	41,771,914
Machinery and vehicles:		
Electrical	11,301	5,651,790
Machinery	11,091	5,546,150
Boilers	4,561	455,997
Automobiles and other vehicles	3,803	3,808,866
Auto accessories	1,597	797,319
Agricultural implements	547	273,555
All other	1,534	763,098
Total	34,434	17,296,775
Chemicals and drugs:		
Soap and washing powders	13,452	2,690,611
Soda, miscellaneous	9,912	703,823
Paints and varnishes	7,882	3,310,517
Pharmaceutical preparations and drugs	2,798	1,349,101
Fertilizers	1,228	47,131
Perfumes and toilet preparations	589	1,176,823
All other	16,496	1,396,156
Total	52,357	10,674,162
Unclassified:		
Musical instruments	1,686	4,724,069
Toys	1,132	226,416
Household goods and effects	959	479,614
Ink	361	450,712
All other	163,405	153,366,776
Total	167,543	159,247,587

RECAPITULATION—DOMESTIC RECEIPTS

Animal products	22,330	$10,144,851
Vegetable food products	143,069	24,067,444
Other vegetable products	13,851	9,292,090
Textiles	21,537	15,857,270
Wood and paper	1,800,026	45,625,519
Nonmetallic minerals	51,687	8,035,118
Metals and manufactures of	524,749	41,771,914
Machinery and vehicles	34,434	17,296,775
Chemicals and drugs	52,357	10,674,162
Unclassified	167,543	159,247,587
Total domestic receipts	2,831,583	341,812,731

Domestic shipments
(Ten months of 1924)

Products	Quantity	Value
Animal products:	*Tons*	
Leather hides, manufactures	4,605	$864,554
Fish, miscellaneous	2,106	1,248,567
Tuna, canned	1,846	1,108,266
Sardines	843	505,534
Lard, grease	229	91,723
Meat products	17	15,783
All other	1,067	753,121
Total	10,713	4,587,548
Vegetable food products:		
Beans	13,361	2,155,431
Fruits, canned and fresh	2,926	1,300,771
Vegetables, canned and fresh	2,018	478,053
Fruits, dried	1,389	345,505
Grain, hay, etc	1,146	45,833
Oil-cake meal	954	57,698
Vegetable oil, olive, etc	637	212,672
Honey	344	68,871
Nuts	184	82,969
Confectionery	31	30,937
All other	11,610	4,407,160
Total	34,600	9,117,377
Other vegetable products:		
Rubber and rubber manufactures	836	292,830
Vegetable drugs	27	22,984
Seeds and bulbs	12	960
All other	238	125,324
Total	1,113	442,098
Textiles:		
Cotton	3,794	3,156,563
Wool and wool manufactures	2,343	3,906,040
Cotton manufactures	224	185,835
All other	850	233,113
Total	7,211	7,481,551
Wood and paper:		
Paper manufactures	4,984	541,014
Lumber manufactures	2,114	114,869
Furniture	63	4,415
All other	1,827	110,123
Total	8,938	770,421
Nonmetallic minerals:		
Petroleum products	9,883,853	75,921,472
Brick, clay, tile and earth	9,881	274,961
Talc	3,838	921,023
Cement	1,649	26,383
Glass and glassware	154	46,475
All other	717	36,454
Total	9,900,092	77,226,768
Ores, metals, and manufactures of:		
Lead, copper, brass and manufactures	1,982	1,234,332
Iron and steel	1,457	87,402
Metal, manufactures	722	72,182
Metals, n. o. s	622	62,197
Hardware	53	5,172
All other	755	54,024
Total	5,591	1,515,309
Machinery and vehicles:		
Autos, vehicles, and parts	611	613,504
Electrical machinery and parts	442	220,980
Oil-well machinery	252	156,555
All other	809	286,584
Total	2,114	1,277,623
Chemicals and drugs:		
Borax	12,794	1,023,592
Soap and washing powder	385	84,398
Acids	198	15,834
Paint and varnish	191	57,169
All other	2,022	161,767
Total	15,590	1,342,760
Unclassified:		
General merchandise	26,020	25,970,554
Empties	511	264,972
Household goods	156	77,283
All other	338	340,918
Total	27,025	26,653,727

RECAPITULATION—DOMESTIC SHIPMENTS

Animal products	10,713	$4,587,548
Vegetable food products	34,600	9,117,377

Domestic shipments—Continued

RECAPITULATION—DOMESTIC SHIPMENTS—continued

Products	Quantity	Value
	Tons	
Other vegetable products	1,113	$442,098
Textiles	7,211	7,481,551
Wood and paper	8,988	770,421
Nonmetallic minerals	9,900,092	77,226,768
Ores, metals, etc	5,591	1,515,309
Machinery and vehicles	2,114	1,277,623
Chemicals and drugs	15,590	1,342,760
Unclassified	27,025	26,653,727
Total domestic shipment	10,013,037	130,415,132

Foreign imports

(Ten months of 1924)

Products	Quantity	Value
	Tons	
Animals and animal products:		
Tankage	2,653	$102,358
Dried blood	2,486	97,656
Fresh fish	1,529	162,419
Canned fish	923	216,312
Dairy products	114	63,337
Leather and manufactures of	113	72,534
All other	1,594	279,687
Total	9,412	994,303
Vegetable food products:		
Vegetable oils	16,522	1,141,273
Rice, barley, and mill feed	15,904	419,372
Nuts	6,545	326,682
Coffee, tea, chocolate	6,421	195,792
Sugar	5,434	500,579
Vegetables	1,626	153,066
Fruit	955	48,636
Spices	293	83,016
Flour	202	11,701
Confectionery	78	14,615
Canned goods	1	239
All other	727	85,526
Total	54,708	2,980,497
Other vegetable products:		
Rubber and manufactures of	4,136	1,829,571
Oils	529	62,325
Cigars and tobacco	243	191,146
All other	7,358	786,292
Total	12,266	2,869,334
Textiles:		
Rags and cotton waste	5,725	235,939
Vegetable fiber	751	507,521
Cotton manufactures	443	286,739
Kapok	138	8,122
Rope and twine	117	32,068
Bags and burlap	74	13,035
Wool manufactures	49	175,295
Linoleum	47	229,943
Rugs and carpets	15	50,781
Silk manufactures	14	215,294
All other	102	166,721
Total	7,475	1,714,758
Wood and paper:		
Lumber	104,322	1,835,595
Newsprint paper	43,437	3,328,505
Paper manufactures	4,592	574,615
Furniture	598	136,458
All other	2,609	146,969
Total	155,558	6,022,142
Nonmetallic minerals:		
Cement	78,483	784,966
Coal and coke	16,711	210,755
Earth, clay, tile, and sand	10,728	136,412
Glass and glassware	7,144	1,316,330
Chalk	2,861	7,802
Earthenware	1,083	378,890
All other	9,899	449,661
Total	126,909	3,284,816
Ores, metals, and manufactures of:		
Iron and steel	51,824	1,577,396
Hardware	3,122	4,599
Metal, not otherwise specified	681	97,918
Brass and manufactures of	5	10,788
Gold and silver		3,393
All other	622	71,522
Total	58,412	1,765,616
Machinery and vehicles:		
Electrical goods	22	10,539
Autos, other vehicles, and parts	6	10,005
Agricultural machinery	2	199
All other	143	51,737
Total	173	162,480

Foreign imports—Continued

Products	Quantity	Value
	Tons	
Chemicals and drugs:		
Fertilizers	11,602	$174,512
Soda	1,815	75,954
Paints and varnishes	1,515	53,374
Pharmaceutical preparations and drugs	344	15,348
Soap and washing powder	47	9,098
Perfumes and toilet preparations	25	15,185
All other	4,514	249,895
Total	19,862	593,366
Unclassified:		
Household goods	689	409,190
Musical instruments	410	23,324
Toys	225	135,656
Goods returned	60	77,011
Works of art	37	39,029
All other	249	780,962
Total	1,670	1,465,172

RECAPITULATION—FOREIGN IMPORTS

Animals and animal products	9,412	$994,303
Vegetable food products	54,708	2,980,497
Other vegetable products	12,266	2,869,334
Textiles	7,475	1,714,758
Wood and paper	155,558	6,022,142
Nonmetallic minerals	126,909	3,284,816
Ores, metals, and manufactures of	58,412	1,765,616
Machinery and vehicles	173	162,480
Chemicals and drugs	19,862	593,366
Unclassified	1,670	1,465,172
Total foreign imports	446,445	21,852,484

Foreign exports

(Ten months of 1924)

Products	Quantity	Value
	Tons	
Animal products:		
Sardines, canned	12,327	$1,805,791
Leather, hides, and manufactures of	2,623	496,492
Fish, canned and fresh	885	151,574
Tuna, canned and fresh	4	2,251
Dairy products		885
All other	1,252	202,367
Total	17,091	2,659,862
Vegetable food products:		
Fruits, fresh	6,430	807,932
Grain and mill feed	3,971	198,115
Fruits, canned and preserved	3,674	497,072
Fruits, dried	2,115	285,582
Vegetable oils	210	53,223
Flour	202	17,523
Beverages	184	31,526
Vegetables	181	35,567
Breadstuffs	140	31,899
Honey	113	31,113
Confectionery and sugar	103	46,494
Chocolate, tea, and coffee	15	9,500
All other	388	78,302
Total	17,726	2,123,848
Other vegetable products:		
Rubber	591	271,299
Seeds and bulbs	52	13,344
All other	733	361,480
Total	1,376	646,123
Textiles:		
Cotton	6,207	1,545,045
Cotton manufactures	364	356,076
Wool manufactures	15	17,454
Vegetable fiber	10	2,141
All other	1,498	269,817
Total	8,094	2,184,533
Wood and paper:		
Paper and paper manufactures	16,408	581,998
Lumber and lumber manufactures	2,402	91,090
Furniture	243	103,389
All other	156	8,866
Total	19,209	785,343
Nonmetallic minerals:		
Cased petroleum products	25,000	1,019,600
Cement	3,151	22,945
Brick, clay, tile, and earth	2,559	118,685
Glass and glassware	815	42,198
Earthenware and china	46	10,513
All other	1,065	32,605
Total	32,636	1,246,546
Petroleum products in bulk	2,882,296	41,859,186
Total	2,914,932	43,105,732

Foreign exports—Continued

Products	Quantity	Value
	Tons	
Ores, metals, and manufactures of:		
Iron and steel	7,893	$561,505
Copper, brass, and manufactures of	229	52,258
Hardware	122	26,256
Manufactures of metal	27	7,752
All other	421	60,818
Total	8,692	708,589
Machinery and vehicles:		
Oil well machinery	882	543,243
Autos, vehicles and parts	374	361,820
Agricultural implements	130	29,175
Electrical machinery	92	69,173
Engines and parts	8	9,169
All other	281	154,653
Total	1,767	1,167,233
Chemicals and drugs:		
Borax	10,599	927,642
Paint and varnish	202	31,926
Soap and washing powder	71	12,998
Pharmaceutical preparations	58	73,573
Soda	46	4,314
Acids	8	2,925
All other	1,079	117,200
Total	12,063	1,170,578
Unclassified:		
Household goods and effects	177	137,535
Toys	7	6,283
General merchandise	1	1,903
All other	467	194,830
Total	652	340,551

RECAPITULATION—FOREIGN EXPORTS

Animals and animal products	17,087	$2,659,862
Vegetable food products	17,726	2,123,848
Other vegetable products	1,376	646,123
Textiles	8,094	2,184,533
Wood and paper	19,209	785,343
Nonmetallic minerals	32,636	1,246,546
Petroleum products in bulk	2,882,296	41,859,186
Ores, metals, and manufactures of	8,692	708,589
Machinery and vehicles	1,767	1,167,233
Chemicals and drugs	12,063	1,170,578
Unclassified	652	340,551
Total	3,001,598	54,892,392

Customs reports, Los Angeles customs district

EXPORTS

Months	1924	1923
January	$3,407,564	$3,017,336
February	4,226,489	1,930,643
March	5,044,367	2,086,422
April	4,629,302	3,373,024
May	5,442,794	2,843,664
June	5,331,087	3,662,187
July	7,001,116	2,692,798
August	4,173,256	2,475,871
September	6,485,685	2,487,445
October	7,523,412	2,392,161
Total	53,265,072	26,951,551

IMPORTS

Months	1924	1923
January	$2,372,704	$2,208,748
February	2,642,985	1,163,057
March	2,010,294	1,992,590
April	1,984,521	2,902,062
May	2,446,331	2,275,581
June	2,815,678	3,063,984
July	2,527,166	2,788,473
August	2,293,479	2,908,142
September	2,943,504	2,000,808
October	2,698,627	2,786,268
Total	24,735,289	24,089,713

COLLECTIONS

Months	1924	1923
January	$317,237.14	$201,149.95
February	278,119.16	168,050.11
March	290,737.84	276,355.06
April	317,653.10	269,044.57
May	327,119.74	256,625.25
June	355,850.21	315,168.03
July	407,645.80	374,227.63
August	385,982.32	413,233.94

Customs reports, Los Angeles customs district—Continued

COLLECTIONS—continued

Months	1924	1923
September	$434,064.08	$309,006.29
October	435,553.04	441,051.00
Total	3,549,962.43	3,023,911.83

DO YOU KNOW

That Los Angeles exports more than 60 per cent of all the canned sardines exported from the United States?

That the export trade of Los Angeles at present is more than double that of a year ago?

That southern California products are marketed in South Africa and East Africa now that our harbor and shipping has opened to us the markets of the world?

That the trade extension department of the chamber of commerce is equipped to help you with your world-trade problems?

That England is the biggest foreign market of Los Angeles and China is our second largest, proving that steamships have brought the whole world to our doors, these countries being on opposite sides of the globe?

That from 10 to 30 Los Angeles firms are becoming interested in export trade every month?

That more than $20,000 worth of Los Angeles machinery was recently shipped to New Guinea, perhaps the most savage region left on the globe?

That Los Angeles exports to foreign countries each month enough gasoline to run an automobile for 600 round trips to the moon, even if it got only 15 miles out of a gallon?

That the service of the United States Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is available through the trade extension department of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce?

That the trade extension department issues a weekly Business Builders' Bulletin to all members of the chamber interested in foreign trade, which bulletin is available on application therefor?

MEMORANDA DEALING WITH CERTAIN PHASES OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL (H. R. 10894)

President Coolidge, in his message to Congress on December 3, 1924, used the following language:

> There are pending before the Congress bills for further development of the Mississippi Basin, for the taking over of the Cape Cod Canal in accordance with a moral obligation which seems to have been incurred during the war, and for the improvement of harbors on both the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts. While this last should be divested of some of its projects and we must proceed slowly, these bills in general have my approval. Such works are productive of wealth and in the long run tend to a reduction of the tax burden.

Since this language clearly indicates that the President questions the merits of some harbor project on the Pacific or Atlantic coast, and since the bill contains no harbor project of importance upon the Atlantic coast, it seems pertinent to consider the merits of the one large project upon the Pacific coast, namely, Los Angeles Harbor.

The shipping in the harbor of Los Angeles, Calif., has shown a phenomenal growth in recent years. In fact, this shipping has outstripped the growth, remarkable in itself, of population in this territory.

The shipping in Los Angeles Harbor first passed the million-ton mark in 1905, and has never since dropped below that figure. It first passed the 2,000,000-ton mark in 1916, and has since continued to grow, as shown in the following tabulation:

	Tons
1916	2,014,425
1917	2,409,046
1918	2,091,056
1919	3,152,005
1920	4,210,176
1921	4,862,882
1922	10,285,810
1923	27,154,550

Thus in the last two years shipping has more than doubled each year.

The composition of the tonnage in the last two years is significant, as it indicates the reason for the disproportionately large growth of shipping. In the following tabulation the shipping in Los Angeles Harbor is analyzed, segregating the foreign and domestic (coastwise) shipping and the receipts and shipments for each. The three largest commodities in the

list are set out separately and all other commodities are grouped:

1922

Commodity	Receipts	Shipments	Total
Foreign:	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
Oil	2,243	665,197	667,440
Lumber	24,366	901	25,267
Iron and steel [1]	1,935	2,750	4,685
All other	211,853	67,781	279,634
Total	240,397	736,629	977,026
Domestic:			
Oil	13,047	6,262,876	6,275,923
Lumber	1,784,739	2,041	1,786,780
Iron and steel [1]	360,842	14,387	375,229
All other	658,352	212,500	870,852
Total	2,816,980	6,491,804	9,308,784
Grand total	3,057,377	7,228,433	10,285,810

Commodity	Tons	Per cent
Foreign and domestic receipts and shipments combined:		
Oil	6,943,363	66.5
Lumber	1,812,047	17.6
Iron and steel [1]	379,914	3.7
All other	1,150,486	11.2
Total	10,285,810	100

[1] Figures for iron and steel cover only manufactured products—pipe and fittings, sheets and plates, structural shapes, etc.—not ores, pig, or scrap.

1923

Commodity	Receipts	Shipments	Total
Foreign:	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*
Oil	8,601	2,440,250	2,448,851
Lumber	172,042	8,874	180,916
Iron and steel [1]	4,039	3,796	7,835
All other	267,546	81,482	349,028
Total	452,228	2,534,402	2,986,630
Domestic:			
Oil	135,855	19,063,814	19,199,669
Lumber	2,701,409	5,974	2,707,383
Iron and steel [1]	775,775	10,750	786,525
All other	730,310	744,033	1,474,343
Total	4,343,349	19,824,571	24,167,920
Grand total	4,795,577	22,358,973	27,154,550

Commodity	Tons	Per cent
Foreign and domestic receipts and shipments combined:		
Oil	21,648,520	79.7
Lumber	2,888,299	10.7
Iron and steel [1]	794,369	2.9
All other	1,823,371	6.7
Total	27,154,550	100

[1] Figures for iron and steel cover only manufactured products—pipe and fittings, sheets and plates, structural shapes, etc.—not ores, pig, or scrap.

From this it will be seen that about two-thirds of the 10,285,810 tons in 1922 consists of oil. Over one-half of the remainder (that is, more than one-sixth of the total) is lumber brought in, and all other shipping is less than one-sixth of the total. In 1923, the division is still more striking. Four-fifths of the 27,154,550 tons consists of oil and more than one-half of the remainder (over one-tenth of the total) consists of lumber brought in, all other shipping being less than one-tenth of the total.

The next largest item in domestic receipts is pipe and fittings, sheets and plates of iron and steel, and structural steel. There seems to be little doubt that a large proportion of the lumber and of these iron and steel products are used in connection with the production, distribution, and processing of oil, consequently the amount of this shipping business which is directly dependent upon the oil industry is materially greater than that covered by the oil itself.

Practically all oil shipped from the port of Los Angeles is produced within a radius of 30 miles of this port. Oil produced in other fields has already established channels to other ports, and in view of the investment involved in pipe lines, refineries, and other handling facilities, it is conjectural to what extent this traffic might be diverted to Los Angeles Harbor, if the latter is further developed.

It is, therefore, important to examine the production of oil in the field directly tributary to the port of Los Angeles. According to the figures contained in a Standard Oil bulletin, under date of March, 1922, the production of oil in this territory for the 10 years ending with 1921, was as follows:

1912	10,993,000
1913	13,556,000
1914	16,635,000
1915	15,141,000
1916	16,401,000
1917	19,657,000
1918	26,301,000
1919	29,999,000
1920	30,005,000
1921	35,587,000

According to the figures from the State mining bureau, the production of oil in this district for 1922 and 1923, segregated by fields, is as follows:

District No. 1	Barrels, 1922	Barrels, 1923
Beverly Hills	175,222	167,553
Brea-Olinda	4,417,055	3,711,928
Coyote Hills	7,142,859	2,780,145
Huntington Beach	11,179,882	33,813,185
Long Beach	18,049,240	67,901,002
Montebello	6,614,661	3,989,883
Newhall	75,834	58,936
Redondo-Torrance	190,371	3,155,716
Richfield	8,309,695	6,169,663
Salt Lake	829,498	794,555
Santa Fe Springs	10,630,430	81,464,415
Whittier	929,561	736,463
Dominguez	----------	167,836
	68,544,308	204,911,280
Los Angeles City Field	231,732	229,069

While final figures are not available for production in this field for 1924, preliminary figures of production by months are as follows:

California oil production, barrels of clean oil, 1924

[NOTE.—As these figures are secured from a different source, the designation of the fields does not correspond in each case, and consequently the figures are not always comparable. However, the largest and most important producing fields are clearly indicated.]

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September
Los Angeles—									
Salt Lake	97,081	84,483	80,297	71,045	76,652	80,749	74,224	76,684	66,480
Whittier	63,261	58,564	62,266	59,217	64,768	61,899	65,939	69,250	64,622
Fullerton	303,647	314,934	323,285	321,840	379,170	351,335	361,984	351,021	345,209
Coyote	129,490	117,872	117,635	459,738	583,235	564,901	606,272	628,511	598,574
Santa Fe Springs	4,278,179	3,066,520	2,682,741	2,181,404	2,149,880	1,831,457	1,846,421	1,797,595	1,700,493
Monte Bello	529,013	537,732	522,312	498,729	519,101	501,524	520,108	524,141	503,580
Richfield	414,666	399,788	397,265	380,173	378,322	358,474	358,387	367,347	344,906
Huntington Beach	1,986,723	1,735,201	1,733,090	1,540,845	1,506,100	1,382,184	1,340,202	1,290,901	1,238,214
Long Beach	6,778,037	6,351,371	6,104,507	5,275,313	5,172,472	4,785,362	4,778,989	4,620,041	4,279,352
Torrance	972,261	800,311	1,168,181	1,644,023	1,783,670	1,716,885	1,776,550	1,741,121	1,629,453
Compton (Domingues)	56,851	41,843	119,285	216,881	266,112	286,025	519,600	740,414	900,620
Rosecrans	----------	----------	----------	----------	18,801	21,225	20,631	35,454	77,915
Inglewood	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	410
Total for Los Angeles district	16,560,209	13,509,619	13,210,854	12,719,208	12,898,283	11,942,020	12,269,307	11,542,480	11,749,830
Balance of State of California	4,352,791	4,831,381	6,702,146	6,580,792	6,935,717	6,865,980	7,005,693	7,570,520	6,558,170
Total California production	20,913,000	19,341,000	19,913,000	19,300,000	19,834,000	18,808,000	19,275,000	19,113,000	18,308,000
Balance of United States	35,542,000	36,113,000	39,826,000	40,133,000	41,819,000	40,484,000	41,808,000	42,591,000	41,303,000
Total United States production	56,455,000	55,454,000	59,739,000	59,433,000	61,653,000	59,292,000	61,083,000	61,704,000	59,611,000

Based upon these figures for the first nine months of 1924, the total production of the Los Angeles district would total about 150,000,000 barrels. However, with a steadily decreasing production, the yearly total will probably be less than that amount. Even 150,000,000 barrels for the year 1924 would represent a reduction of over 25 per cent from the 1923 production.

From these figures for 1924 it will also be seen that the four largest and most important fields, namely, Santa Fe Springs, Huntington Beach, Long Beach, and Torrance, have apparently all passed the peak of their production and have entered the steady decline which always follows such a peak, while only two fields of important size show marked increase in production through the year, namely, Coyote and Dominguez. Two new fields, Rosecrans and Inglewood, have apparently not yet developed to the point where their production can be safely predicted.

It will also be noted that the total production in this field shows a considerable decrease through the year, while the production for the rest of the State of California shows a material increase and the production for the entire United States shows a distinctly rising tendency.

The Bureau of Mines states that after an oil field reaches it peak it is safe to estimate that one-third of the total possible production of the field has been reached. Following the peak point, which is often a sharp rise, they show a slow but steady decline for the other two-thirds of the ultimate production. This has held good in other fields and is considered by them a safe estimate.

The United States Geological Survey in a pamphlet entitled "Petroleum in 1922" comments on the production of oil in California in these words:

Although California ranks second among the oil-producing States, with an output of 138,468,000 barrels, the most noteworthy feature of the production of petroleum in 1922 in the United States was California's increase of 23 per cent over her output of 1921, foreshadowing her tremendous production in 1923. This increase was due to the development of the Long Beach, Santa Fe Springs, and Huntington Beach pools in the Los Angeles Basin. Oil was obtained from the Huntington Beach pool throughout 1921, but the yield was greatly increased during 1922. Santa Fe Springs and Long Beach began to produce late in 1921 and rapidly increased through each successive month of 1922. During the last six months of the year these three pools produced almost half the entire yield of the State. The reason for the rapid development of these pools far beyond the requirement of the industry lay primarily in the character of the ownership of the land, which was mostly held in small tracts on which many protective offset wells were drilled.

It will readily be understood that the inevitable corollary to such a forced development of the maximum capacity of an oil field by protective offset wells is the more rapid depletion of the field than would otherwise occur. These fields must be drained of their oil as rapidly as possible in order that each of the small property owners may get his share.

Another feature which must be considered in connection with any development of Los Angeles Harbor is the fact that the local demand for oil is very large. All railroad service and all steamboat service is oil burning. Gas producing and industrial service is practically all oil burning. Very little coal is used for any purpose. Coastwise shipments of coal into Los Angeles in 1922 amounted to about 5,000 tons and in 1923 to about 16,000 tons, showing the negligible use of coal in this territory. It is, therefore, a natural question to ask how soon the local demand for oil, which of course grows with the increase in population and industrial activity, will overtake the decreasing production of oil in this territory and, as a consequence, practically eliminate the shipment of oil through the port of Los Angeles.

The following figures for the tonnage of shipments for eight other ports, for the year 1922, are interesting for comparison with the tabulation of the shipping in Los Angeles Harbor, given above. It will be noted that, although these ports all have smaller total tonnage than Los Angeles, their tonnage of a stable nature exceeds that of Los Angeles.

Tonnage, 1922

	Tons
Seattle, Wash.:	
Oil	1,102,251
All other	4,589,286
Total	5,691,537
Portland, Oreg.:	
Oil	1,040,477
All other	7,442,747
Total	8,483,224
San Francisco, Calif.:	
Oil	6,716,788
All other	8,120,821
Total	14,837,609
Galveston, Tex.:	
Oil	5,858,424
All other	4,372,141
Total	10,230,565
New Orleans, La.:	
Oil	3,001,160
All other	13,165,086
Total	16,166,246
Baltimore, Md.:	
Oil	1,850,202
All other	11,345,424
Total	13,195,626
Philadelphia, Pa.:	
Oil	6,203,420
All other	19,756,680
Total	25,960,100
Boston, Mass.:	
Oil	2,009,577
All other	11,984,069
Total	13,993,646

Los Angeles Harbor has already been provided by the United States with a breakwater about 11,000 feet long, a main entrance channel 30 feet deep at mean low water, terminating in a turning basin within the harbor; channels 20 feet deep extending from the turning basin into the east and west basins, a channel 30 feet deep from the turning basin to the westerly side of the west basin, and a channel 20 feet deep extending through East Basin to the Long Beach-Los Angeles city line in Cerritos Channel. In addition, the Los Angeles River, which formerly deposited its large burden of silt in the harbor, has been diverted. Local interests have given considerable cooperation in the harbor improvement and in the river diversion works.

The enormous growth in shipping shown above has resulted in congestion in this harbor and local interests request additional improvements, which include:

A depth of 37 feet in the entrance channel;

Additional dredging to 30 feet in the west basin;

A depth of 32 feet through Cerritos Channel;

Reclamation of an area known as Reservation Point, on the east side of the inner-harbor entrance;

Additional dredging in the southwest section of the outer harbor; and

Extension of the existing breakwater from its present eastern end to the northeast and north, connecting with the mainland just west of the mouth of the silt-diversion channel in Long Beach, with suitable openings, thus inclosing an area of open sea to the south of the main entrance and of Terminal Island.

In reporting to Congress upon these proposed additional improvements the Chief of Engineers stated (p. 47, Rept. No. 1053, 68th Cong., 2d sess.):

The tremendous growth of the commerce of Los Angeles Harbor, reaching in 1923 the extraordinary figure of over 26,000,000 tons, is too well known to require amplification. Taken in connection with the exceptionally large proportion of deep-draft vessels calling at the port, it is ample warrant for the dredging in the main channel, Cerritos Channel, west basin, and the southwest section of the outer harbor, advocated by the district engineer, and which I consider necessary to meet existing conditions.

The breakwater proposal, on the other hand, looks not to the present but to the future, in which the port's business would be not only larger but of a quite different character. Los Angeles and Long Beach, in spite of their great tonnage, do not as yet constitute a truly national port. The bulk of the traffic is either oil from the intensively developed adjacent fields, or building materials required by the growth of the neighboring communities, which growth is principally due to a heavy influx of population in recent years from all parts of the country. These conditions will not obtain indefinitely. Moreover, the present basic commodities of oil and lumber, especially the former, may be moved in large quantities over a very limited water front. So long as the character of the port remains what it is, there should be no serious difficulty in handling its traffic in the present inner harbor. Local interests, however, now propose to enter the field of general transshipment business. The volume of general commerce predicted by their engineers requires a yearly average increase of a million tons—

that is, an increase each year equal to approximately the total of the present general commerce, a figure too large to be obtained from the limited area of southern California, which constitutes the port's present hinterland. Its realization would require that Los Angeles and Long Beach become the gateway of much of the southwestern United States. Given sufficient effort and proper cooperation among all concerned, this end can be attained. If it is attained a radical change in the layout of the harbor is necessary.

Giving the report of the Chief of Engineers the most favorable construction, the large bulk of the money proposed to be spent upon these further improvements—that is, $14,000,000 for the extension of the present breakwater, half of which is to be paid by the United States Government—is frankly based upon purely conjectural future development upon altered traffic routes in the territory behind Los Angeles, and the matter is submitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers with that fact clearly stated in his report. The question is, therefore, whether this project should not, for the time being at least, be divested of its most expensive item—that is, the breakwater—until such time as the development of such a stable traffic is clearly indicated.

GREATER HARBOR COMMITTEE OF TWO HUNDRED
OF THE LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 10, 1925.

Hon. WALTER F. LINEBERGER,
House of Representatives, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LINEBERGER: Mr. Windham placed in my hands yesterday the memo mailed by you under date of the 3d, and we went at once to work, as per inclosure, to answer the main points. We trust this has been done to your satisfaction. From your telegram of the 7th we are of the impression that you have already crossed the Rubicon, that the bill is safe, and that the party preparing the memo will have no occasion to use it. Nevertheless, we have gone ahead and have prepared the rebuttal in case the necessity should arise for its use. In the very short time allowed for our preparation it was not possible to harmonize our forces. On this account Mr. Matson's memoranda, as does our own, goes under separate headings and may show some duplication.

The memo was prepared by some one thoroughly familiar with the oil industry and California conditions and with a very good grasp of the situation. If we were fighting this battle on the basis of our harbor as a future oil port it would be an unanswerable document. Fortunately for us, we have at all times discounted the oil situation in the figuring of our future harbor needs. We have a keen interest in knowing if you have any line on where the document was prepared, i. e., Washington or California, and if so, who was the writer.

Permit us to extend our congratulations on the wonderful fight you have put up for the bill. Our people are quite elated over it.

Sincerely yours,

BURT A. HEINLY,
Executive Secretary.

(Memorandum)

JANUARY 10, 1925.

To: WALTER F. LINEBERGER.
From: Burt A. Heinly.
Subject: Discussion and criticism of memoranda dealing with river and harbor bill H. R. 10894.

In the memoranda on river and harbor bill H. R. 10894, the large amount of statistical data on oil production and export through Los Angeles Harbor have been admirably prepared and check with the data used by the various organizations urging the passage of the bill.

The writer of the memoranda, however, bases his whole thesis on oil exportation, whereas oil has simply drawn attention of the world to Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, and in all the computations by advocates of the greater harbor bill oil export has been discounted much more severely than by the opponent of the bill in this paper. We have paid attention to the assured growth of the harbor along other lines. Also, incorrect deductions have been made from the statistics presented, which will be taken up item by item in later paragraphs.

The memoranda are largely based on Government statistics of 1922, and particularly 1923, and the assumption is very plainly made that the output of oil in this region is to-day very sadly on the decline, that no new fields have been opened up, and that all remaining oil territory in the region has been prospected and found worthless.

For the moment assuming the same basis of argument as the writer of the memoranda, whom for briefness we shall call "M." that it, let us examine both oil conditions and marine exportation.

Let this be distinctly understood: A very large tonnage of bulk oil can be handled through pipe lines with exceeding rapidity and over a very small length of wharfage. The 7,000,000 tons of oil exported in 1922 required only 11 per cent of the available developed water frontage, or 4,662 linear feet of wharf, whereas the miscellaneous harbor use and general merchandise required 37,663 linear feet in the handling of the 2,285,000 tons of lumber and general merchandise. In 1923 the whole export of oil, or 22,000,000 tons, was handled over 12 per cent of the available harbor wharfage, leaving the balance of 88 per cent harbor frontage, represented by transit sheds, etc., as required to handle the port's lumber and general merchandise. In other words, "M's" whole argument is centered on a commodity, which, large though it is, requires the least area and extent of harbor frontage to handle it. Moreover, it is anticipated that the maximum wharf frontage for oil export has already been constructed. So far as the future needs and building requirements of the harbor are concerned, it might be entirely disregarded. If all oil shipments or possibility of oil shipments at the harbor ceased to-morrow, the conditions could be changed only by 12 per cent, which does not seriously affect the needed greater frontage and harbor capacity as will be provided by the outer breakwater.

We do not disregard oil, for it will be a commodity of export for many years; but we bear down upon the fact that the need of the outer breakwater and the greater harbor is not for oil but for the handling of general merchandise, raw and finished, to keep pace with the growth in all other directions of the Pacific southwest.

In making this statement the fact should not be begrudged that oil is as much a commodity as cotton from the South, coal from Norfolk or Baltimore, or timber shipped through Portland and Seattle. In comparison with the latter, timber is a natural resource, just as subject to exhaustion as is oil, gold, silver, coal, or iron. Oil also is the guts of the Navy, whose fighting radius is in proportion to its fuel capacity.

"M's" principal argument seems to rest on the year of flush production, in 1923. We have no desire to equal this under similar conditions. In fact, the whole energy of the oil industry has been directed to prevent its continuance or repetition. The greater harbor committee in working out its computations of future harbor tonnage, and after conferences with the foremost oil geologists of this country, assumed for a period of 10 years, 1924–1934, only 50 per cent of the 1923 yield. How conservative this is is shown by the fact that oil exports from Los Angeles Harbor for calendar year 1924 dropped only 30 per cent below that of 1923. In 1924 we went down from the peak to settled production. There is no indication that export in 1925 or 1926 will fall below that of 1924.

"M" calls attention to the decline of Santa Fe Springs and Signal Hill, but signally fails to call attention to the new and powerful fields either proven or brought in and which assure no diminution of average flow of 1924 for a considerable period. Neither does "M" refer to still undiscovered pools. Much wildcatting is going on in the region, and in view of past experience it is fair to presume that other fields will be brought into existence. The Baldwin Hills is an example of this. We inclose the thought of two of the eminent geologists on this subject.

"M" speaks of the rise and forecasts the fall of the oil industry, but is either entirely unfamiliar or fails to comment on the movement of general merchandise.

From 1900 to 1915 (when the World War began and nearly all Pacific coast shipping was diverted to the Atlantic) the tonnage of general merchandise through this port made an average annual increase of 28 per cent. From 1919 to January 1, 1924, the average annual increase in tonnage of general merchandise alone through this port was 48 per cent; 1924 figures are not yet available.

Taking up the memoranda in detail we make comment on individual paragraphs, statements, and erroneous deductions as follows:

At the bottom of page 2 the pure assumption is made that out of general merchandise comprising heavy tonnage of pipe fittings, plates, sheets, structural steel, and lumber "in large proportion went to production, distributing, and processing of oil, and so the tonnage was naturally greater than that covered by oil itself."

This is not a statement of a fact, but simply a guess, and the guess is wrong.

The greater harbor committee in attempting to define and predict its curve on general merchandise took these items, and by very careful computation and inquiry, sought to ascertain the facts. We found that of steel products, the oil industry in the peak year of 1923 consumed only 10 per cent. Of total lumber importations the oil industry required only 2 per cent.

Only a sentence is necessary to state where the balance of these materials went. They were required in waterworks construction, office buildings, stores, and dwellings to take care of the rapidly increasing population of this district.

On page 3, second paragraph, it is stated that "practically all oil shipped from the port of Los Angeles is produced within a radius of 30 miles of this port, and so forth." "Oil produced in other fields has already established channels and other ports."

This is incorrect. Oil is delivered from a distance of about 125 miles. General Petroleum has an 8-inch pipe line laid from the Kern County fields, with a capacity of 30,000 barrels per day, and this has been under operation for a considerable period. Pan-American now has under construction a 10-inch pipe line from the Elk Hills district to the harbor, a distance of 140 miles, capacity of 40,000 barrels daily, which will handle Government oil. Mr. Doheny, himself, has testified that it will require at least 20 years to handle this field. The oil from this field at the present time is being delivered north into San Francisco. The line is well under construction, will shortly be under operation, and will deliver its entire output at Los Angeles Harbor.

On page 5, second, third, and fourth paragraphs:

The intent of these paragraphs is to show the rapid decline of the oil supply in this region. Interviews with W. W. Orcutt, chief geologist of the Union Oil, and Joseph Jensen, geologist of Associated Oil, men by position, training, and knowledge best suited to refute this intimation, are inclosed.

The fields named have passed their peak of production, but they have settled down to steady production. New fields have come into production, and if handled like the four old fields, and coupled with them would have produced an output in 1924–25 greater than the peak year of 1923.

The point we desire to make is that the oil industry is undertaking to regulate production in keeping with demand for a long period; that the new fields brought in could have maintained the 1923 yield; and that what "M" points out as a decline of the whole region is only a decline of the four best-known fields, with a restricted development of other fields just as big, but which are and will be developed and conserved along good business lines.

Of course, this region shows a material decrease and other regions, particularly the whole United States, a marked increase. In 1923 Los Angeles oil knocked the bottom out of the oil industry. The Signal Hill and Santa Fe fields, in the hands of little fellows trying to get out their oil before the fellow next to them, swamped the market. Our storage was totally inadequate. We had to get rid of our oil at any price. Crude could be delivered to Atlantic seaboard cheaper from Los Angeles and the mid-continental and Texas fields; the result was that the market was so demoralized that they shut down. During 1923 Los Angeles was trying to supply the whole United States. We got ourselves in hand late in 1923; prices of crude have been stabilized and advanced, and other fields of the country are again under way.

Page 6, second paragraph:

"M" in this simply explains the 1923 situation. The other fields that have been developed or been "proved up" are in the hands of the large companies. (See Orcutt's comment on Dominguez.) The very thing to which "M" calls attention is the situation that has been gotten in hand and is reflected in the reduced production and exportation in 1924.

Page 6, third paragraph:

"M" is correct in stating that population growth means larger consumption of oil products. This section is interested in industrial development, and industrial development means ingoing and outgoing general merchandise. It is on this increase that Los Angeles believes in the necessity for the start in building of the outer breakwater. Coal is not used here, because there is no present requirement for its use when a better agent, i. e., oil, is at hand. Coal, however, will be used in coking as a part of the iron-smelting industry now under establishment in the Long Beach section, and when required in general use will come by water. Oil, with cheap water and hydroelectric power, provides for the rapid industrial development of this district with all that portends in shipping and harbor requirements. Los Angeles has not entered upon her industrial era; she is now within it.

Our industries do not as a rule grow here. By reason of the advantages offered they transport themselves bodily from other slower growing, less-favored localities. The industrial directors of the railroads are therefore closest to the rapid growth of industry. It is the belief of the three men representing the three transcontinental railroads that the year 1928 in dollars will show 100 per cent over the output of this district in 1923.

Returning to the subject of the oil industry and the question of "M" if "the decreasing production of oil will not practically eliminate the shipment of oil through the port."

The men who have built up the oil industry of this section are deserving of the credit for more acumen and business ability than "M" seems willing to give them.

The oil people at the present time, according to Mr. J. C. Anderson, president of the Pan American, have approximately $100,000,000 in the aggregate invested in and around the harbor in the handling, refining, and shipment of oil. The large investment has not been made on pure guesswork. It is not based on the assumption that the oil will be exhausted within a 5 or 10 year period or that their investment must be junked at the end of that time. It is very firmly based on studies and logical beliefs that this natural resource will be developed in quantities approaching 1924, both from present and new fields, and that sagging, if and when it starts, will be taken up by imports from Mexico and Central America, the crude being brought here for refining and distribution locally and abroad; that automatically we will swing from export to import without materially affecting the fabric of the industry.

It will thus be seen that the shrewd men of this great industry anticipated "M's" thought on the subject by some years and answered it at least to their own satisfaction by the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars.

Last paragraph, page 7, and all of page 8:

No exhibit more damaging to the memoranda could have been presented than the quoted references to the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, as quoted in the memoranda's closing paragraphs. No more consistent brief for the breakwater project and its undertaking in the near future could be presented than this report in its entirety.

This board made a personal visit to Los Angeles in January, 1924. They were fully familiar with all the harbors of the United States, their needs and possibilities. This board by experience was hard-boiled and strengthened by experience to cast aside the dross and get at the facts. This board conducted its own hearing and its own investigations. It went into the oil situation just as "M" went into it, but the board did not stop with oil. It went into the industrial growth of this region, the increase in population, the investments amounting to hundreds of millions being made in waterworks and hydroelectric production to take care of the future population and the industrial rise of the district. These things led them to believe that by the time the Government breakwater could be built the necessity for its use would by that time have been created. They saw its necessity. They recommended that it should be built. In this recommendation the Chief Engineer of the United States Army concurred.

LOS ANGELES, *January 9, 1925.*

COMMENT OF MR. JOSEPH JENSEN, GEOLOGIST OF THE ASSOCIATED OIL CO., ON "MEMORANDA DEALING WITH CERTAIN PHASES OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL (H. R. 10894)"

Cursory examination of production figures for oil in the Los Angeles Basin as quoted shows them to be correct and in keeping with the facts as far as they go. The figures are not to be criticized. Their interpretation is, however, subject to criticism.

It is true that the year 1923 was one of flush production, and that no one should base any estimates wholly on performances in 1923. The flush production of 1923, however, has now become settled production, and the quotations from the Geological Survey apply to the production of 1923 in part, but the actual production of the fields that made flush production in 1923 shows that that production is now settled production and is not subject to such a rapid decline.

The writer of the memoranda has adhered to official reports and has not kept pace with the developments of this district. He makes no mention of new fields that have been found or those that are in prospect. Neither does he have knowledge, or if he does he does not write, of the production of new fields over the last six months' period, Baldwin Hills is not even mentioned, yet this new field has been proven to be at least 1½ miles long. Seal Beach is not named. Both Baldwin Hills and Seal Beach lie in the same chain of hills that contains the Dominguez, Signal Hill, and Huntington Beach fields. They may reasonably be expected to furnish fields of similar character.

Dominguez for the year 1923, as quoted from the United States Geological Survey, produced 167,836 barrels. Yet this field is now producing 63,000 barrels in a single day. It will produce more oil in 1925 than in 1924, and all indications are that it will produce as much in 1926 as in 1925. It is now the second field in southern California.

While the growth of southern California has been remarkable, the fact remains that much of the refining capacity of California is located on San Francisco Bay and that unrefined products will be shipped to San Francisco and refined products will be returned from San Francisco.

The writer of the memoranda makes the point that no coal is used, but when fuel oil becomes valuable enough to justify importing coal, then coal will come into Los Angeles Harbor and fuel oil instead of being burned will be made into gasoline. This simply means that the industrial center around Los Angeles will import coal and export gasoline. As a much larger quantity of coal is necessary for the same amount of heat secured from oil, the time is bound to come

that the oil industry will make more valuable products from the oil and that the other industries of southern California will have to burn coal. Coal from tidewater coal mines can be brought into Los Angeles more cheaply than coal from the Rocky Mountain States. This should compensate for any lost oil tonnage that the writer of the memoranda has feared. Industry and population make business and tonnage. New York has no oil, coal, iron, or other natural resource, but it has industry and population.

COMMENT OF MR. W. W. ORCUTT, CHIEF GEOLOGIST OF THE UNION OIL CO., OF CALIFORNIA, ON CERTAIN PHASES OF RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL, H. R. 10894

The initial decline in production of the four major pools—Sante Fe, Huntington Beach, Long Beach, and Torrance—of the Los Angeles Basin, has already taken place, and these areas are now on what we call a "settled production" basis. The annual decline from now on will be small, say 10 per cent per annum. The new pool of Dominguez, now producing 60,000 barrels daily, is capable of quick development if desirable to offset the whole decline from the four fields above mentioned for several years to come. In addition, there is the new Rosecrans pool, which will no doubt produce much oil; however, the peak production here will come within the next 12 to 16 months.

Furthermore, production from the old fields in the basin, which have been partially "closed in" or operated in an indifferent manner for the past three years, can be put back on full production again on short notice. All the above will tend to maintain and stabilize production for several years. With the possibility of some of the "wild cats" now drilling finding a new pool, it would appear that there is very little probability of a heavy decline in the production of the Los Angeles Basin for some years to come.

The consumption of crude oil and refined products on the Pacific coast is the highest per capita of any similar area in the United States, owing to the large number of cars per capita and on account of good roads and open weather the year around. When the time comes that consumption is greater than the supply of petroleum products, the shortage will be imported from Mexico and South America, using the same harbor facilities already installed, the value of which runs into many millions of dollars.

Memorandum

JANUARY 9, 1925.

To: Mr. Heinly.
From: Mr. Matson.

Referring to our telephone conversation, I am handing you herewith three copies of a few paragraphs I have hastily dictated in reply to the memorandum received from Washington opposing our breakwater project.

This will not reach you in time to get into your brief, although I am sending you these copies with the suggestion that you forward two of them to Congressman LINEBERGER and one for your own files. Major LINEBERGER can then use them for any argument he sees fit:

(1) Is the supply of California oil decreasing? Herewith I attach a copy of tabulation showing the production of each California oil field by years since 1876. This tabulation is useful in showing that while a field attains a peak a few years after oil is discovered, it continues to produce in comparatively large quantities, and before the production of the old fields is fully diminished new fields are brought into production which far more than offset any decrease in the production of old fields. Thus while the production occasionally is less in some year than the preceding year, the general trend is constantly upward, and there is no reason to believe that California oil production is to show any great falling off.

We realize, of course, that in such fields as Long Beach, Santa Fe Springs, and Huntington Beach, where there is a tremendous amount of independent drilling and production was not controlled by demand, that production will considerably decrease. On the other hand, it is noted that on page 3 of the memorandum referred to the production of the Dominguez field in 1923 is given as 167,836 barrels. At the present time the Dominguez field will produce more than that much oil in three days, and it is just getting well under way.

(2) It is conceded that the oil statistics given in the memorandum referred to are probably correct, but we contend that they are wrongly interpreted. In other words, suppose they are correct, what of it?

Since 1923 the larger oil companies have been building a great amount of storage, and during 1924 large quantities of petroleum went into storage instead of being shipped out of the harbor. There has also been a large increase in the refinery capacity of southern California, and very much more of the crude oil is being sent out as kerosene and gasoline. More and more of this product is going out as case oil, and case oil moves the same as general merchandise and requires just as much wharf space.

(3) The statement is made in the memorandum referred to that practically all of the oil shipped from the port of Los Angeles is produced within a radius of 30 miles of the port. The author of this statement evidently does not know that Los Angeles is connected by pipe lines of the General Petroleum Co. with the oil fields of the San Joaquin Valley. We bring a large amount of petroleum here. Some of it also is brought in by boat from Port San Luis and Santa Barbara County for refining. Furthermore, the Pan American Petroleum Co. is now spending a million dollars in building pipe lines between the harbor and new oil fields in the San Joaquin Valley.

(4) It should not be overlooked that shipment of oil from the port of Los Angeles is of great benefit to other parts of the United States. Shipment of crude oil alone in 1924 amounted to 68,146,444 barrels, which went to refineries all along the Atlantic coast and to other ports along the Pacific, there to be manufactured into refined products. The total exports of bulk oil from this port in 1924 amounted to 101,454,664 barrels, which was more than the total production of the entire State of California in 1919.

(5) If it is argued that the harbor of Los Angeles should not be developed because of a possible decrease in the production of petroleum in California, it should also be argued that the ports of Seattle, Tacoma, and Portland should not be improved because the timber supply of Washington and Oregon is being chopped off. Neither should Norfolk and certain other ports on the Atlantic coast be improved because the supply of coal in the Allegheny Mountains and elsewhere is being depleted, nor should certain iron ports in the upper lake regions be developed because the iron deposits are being depleted.

(6) It is asserted in the memorandum referred to that the consumption of oil in southern California for industrial and transportation service will soon overtake the production of oil. We wish that our industrial growth were fast enough that this statement might be true, but while we have built more than 600 new industries in and around Los Angeles in 1924, or an average of nearly two a day, the fact remains that our production of oil is increasing very much more rapidly than its use for industrial and transportation purposes. This has held true through a long series of years, and there are no facts to substantiate any conclusion to the contrary.

The assertion that a large portion of the lumber movement through the port of Los Angeles is caused by the oil industry and the falling off in the oil industry would result in the falling off of the lumber movement is erroneous. The use of lumber in the oil industry is almost negligible. It is true that considerable iron and steel products are required in the oil industry, particularly in the way of pipe lines, but this requirement is not nearly as big as that necessitated by the increased population in Los Angeles, which necessitates new buildings, industrial plants, and a great amount for the extension of water mains. Preliminary figures for 1924 show that imports of iron and steel are well over 500,000 tons, and imports of lumber are well over 2,250,000 tons.

(7) We believe one of the best proofs as to whether or not the improvements requested of the United States are required is shown by the fact that the people of Long Beach and Los Angeles are willing to put up an equal amount with the Government for the construction of the breakwater requested, and they are putting vastly greater sums into the construction of other harbor facilities. If these projects were not absolutely necessary, the people who are here on the ground would not be willing to put up their own money to create these facilities, and unless the local people do put up dollar for dollar the Government does not have to expend anything.

(8) On the other hand, in creating new harbor facilities through the cooperation of the Government and the people of Los Angeles and Long Beach, the Government is creating a vast amount of direct revenue for its own Treasury, as is shown by the customs collections, which for the year 1924 amounted to $4,332,037.32.

The customs collections for the past few years have been as follows:

1919	$822, 260. 32
1920	837, 387. 55
1921	1, 296, 718. 22
1922	2, 150, 743. 41
1923	3, 811, 808. 62
1924	4, 332, 037. 32

These figures show the increase year by year as the result of new harbor facilities.

Just after this was finished I have received an estimate from the Chamber of Mines and Oil showing total California production of 236,000,000 barrels. This is much nearer the high production of 1923 than we anticipated.

MATSON.

California's petroleum production from the beginning of the industry to December 31, 1923, by fields

[Compiled by the statistical department of the chamber of mines and oil from data furnished by Federal and State bureaus, the American Petroleum Institute, and the Independent Oil Producers' Agency]

(Barrels of 42 United States gallons)

Year	Kern River	McKittrick	Midway [1]	Sunset [1]	Elk Hills	Coalinga	Lost Hills-Belridge	Santa Maria-Lompoc	Coyote	Montebello	Richfield
1896						14,119					
1897						70,140					
1898		10,000				154,000					
1899		15,000				439,372					
1900	826,775	80,000		12,500		547,960					
1901	3,278,840	430,450	4,235	188,600		525,433					
1902	8,988,046	619,296	3,048	167,558		571,233		94,188			
1903	16,342,099	1,353,206	27,305	352,565		2,138,058		204,890			
1904	17,226,240	1,856,225	910	390,425		5,097,853		700,450			
1905	15,253,845	1,373,030	18,530	419,212		8,882,125		3,402,800			
1906	12,825,166	680,756	11,800	307,550		8,401,105		4,799,411			
1907	12,346,014	2,415,840	149,944	704,805		8,996,268		8,249,236			
1908	13,803,579	3,076,300	434,578	1,463,510		10,725,795		8,699,350			
1909	14,508,242	5,807,360	2,234,455	1,999,701		15,406,619		8,017,455			
1910	14,776,435	5,471,613	11,174,207	9,218,904		18,646,570	4,900	7,607,830			
1911	14,078,890	5,477,532	21,584,602	5,559,069		18,311,251	168,410	7,465,074			
1912	12,446,445	5,094,465	25,948,980	5,590,824		19,546,122	2,680,961	6,801,966	1,359,303		
1913	9,980,940	4,496,842	33,040,129	5,984,651		18,604,626	5,274,553	5,817,711	3,777,359		
1914	7,030,545	3,820,857	37,479,228	12,546,615		15,925,887	4,830,921	4,303,080	6,998,659		
1915	8,034,974	3,552,801	33,311,486	6,006,607		13,548,159	4,318,550	4,536,840	6,610,508		
1916	8,402,525	3,230,644	32,156,818	6,768,658		14,381,493	4,852,431	4,422,410	8,588,699		
1917	8,495,610	3,252,544	29,487,812	7,072,333		15,938,543	6,295,329	5,798,070	11,458,471	789,635	
1918	7,921,515	3,050,627	27,439,993	6,608,940		16,283,066	5,420,079	7,143,750	12,614,598	6,839,267	
1919	7,563,025	2,810,848	26,133,048	5,589,885	281,019	16,385,610	4,554,821	6,030,910	10,240,359	12,100,784	965,408
1920	7,456,515	2,607,240	25,217,420	5,423,781	7,275,809	15,464,198	4,139,767	5,928,060	8,732,435	11,124,585	2,565,346
1921	6,715,680	2,056,101	24,172,350	4,613,965	18,085,425	12,340,637	3,261,281	5,563,324	7,419,050	9,065,723	8,206,962
1922	7,317,288	2,417,434	24,152,026	5,542,816	11,891,030	9,159,368	2,814,824	3,797,903	7,000,373	6,692,024	8,314,528
1923	6,816,134	2,191,702	27,803,281		8,174,371	5,210,839	1,843,483	3,003,672	2,447,825	4,075,669	6,121,335
Total	242,435,367	67,248,713	474,519,659		45,707,654	271,716,449	50,460,310	112,388,380	87,247,639	50,687,687	26,173,579

Year	Whittier	Santa Fe Springs	Huntington Beach	Fullerton [1]	Long Beach	Summerland	Newhall and Ventura Counties	Los Angeles and Salt Lake	Torrance	Miscellaneous	Total
Prior							175,000				175,000
1876							12,000				12,000
1877							13,000				13,000
1878							15,227				15,227
1879							19,858				19,858
1880							40,552				40,552
1881							99,862				99,862
1882							128,636				128,636
1883							142,857				142,857
1884							262,000				262,000
1885							325,000				325,000
1886							377,145				377,145
1887							678,572				678,572
1888							690,333				690,333
1889							303,220				303,220
1890							307,360				307,360
1891							323,600				323,600
1892							385,049				385,049
1893							470,179				470,179
1894						1,800	570,469	196,094		14,715	783,078
1895						16,904	474,624	749,695		4,116	1,245,339
1896						39,792	298,866	902,868		2,135	1,257,780
1897				12,000		130,136	631,135	1,064,158		4,000	1,911,568
1898				60,000		132,217	763,871	1,126,000		3,000	2,249,089
1899				217,599		208,370	743,998	1,052,036		1,500	2,677,875
1900				511,550		183,486	628,734	1,280,000		248,945	4,319,950
1901				753,198		203,616	495,943	1,830,000			7,710,315
1902				1,103,793		136,252	646,496	2,027,000			14,356,910
1903				2,305,613		131,125	682,185	793,765		3,670	24,334,481
1904				2,224,550		120,506	650,779	1,241,304		39,392	29,548,634
1905				2,118,312		96,871	476,898	2,226,768		29,650	34,298,041
1906				2,434,512		72,810	404,379	2,675,650		10,090	32,623,229
1907				3,294,206		69,060	435,584	3,372,465		69,090	40,102,512
1908				4,273,314		67,862	498,015	5,138,959		125,475	48,306,737
1909				5,157,252		66,338	516,628	4,350,898		126,775	58,191,723
1910				6,281,221		74,725	652,575	3,729,618		58,970	77,697,568
1911				7,081,165		71,255	661,785	3,223,661		61,350	83,744,044
1912	747,439			5,813,037		65,715	859,885	3,073,427		45,870	90,074,439
1913	690,133			6,189,561		62,406	1,022,052	2,898,846		27,375	97,867.184
1914	636,789			6,495,100		55,743	968,421	2,504,475		27,375	103,623,695
1915	758,163			5,661,878		53,000	1,036,305	2,110,133		27,375	89,566,779
1916	1,014,667			5,076,306		56,775	1,122,033	1,721,453		27,450	91,822,362
1917	1,156,752			4,750,582		56,570	1,186,407	1,501,799		27,375	97,267,832
1918	1,046,467			4,403,281		54,613	1,386,518	1,397,781		27,375	101,637,870
1919	1,001,048			4,350,084		53,680	1,792,465	1,341,415		27,375	101,221,784
1920	842,184		38,116	5,391,497		54,910	2,122,449	1,311,264		25,610	105,721,186
1921	735,376	208,216	2,518,812	6,012,839	75,588	54,155	2,375,479	1,344,926		24,035	114,849,924
1922	717,729	11,032,955	11,169,383	4,512,974	18,560,595	48,339	3,015,877	1,258,287	190,785	20,338	139,626,876
1923	645,219	79,781,275	34,355,642	4,064,661	68,810,361	52,862	3,702,404	1,192,036	3,128,694	307,430	263,728,895
Total	9,991,966	91,022,446	48,081,953	100,550,085	87,446,544	2,491,893	35,592,709	58,636,781	3,319,479	1,417,856	1,867,137,149

[1] Figures for Midway and Sunset fields are combined after 1922.
[1] Early production included under Newhall and Ventura Counties.
Supplement to the Mining and Oil Bulletin, February, 1924.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRIGGS].

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this bill and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the proposed intracoastal waterway project from the Mississippi River to and along the coastal region of Texas is one of the highest value, for it will assure to both Louisiana and Texas an inland navigable waterway over which both raw materials as well as manufactured products can economically and efficiently move.

Such waterway will bring to Texas new markets for its products in exchange for the products particularly of the great upper Mississippi Valley and territory contiguous thereto.

The intracoastal canal will have a 9-foot depth and a bottom width of 100 feet. It will enable a vast amount of heavy bulk freight, such as oil, sulphur, rice, salt, lumber, and other raw materials, as well as manufactured articles, to be quickly transported by water at very low cost and in enormous quantities; it will not only relieve and reduce traffic demands upon other transportation facilities, so that they may give better and more efficient service, but will also supply a vast territory with opportunity for transporting commodities produced there and developing rapidly a great section which has been retarded in its growth for lack of accessible arteries of transportation.

Some of the most productive areas in the States of Texas and Louisiana are now located miles away from railroads, and such communities find the cost of marketing their products almost prohibitive by reason of difficulties and expense; first, in reaching the nearest transportation facilities, and, second, in the inadequacy and the high cost involved in the use of present facilities.

Some idea of the enormous tonnage which will utilize the proposed waterway may be obtained from the exhaustive studies and investigations made by the Government engineers and the independent investigation conducted at the instance of the Intracoastal Canal Association by Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals, United States Army, retired, who was engineer in charge of the construction of the Panama Canal.

According to General Goethals, the waterway, if extended from the Mississippi River as far west as Corpus Christi, would develop a water-borne commerce of about 12,000,000 tons annually. Allowing for duplication of tonnage in his report, General Goethals states that the present possibilities of the proposed waterway are conservatively estimated at 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons annually.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the United States, in its exhaustive investigation, found that about 4,800,000 tons of commerce would move annually over the intracoastal canal.

The greater amount of commerce which would utilize the waterway would be through commerce; that is, commerce consisting for the most part of bulk freight transported long distances to and from points in Texas and to and from points along the Mississippi River and contiguous waterways and territory.

In the report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to Congress, Gen. Lansing H. Beach, United States Army, then holding such position, stated:

> These reports have been referred, as required by law, to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and attention is invited to its report herewith. A very thorough investigation has been made by the board through its resident member, who spent several weeks in the field checking the commercial possibilities of the waterway as developed by General Goethals and the division engineer. Careful consideration of all the information presented leads the board to agree with the division engineer as to the advisability of the project and to recommend its adoption, subject to certain requirements of local cooperation.
>
> This portion of the Gulf coast is rich in natural resources and in the production of agricultural products, and consumes a considerable tonnage of manufactured products. On account of the natural typography, railroad construction is difficult and very costly, and the movement of commerce is now dependent to a large extent on waterways, of which there are many, both natural and artificial. The proposed improvement would pass through this important area and would provide for the economical transportation of the products of its salt and sulphur mines, oil refineries, and sugar, rice, and lumber mills. It would extend the 9-foot waterways of the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys and admit of direct shipments of manufactured products from large industrial areas as far northeast as Pittsburgh, Pa., for distribution in Louisiana and Texas and northern Mexico. Adequate potential tonnage is available to justify the construction of the waterway at Government expense. To insure a reasonable return on the necessary expenditure, however, it is essential that some provision be made for the actual movement of commerce by the new route. It appears that this can best be assured by requiring that local interests shall provide adequate vessels, terminals, and auxiliary equipment to move a specified minimum tonnage on the various sections of the waterway.

The great forests of east Texas and Louisiana, and the lumber milled there, the enormous supply of oil and sulphur, the great quantities of rice, salt, and other materials will have new markets opened for their consumption, and the communities producing them will in turn acquire the advantage of far lower transportation costs, with expeditious movement of manufactured steel and other products used in Texas and Louisiana in such large quantities and at present very high cost.

The waterway in thus enabling the farmer and the producer of raw materials on the one hand to sell their products in new markets, with greatly reduced transportation costs, while at the same time enabling producers of manufactured products needed upon the farm and utilized in industry to transport the same to destination at lower cost, will prove a most effective and efficient way to provide needed additional transportation facilities and at the same time supply cheaper transportation and promote general prosperity.

The proposed intracoastal canal is most favorably and strongly recommended by all the Government engineers, including the Chief of Engineers of the Army, and is also most strongly indorsed and advocated by General Goethals and a number of civic organizations which are cognizant of the remarkable opportunity for transportation relief and development which will be provided through the project now before the Congress.

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in its report takes occasion to point out the probable amount of tonnage which may reasonably be expected to move over different sections of the waterway. It says:

> Assuming satisfactory conditions as to equipment, rates, and channel, the estimate in the special report for the annual tonnage of a 9-foot waterway, section by section, is approximately as follows:
>
> Between New Orleans and Morgan City, 1,600,000 tons, two-thirds eastbound.
>
> Between Morgan City and the Sabine ports, 1,150,000 tons, about balanced.
>
> Between the Sabine ports and Galveston Bay, 1,600,000 tons, four-fifths westbound.
>
> Between Galveston Bay and Gulf, Tex., 700,000 tons, principally eastbound.
>
> The special report states that this would be largely through or long-distance commerce, requiring for economy a breaking and reassembling of tows at New Orleans and to a lesser extent at Galveston.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors and this House originally recommended to Congress the adoption of the proposed intracoastal canal waterway project from the Mississippi to Corpus Christi, Tex. Owing, however, to an abridgment of the administration's legislative program for this session, the Rivers and Harbors Committee modified its former action and for the present provided for the extension of the waterway only as far west as Galveston.

Undoubtedly further authorization will be made by Congress at an early date for carrying forward the improvement further westward, as recommended by the Government engineers.

In its report to Congress, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, of which General Taylor, now Chief of Engineers, was then chairman, called attention to the conspicuous value of such further extension. He said:

> The analysis of available traffic in the attached report of the resident member of the board indicates that the Galveston-Gulf section is justified irrespective of the remainder of the waterway by the potential sulphur and oil movements. While the traffic included in the estimates pertains largely to one company, the magnitude of its production representing a large part of the total national output of sulphur, justifies the provision of more economical transportation facilities, especially as, under the highly competitive conditions existing in the sulphur business, any saving will probably be reflected in the selling price of the product. Moreover, this part of the waterway would be available for the use of another important sulphur company, at Freeport, which, although it favors the movement of its product by ocean carriers direct from that port, has shipped considerable amounts of sulphur to Galveston in the past for export of coastwise movement.

General Beach, then Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, testified before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that—

I have been told by some of the leading iron and steel men of Pittsburgh that if this canal is opened they will ship unbroken cargoes from Pittsburgh through to Galveston and Corpus Christi.

It is apparent, therefore, that the proposed waterway will prove of inestimable value to not only the sections of Texas and Louisiana immediately adjacent thereto, but also to a very wide belt of surrounding territory, by affording economical, additional, and efficient transportation service for the carriage of farm, timber, and mineral products to new markets and enabling the agricultural and industrial interests of Texas to obtain at lower costs commodities which they are required to purchase elsewhere.

More and more, as the growth and development of the Nation rapidly proceeds, the value of adequate, prompt, and cheap transportation service is being appreciated.

Waterways play a most important and necessary part in the transportation agencies of the Nation. They are destined soon to play an even more important part, especially by reason of the low cost of such transportation service.

It is interesting to note that through the port of Galveston alone commerce poured in an increasing tide from 3,168,995 tons in 1919 to 5,763,805 tons, valued at $835,190,323, in 1923.

The value of the foreign commerce, or exports and imports, as given by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army for the year 1923, was $372,287,850. The value of the coastwise commerce through the port of Galveston for 1923 was $462,680,142.

From figures most recently compiled by the Department of Commerce for the calendar year 1924, it is disclosed that another great increase has occurred in the foreign trade through Galveston and that the value of such commerce for 1924 amounts to $620,997,033, being $3,332,810 in excess of the foreign commerce moving through the port of New Orleans during the same year, thereby giving to Galveston the distinction of being in value of its commerce the second greatest seaport in the United States.

Galveston continues to be the world's greatest seaport of export cotton. Up to February 1, 1925, its foreign exports were approximately 2,100,000 bales of cotton, while its coastwise shipments aggregated approximately 550,000 bales.

The aggregate value of all commerce moving through the port of Galveston during 1924 will probably exceed this year the sum of $1,000,000,000.

Enormous quantities of grain, sulphur, flour, oil, rice, and other commodities have also moved through such port, thereby emphasizing the tremendous value of the port to not only Texas and the Southwest but to the whole Nation.

As a conspicuous example of how practically indispensable the services of such port has become to not only producers and shippers of cotton, who increasingly avail themselves of its service and facilities, but to the great grain-growing interests of the South and Central West, it is only necessary to point to the tremendous movement of wheat recently, which for several months past has sought from such wheat-growing areas an outlet to foreign markets through the port of Galveston.

The southwestern grain belt, especially in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas, are appreciating more and more the cheaper, shorter, and more efficient service through this port, and are utilizing its facilities to a constantly increasing degree. This year between thirty and forty million bushels will be exported through Galveston.

The year previous the grain growers of the South and West had keenly felt the loss of foreign markets for their surplus grain. Practically 150,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat raised for export had been thrown back upon their hands and had demoralized the home market and brought wheat down to a point below the actual cost of production.

When, therefore, this season a renewed foreign demand for American wheat developed, it was of the utmost importance to the grain grower that he should have facilities at hand for transportation of his wheat to such markets as long as the demand continued.

The movement of such export grain was largely routed through the port of Galveston, and the prompt and expeditious handling there, with the allocation of sufficient American ships to meet the emergency presented by the tremendous volume of grain shipped, enabled the grain growers to not only expeditiously deliver such export grain in the various European markets to which it was destined, but more important yet, resulted in stimulating the price of wheat and thereby enabled the American grain producer to obtain better prices and to retain the foreign markets which, up to last year, he had been accustomed to enjoy, especially since 1915.

The increasing value and service of the port of Texas City is also most conspicuous. The great volume of oil, sulphur, sugar, and other commodities moving through that port has demonstrated how important it has become and how bright a future it has before it. The sugar imports have been unusually heavy by reason particularly of the greater amount of sugar utilized by the new refinery located there. The statistics of the Chief of Engineers reflect that nearly 3,000,000 tons of commerce passed through Texas City in 1923.

The surveys authorized in the pending bill for Galveston and Texas City channels ought to be adopted and promptly and thoroughly made with a view to providing such additional improvements in such channels as may be needed.

The construction of the intracoastal canal will not only bring to the coastal section of Texas and territory contiguous thereto new and cheap transportation service, but should also materially increase the volume of commerce moving through the ports of Galveston and Texas City, for it will mean the handling through such ports of tonnage destined for and shipped from places and parts of the country not now reached through such ports by waterway service.

Some idea of the extent of this increased volume may be gained from the figures previously stated with reference to the estimated tonnage which will utilize the intracoastal canal.

The influence of the proposed waterway in bringing about lower and more favorable adjustment of other transportation rates will no doubt be very considerable and thereby stimulate a further increased movement of commerce generally through such ports.

Further opportunity will be afforded for developing such localities as important points of distribution, and such opportunity will likewise be a most valuable one.

The intracoastal canal, utilizing as far as possible natural and developed streams and canals along the route of the new waterway, promises relief from most, if not all, of the transportation problems confronting so much of the coastal section of southeast Texas and assures to a large part of Texas, as well as to Louisiana, a development of prosperity and progress which the resources of that section should command, but which in a large measure has been retarded by the need for more adequate transportation facilities.

The proposed project, when completed, will prove one of the greatest assets of the sections and of the States through which it passes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAWES].

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the bill and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Chairman, over 20 years ago I became interested in the practical utilization of our rivers, wrote the organization, and was for many years chairman of the speakers' committee of the renewed plan, which resulted in bringing a President, Senators, Congressmen, governors, and mayors on long river trips of investigation that they might personally view the possibility of transportation addition and betterment.

This was but one of the many renewals of an endeavor to render useful this great national system of waterways. Its feasibility immediately grips the imagination and its tremendous loss of power and opportunity holds the thought for construction.

The whole valley has spent liberally of private money for exploitation and organized civic effort.

It has been a favorate theme of governors, of progressive mayors of cities, and champions in both branches of Congress have fought for an enlightened national liberality and a comprehensive continuous plan.

These years of personal effort have been added to by participation in highway development, with the hope that ultimately one general plan would result in the connection and coordination of the highway, the railway, and the waterway.

AN EMPIRE

The Mississippi Valley is an empire of wealth in itself, self-sustaining in its raw and manufactured products, raising on its fields more than two-thirds of the agricultural products of the Nation, manufacturing in its plants one-half of the aggregate products of the whole of America, feeding, clothing, and enriching more than 60,000,000 men, women, and children—the richest, most prosperous, most productive area in the known world.

Missouri, my own State, is its geographical center, equidistant from the valley's northernmost boundary and the gulf and lying midway between the Appalachians on the east and the western watershed of the Father of Waters on the west.

Twenty-two States, with a population in excess of one-half that of the entire Nation, lie wholly or in part within this vast area. The valley comprises Kansas on the west; Montana,

Wisconsin and Minnesota, and the Dakotas on the north; Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama on the south; and portions of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Ohio on the east.

At least four mountain areas are embraced within this boundary. There are forests and plains, thinly populated but teemingly productive flatlands, and then again great congested commercial centers.

Pittsburgh on the east links up with Wheeling; Cincinnati, Frankfort, Louisville, and Paducah lead us southward toward Nashville, Birmingham, Montgomery, Memphis, Vicksburg, New Orleans, and Mobile. Chicago and St. Louis, St. Paul, Minneapolis, Davenport, Dubuque, Kansas City, Omaha, Tulsa, Little Rock, Dallas, and Houston—and far to the north, Bismarck—all these great centers play important parts in working out the destinies of the valley.

While more than half of the entire population of the Nation may be found in this great valley, nearly 70 per cent of the rural population is confined to this area. Incidentally, the area of the valley is all but 35 per cent of the entire area of the United States.

On the valley's fields all but 15 per cent of the entire corn output of the Nation is grown. Two-thirds of the exportable products of America. Eighty per cent of the Nation's wheat field is found. Practically all of our rye, barley, flaxseed, sugar cane, and oats are raised. On its 295,000,000 acres the potential productive wealth is incalculable. Its stock is about three-fourths of the total of the Nation.

Producing more than one-half of the manufactured products of the United States, this great area turns out the agricultural implements of the world, 90 per cent of the automobiles, one-half of the brick and terra cotta, one-third of the leather, two-thirds of the wood, one-half of the furniture, one-half of the glass, and practically all of the iron and steel work, to say nothing of the valley's practical monopoly in the output of coal, coke, and iron ore.

The Mississippi Valley is larger than the area of the whole of continental Europe. It is the world's most precious area, God's richest grant to man. Its development in less than 100 years is probably the most remarkable chapter in the history of our national growth.

OUR USELESS RIVERS

The House for more than 50 years has in careless fashion been dealing with the valley's vital problem, without constructive plan, doing a little at a time and watching that little being washed away, because we have built partly and not completely.

A foundation without a roof will disintegrate, a road without maintenance will crumble and become impassable. A waterway is not different; it must be completed or remain useless.

Now, what do we find the situation to be?

Under the bridges that span the greatest natural system of waterways in the world—the waterways of the valley—our great rivers flow idly and uselessly on, disturbed only here and there by a spasmodic attempt of private capital to bring life and being to waterway transportation, and but recently by the Government's barge line experiments.

The Mississippi River and its tributaries drain an area of 1,250,000 square miles, a figure that challenges imagination.

Early in our national history the pioneers saw the utility to which this great watershed could be placed and before the railroad came into existence, as early as 1819, the steamboat's whistle had echoed on the Mississippi and Missouri as far as Council Bluffs.

But to-day these great, wide, natural transportation highways are practically unused. In comparison with their potential possibilities they are unused. From the Appalachians to the Rockies and from Minnesota to the Gulf, transportation by water is negligible when considered in the light of the gross tonnage available for such transportation, if the rivers can be successfully operated.

Nor is this the only desultory fact. Great productive stretches of farm land, and, indeed, cities, have been and still are flooded annually. The Mississippi, waiting to be harnessed, races over its banks with clocklike precision, devastating hundreds of thousands of acres of this rich Mississippi Valley. The Missouri at intervals swells over into Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska, taking its flood toll of millions of dollars, and in some cases life. The incompleted locks and dams and basins of the Ohio are not able to hold the Ohio during its rampages. The Wabash, the Tennessee, the Arkansas, the Illinois, and the Red at times deluge parts of Arkansas, Texas, Tennessee, Alabama, Illinois, and Indiana.

During these floods channels are changed, trees and logs swept into the streams, new deltas formed, sand bars erected, banks eaten from the one side of the river and extended on the other, makeshift docks torn from their moorings and swept downstream to form further obstruction and, in general, the great river beds left in a condition of chaos and unusefulness.

Meanwhile the railroads, unable to keep up with the development of the commerce of the valley, for various reasons are unable to transport the cargoes that pile up on the freight platform. Fortunes are lost in rotted products and dwarfed production. The full productivity of the Mississippi Valley is curtailed.

A large portion, practically all, of the 1,250,000 square miles of territory is merely drained by this great system—drained and flooded, but not served.

In simple language, the greatest natural water system in the world remains idle and useless.

As proof of the above statement it may be well to point out that one of the rivers—the Missouri—of this system has, according to the Missouri River Commission, a navigable length of 2,300 miles.

This length is about three times that of the Rhine in Germany. And yet in a 30-year period of development of transportation in the two countries, 1875 to 1905—Germany and the United States—water transportation in Germany increased five times in aggregate tonnage, while railroad transportation increased four times.

In the United States in the same period water transportation practically disappeared from transportation calculations, while railroad development resulted in the carrying of practically all our tonnage.

THE NATIONAL SITUATION

Before discussing the rivers in detail some statement should be made of the water transportation of the Nation in general and facts cited in connection with our harbors and Great Lakes and ocean outlets. To do this will in some measure indicate the relation of the river to the harbor of either the Gulf, the ocean, or the Lakes. The responsibility for legislation rests with Congress in all these phases of the waterways problem.

In addition to 25,000 miles of navigable streams we have a coast of 21,354 miles, including bays and islands.

The Great Lakes represent a combined length of navigable water of 1,400 miles, a distance as great as from Paris to Constantinople.

There are approximately 20 first-class rivers emptying into the Atlantic from the Appalachians, and these range from between 100 to 600 miles in length.

The Columbia River, on the Pacific side, is 1,400 miles long. The Colorado is 1,100 miles in length. With the St. Lawrence River properly canalized for connection with the Great Lakes, and the Chicago strip connected up with the Mississippi—a project which has been repeatedly proposed and indorsed—transportation could sweep from the North Atlantic through the boundary section of Canada and the United States, through the Lakes, past Chicago, and down the Mississippi to the Gulf, taking care of intermediate points and short hauls.

The figures of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the calendar year 1923 show a total of 38,682,092 tons of imports in the commerce of the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports, valued at $3,327,011,950, and a total of 44,316,413 tons of exports, valued at $3,842,000,000, making a total of 82,900,000 tons of foreign commerce, valued at $7,169,000,000.

The coastwise receipts, the report states, amounted to 86,747,000 tons, valued at $5,000,000,000, while the coastwise shipments amounted to 90,633,000 tons, valued at $4,272,000,000.

The total domestic commerce of the Pacific, Atlantic, and Gulf ports was 361,320,000 tons, valued at $19,217,000,000.

On the Great Lakes the imports totaled 5,705,000 tons, valued at $166,852,000, and exports of 8,954,602 tons, valued at $86,511,000, making a total of 14,650,000 tons handled on the Lakes, at a valuation of $253,000,000.

The domestic receipts on the Lakes amounted to 109,000,000 tons, valued at $1,200,000,000, and shipments of 111,500,000 tons, valued at $1,048,000,000. The total domestic commerce on the Lakes was 221,715,000 tons, valued at $2,261,000,000. After eliminating duplications, the report says, the net tonnage of the Great Lakes was 125,000,000 tons, valued at $1,300,000,000.

The Lakes are confined to the mileage represented by their farthest points, estimated at 1,400 miles.

The Government reports show the rivers with a navigable length of 25,000 miles.

On these 25,000 miles, including all canals and other channels, owned publicly and privately, the total commerce was 52,921,000 tons in 1923, valued at $1,009,831,000.

The railroads, as I pointed out in a previous discussion of transportation, carried 1,387,942,000 tons of freight in 1923

and received a gross operating revenue of $6,289,000,000, or a revenue equal to six times the valuation of the cargoes transported on the rivers of the Nation.

In addition the railroads carried 1,009,000,000 passengers a distance of 38,297,000,000 miles in 1923, and there were no passengers to speak of carried on the rivers.

These figures tell their own story. There is capital invested in water transportation. There is tonnage passing over properly handled waterways. There is practically no traffic on the 25,000 miles of river highways.

HISTORY OF THE WATERWAYS

There is nothing new in the question of waterways. There should be. The public for years has been reading of the problem, has heard it discussed and denounced, indorsed and espoused. So far, however, Congress has been satisfied with annual expenditures, annual wrangles, annual investigations of the waterways, surveys, reports and further surveys. Project after project has been indorsed only to be abandoned later incompleted. The experiment of the waterways has never been proved or disproved, because it has not been a complete experiment, but merely a half-finished experiment, impossible of any probative weight.

As far back as 1802 the Government began its work on the waterways of the country. A report of the Secretary of War made in 1915 shows that the first congressional appropriation was on April 6, 1802, when $30,000 was set aside for the "rivers."

This was a small amount, and the purpose for which it was set aside was general. No comprehensive scheme attended its consideration.

In 1806 another appropriation was made of $25,000 for canals, and this ushered into the story of transportation in America the era of the canal. In 1807 a man by the name of Jesse Hawley had written articles in the Ontario Messenger about a canal between Buffalo and Utica. He suggested that the National Government should foot the bill. But the National Government was not of a mind to do so, and the matter was taken up in the New York Legislature.

It was not, however, until 1817 that the Erie Canal was started, financed upon the credit of the State of New York. It was opened in 1825. The Government appropriations meanwhile for rivers and harbors were for reconstruction work and assistance on a piecemeal scale.

In 1828, actuated by the success of the Erie, the Government had taken a new attitude, and in that year $1,000,000 was appropriated for canals.

This was the largest appropriation until 1837, when $1,666,000 was appropriated, and out of this sum the rivers received $754,000, the largest appropriation up to that time.

The harbors, however, were being cared for in annual appropriations, as high as $1,000,000 being spent on them in one year.

In 1852 the rivers received a second substantial appropriation, this being for $1,074,000, while in 1866 the canals came in for a period of assistance, in which almost annual allotments were made. In 1873 the Government finally got the river appropriation of that year up to the $2,000,000 mark, and in 1882 the amount for the first time reached above the $10,000,000 mark, when $12,000,000 was appropriated for the rivers.

With varying success the advocates of the river improvement plan received occasional appropriations, but not with any apparent attempt on the part of Congress to conceive the river problem as a whole and act upon it accordingly.

A NEW ERA FOR THE RIVERS

Real river improvement actually began in 1870. Previous to that time the work was without system and the money practically wasted. In 1878 the appropriations became somewhat noticeable.

Attention had been given later to the Missouri, and what was known as the Missouri River Commission was created. By 1902 it was discovered that seven or eight million dollars would have to be spent on that river alone, and after considerable discussion the Missouri commission was abolished.

It was not until 1907 that any governmental activity of a constructive character could really be said to have been attempted.

Mr. Roosevelt, in connection with the Panama Canal plans, ordered a survey of the Missouri River situation, and what was known as the Inland Waterways Commission was created. The report of this board was the first comprehensive survey of any river problem from an engineering and business standpoint ever made.

So that actually river development, so far as Congress is concerned, dates seriously to about 1878, and in a comprehensive way only as far back as 1907.

Previous to the action of the President in calling for a comprehensive survey, organizations had been formed for the purpose of spreading propaganda in favor of deep waterways.

Personally, I had the honor of drawing the outline of the Lakes-to-the-Gulf organization, which initiated the "14 feet through the valley" idea, and to the activities of which organization, together with similarly formed bodies in other sections of the country, may be largely attributed the first comprehensive study of the waterways as vital factors in the transportation problem.

The greatest activity of public-spirited citizens and Government authorities was manifested first between the years 1900 and 1907. As a result of the work of these men and the creation of the Inland Waterways Commission, the first real plans for waterway improvement were laid.

The report of the Inland Commission recommended that $20,000,000 be spent on the Missouri from Kansas City to its juncture with the Mississippi above St. Louis.

What happened is quite fresh in the minds of many. A battle ensued in Congress. It was a bitter fight, and not until 1910 was there an appropriation of $1,000,000 for this purpose. It was during this fight that the "pork-barrel" charges took on serious aspect and threatened to end the waterways program.

Even the appropriation of 1910 of $1,000,000 had a rider attached to it providing for a "reexamination" of the Missouri situation, and it was not until 1912 that the appropriation was finally made available.

As a sample of governmental processes, it may be said that three years afterwards, after $6,250,000 had been spent, Congress ordered another "reexamination."

THE SITUATION SINCE 1915

There is hardly anyone conversant with public affairs who will not recall the "black eye" which the waterways temporarily received in the report of Lieut. Col. Herbert Deakyne in 1915. He was in actual charge of an investigation of the Missouri and made the report to his superior officers in the War Department. One of these sustained the report, which gave it added weight. Another, however, finally disapproved it, and the program of the river again took on new life.

Colonel Deakyne, for one thing, set forth that the traffic on the Missouri River amounted to 309,684 tons. Of this, he said, all but 37,500 tons consisted of logs, sand, and gravel dug up from the river itself and handled by the dredges. He threw suspicion in other ways on the river program.

All the river associations of the Nation denounced the report and many of the leading newspapers of the Central and West Central States answered the report in vehement editorial denunciation.

At this time there was but one large boat company operating on the Missouri, the Kansas City Navigation Co., organized in 1912 through popular subscription of $1,000,000, which company in 1915 had 2 towboats and 13 steel barges. Whether the company was successful has been argued pro and con, but in 1917, when the Government took over the transportation of the Nation, the company sold out to the administration, and its boats became Federal property.

During the later years of river improvement some work has been done by the States but largely the present situation is the result of Federal activity. And while the waterways system is direly in need of attention, some great advances have been made.

The Ohio River lock and dam system (of course, wholly inadequate to take care of the present traffic and out of the question with respect to potential traffic) represents at least a comprehensive idea, however niggardly it may have been treated financially.

The Mississippi has been deepened, but insufficiently. The Missouri has been treated to both bed and bank attention, but inadequately. The Ohio has been given the benefit of locks and dams, but inadequately. All of the various projects upon which money has been spent are only completed to an extent less, in many cases, than 50 per cent.

No completed experiment in waterways transportation has actualy been made. No project has been carried out on a businesslike basis. No project has been finished.

There are the Flushing Bay and Creek project, the Delaware River, Wilmington Harbor, Salem River, Cambridge Harbor, Onancock River, Norfolk Harbor, the waterway from Charleston to Wintah Bay, Miami Harbor, Houston Ship Channel, the Mississippi River from the mouth to the Ohio River, the Mississippi from St. Louis to Minneapolis, the Missouri from Kansas City to the mouth, the Ohio lock and dam reconstruction, several harbors on the Great Lakes, San Diego Harbor,

the Columbia River in Washington, and other projects, all needing assistance, all incomplete, and all suffering from piecemeal appropriation and lack of maintenance.

These projects do not take into consideration certain of the Great Lakes projects and other plans for the Eastern section of the country, nor do they contemplate the St. Lawrence improvement. They are simply those projects having to do with rivers and harbors to which attention has already been given and on which moneys have been spent. If these projects are not taken care of, the money of the past will be lost.

AN UNTRIED EXPERIMENT

Up to 1924 the amount appropriated by the United States in the matter of rivers, harbors, and canals reached the grand total of $1,255,392,000.

For rivers alone up to 1915 when the first summary of past expenditures was made, there had been spent $475,000,000. On canals $43,000,000, and on harbors $270,000,000.

These amounts have been increased to total the $1,255,000,000 figure as the grand total, but it will be seen that under the annual appropriations made since 1915 the rivers have, comparatively, received only about one-third of the amount nominally appropriated for "rivers and harbors."

And whatever the amount might be, had the rivers received it all the fact remains that the projects are uncompleted.

For instance, the original project approved by Congress for the Mississippi River from the Ohio to St. Louis, Mo., called for an expenditure of about $21,000,000.

Instead of spending $21,000,000 during the 12-year period provided for in the bill passed in 1910, only $1,900,000 was expended throughout this period.

At this rate of expenditure it would take 132 years to complete this project.

Only 132 years to wait!

The Missouri project between St. Louis and Kansas City was to have cost when approved in 1913, $20,000,000. The maintenance cost was estimated and is about $500,000. The annual appropriation since 1913 has averaged $890,000.

At that rate it will take 50 years to finish the job.

These two situations or circumstances indicate the unbusinesslike methods of Congress in dealing with the river problem indicate also the truth of the statement that the waterways experiment has not been tried and prove conclusively that no decision can as yet be rendered as to whether the waterways can be made profitable or not.

To remedy this situation of continued maintenance charges and extended building periods on a limited annual appropriation there is now before Congress a plan to take care of the river situation through a Federal bond issue on the same theory as that by which the States have begun to construct their highways.

IN CONCLUSION

After all is said and done the ultimate and only reasonable excuse for the development of a waterways system is the benefit to the citizen—the farmer, the manufacturer, and the consumer. Exports resulting from the coordination of river and ocean or lake harbor merely contribute to the enrichment of the individual through national progress.

That benefit can be brought about, if at all, in two ways by means of the waterways:

(1) By increasing or tending to increase production through the facilitating of traffic movements;

(2) By reduced rates.

The first of these is a matter which seems readily discernible. If the farmer in Missouri can get his product, whether it be corn, rye, oats, hay, wheat, wood, or ore, on the boat and be assured of its ready conduct to market, the stimulus to his business is not a questionable matter. If the manufacturer of bulky, slow-freight products is assured of the same river service, the result is the same.

It is the question of rates upon which the river movement strikes a snag. Opponents will argue that water transportation in the long run is more expensive or nonproductive to private capital. We are told that the general reduction of rates is not possible through water competition. Advocates of river highways will argue that the river will ultimately be the means of "chastising" the railroads.

Either side is engaging in a dispute the facts of which are not obtainable. And for the very excellent reason that, strictly speaking, we have had no experience in the United States of actual competition or cooperation between rail and water because we have had no extensive river transportation since the development of the railroads.

And again, if the river advocate attempts to show that the river when properly developed will cut rates to the ultimate ruin of the railroads he is engaging in a propaganda which, if possible of realization, would result in a national calamity.

The industrial or agricultural community could no more operate without a successful railway system than it could subsist without the river. Whatever the result of the river development may be, rail and water transportation must be worked out harmoniously through orderly cooperation as to rates and upon the broad theory of service to the public and encouragement of private capital.

There is waterway transportation to-day of certain heavy bulk commodities over the Ohio and the Mississippi. But it can not be said to be either competitive or cooperative with the railroads. There are periods of the year when floods interfere, and others when low water militates against successful operation. Wharfing and terminal facilities are limited and inadequate. No system of interchange of traffic between the roads and the waterway has been worked out upon a comprehensive scale. The river fronts of the large communities are largely controlled by the railroads, channels are uncertain, and river beds at times hazardous.

It has also been said that private capital will not invest in waterway carriers. We do not know whether it will or not. It did in the railways in an even more hazardous experiment in the pioneer days. We are in the pioneer days of our waterways. Granting that the Government owns the river ways and offers them to private capital, it must offer them ready for use.

And they are not ready for use to-day.

With questionable depths, dangerous channels, changing beds, unharnessed flood waters, easily ravaged banks, no terminal frontages at industrial points, limited wharfing facilities, and no accepted theory of rate cooperation, it seems patent that to say the Government is offering the rivers to private enterprise for use is to indulge in a euphemism that has little fact in it.

We have made only partial experiment with our rivers. We will not have experimented with them until we have prepared them for use.

When the Missouri farmer finds that he can ship his product by water, or by rail and water, and have it shipped properly to a market that is accessible to the river or the river and rail, when he can do this and then finds that he has not been benefited, he can then say that waterways transportation is a failure.

But not until then.

The farmer and the manufacturer is entitled to that opportunity. After spending more than a billion dollars to start the experiment Congress should now take comprehensive steps to make the experiment real.

We can not say the experiment failed, because it has not been completed.

Our first duty is its completion. We have gone too far to stop now. We have not reached the point of demonstration. We can not pass upon the matter either as a triumph or failure.

The possibilities are too great, the present national investment is too large, to falter; we must go through.

The man who is responsible for public waste is the man who helps block the connected, continuous plan of completion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield now to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the bill and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, the vice of the pending bill lies in its failure to provide for an authorization of a survey of the channel of the Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers, between Portland and the sea. The channels of these rivers should be deepened and widened. Under congressional act of July 25, 1912, House document 1278 of the Sixty-first Congress, third session, a project of 30 feet deep and 300 feet wide was designated. This and more have been accomplished through dredging and diking.

Meteoric increase in tonnage make imperative further improvements, but I find that amendments are impossible, due to the honor-bound agreement under which this bill is being considered. I give notice, however, that every effort will be made to amend it in the Senate.

To the end that your long-neglected education may be repaired somewhat, I now seize this opportunity to inform you of the facts that would justify the authorization and later the appropriation.

The Columbia River, or Oregon as it is sometimes called, is the largest river on the western side of America. It is the

second largest river in the United States. Its source is Columbia Lake in British Columbia. Its estimated length is 1,400 miles. The Columbia and its branches have over 2,100 miles of navigable waters. The area drained by it and its tributaries has been computed to be approximately 300,000 square miles.

The State of Washington is to the north, and Oregon is to the south of the Columbia. Portland is the chief metropolis of this entire area. From Portland to the sea it is approximately 113 miles.

Portland, in so far as population is concerned, is the twenty-fourth city in the United States, but it ranks seventh among the ports of the United States in outbound foreign overseas traffic.

Portland is not only the largest lumber manufacturing port in the United States; it is the largest in the world. It ships more lumber than any other port anywhere in the world.

The exports during 1924 amounted to 386,000,000 feet, valued at $9,815,000. In 1923 we shipped 323,600,000 feet, an increase of 20 per cent over the value shipped the year before. The tonnage of all the commerce has increased 12½ per cent in volume over last year.

Portland is the leading wheat shipping port for American wheat in the United States, and its record is two and one-half times as great as that of its nearest competitor, not even excepting Galveston, New York, Chicago, or any other place.

The exports during 1924 amounted to 21,200,000 bushels, valued at $26,000,000. Bear this in mind, I am giving you the figures for 1924, and they show an increase over 1923, as I have said, of 12½ per cent in volume and 20 per cent in value. Over a period of probably 10 years it has increased from 10 to 25 per cent annually.

The domestic shipments by steamer to American cities amounted to 2,500,000 bushels of wheat, valued at $3,800,000.

Portland is not only the leading lumber and wheat exporting center in this country. It is the leading flour exporting port on the Pacific coast. It surpasses Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, or any other place on the coast. That is due to the fact that the inland empire of 300,000 square miles on the banks of the Columbia River has a down haul of 5 per cent. The wheat comes right down the river to our big elevators at Portland and from there to all ports throughout the world.

The exports during 1924 amounted to 1,400,000 barrels of flour, valued at $7,158,312. The domestic shipments by steamer to American cities amounted to 887,000 barrels, valued at $6,295,000.

The shipments from the Columbia River during the year ended July 1, 1924, amounted to 3,672,832 barrels.

Portland is the leading apple shipping port on the Pacific coast, and it is second in the United States. The exports during 1924 amounted to 844,068 boxes, valued at $1,706,171. The total cargo handled by ocean-going vessels to and from Portland during 1924 amounted to 4,500,000 tons, valued at $275,000,000.

In 1923 it amounted to 3,950,000 tons, valued at $230,000,000.

The total water-borne commerce, according to the records of the United States Army engineers, which include river traffic, will show 8,250,000 tons.

Not only does the maritime commerce show an increase of 12½ per cent in volume but 20 per cent in value over the preceding year, and larger boats are coming every year.

Portland has 54 steamship lines, giving regular service to the principal ports of the world. Ten railway lines serve Portland, five of which are transcontinental systems.

Portland is a large prune and canned goods shipping port. The exports of prunes during 1924 amounted to 9,800 tons, valued at $1,523,000. The domestic shipments to other American cities amounted to 16,000 tons, valued at over $2,000,000.

The exports of canned goods for the same year amounted to 6,500 tons, valued at $1,500,000.

The domestic shipments were 25,698 tons valued at $7,147,000.

The total number of vessels cleared from Portland during 1924 was 1,491.

Mr. SHREVE. How large is Portland now?

Mr. WATKINS. Portland by the last census had 260,000, but a reliable estimate shows that it has 342,000 people.

Portland is not only the seventh city of all the ports of the United States in outbound foreign overseas traffic, it is the first of all the Pacific ports in outgoing foreign commerce.

Customs collections of the Portland district for the calendar year 1924, based on actual receipts for 11 months and an estimate of December collections, reached the very respectable total of $1,285,107.27. This was $66,153.73 below the collections for 1923, which was a banner year. However, the fiscal year 1924 showed a slight increase over the fiscal year 1923, collections for the two periods being $1,248,951 and $1,188,389, respectively. Collections by months for the calendar year 1924 follow:

January	$93, 148. 32
February	78, 356. 52
March	148, 974. 69
April	113, 283. 01
May	143, 170. 50
June	119, 535. 01
July	109, 237. 30
August	96, 554. 98
September	117, 838. 21
October	78, 552. 68
November	79, 363. 78
December (estimated)	107, 092. 27

The normal growth of import business was interrupted by the war, but since 1918 imports have been making rapid forward strides. A review of collections for the period 1919–1924 is interesting, as it gives a fair conception of the increase of dutiable foreign tonnage arriving at the local port. The figures follow:

Year	Collections	Increase over preceding year	Increase over 1918
		Per cent	*Per cent*
1919	$175, 070	44	44
1920	408, 580	133	235
1921	580, 131	42	376
1922	755, 826	30	520
1923	1, 351, 261	79	1, 009
1924	1, 285, 107	[1] 5	954

[1] Decrease.

The value of all imports for the calendar year 1924 was $10,335,157, an increase of $195,021 over the preceding year. This is a comparatively small increase, but 1923 made an exceptionally large advance over the preceding year, the year's total being $10,140,136 and the increase $2,327,190, or 30 per cent. Exports for the year just closed totaled $63,998,230, an increase of $11,488,509, or 22 per cent over the 1923 total of $52,509,721.

Extensive sheep raising in northwestern group of States has led to concentration of wool clip at Portland for storage, manufacture, and annual auction. Portland ranks second only to Boston as Nation's wool market. Eight woolen mills are established in vicinity. Portland is largest wool manufacturing city west of the Mississippi.

Tributary to this wonderful city is an empire unequaled and unsurpassed by any land anywhere.

Because of strategic position at foot of only down grade from the rich productive plateaus of the Rocky Mountains, which extends from Canada to the Mexican border, Portland is natural outlet for a vast hinterland.

It is estimated 100,000,000 bushels of grain are annually raised within immediate tributary territory and which, with other products of 10,000,000 acres of land under crop, naturally seek market through the port of Portland.

The Pacific Northwest, of which Portland's hinterland is a major portion, leads in supply of raw materials on which industry is based. It is estimated that approximately one-fifth of remaining standing timber in United States is located in Oregon alone.

Minerals abound throughout tributary territory, with one of world's largest phosphate rock deposits in southern Idaho, so located that marketing is naturally through the port of Portland. Rich deposits of coal in Wyoming and Utah fields likewise find a route of least resistance via port of Portland.

The port of Portland is the only Pacific coast port where transcontinental rail lines from Rocky Mountain plateaus connect with ocean carriers without having to climb over the snow-covered peaks of Cascade and Sierra Ranges.

Population of countries bordering on Pacific Ocean is estimated at 910,000,000 people. This great consuming market becomes more attractive each year, developing water-borne traffic in the resources of the Pacific Northwest with its neighbors of the Far East.

The following facts submitted to me by the port of Portland are not only reliable but interesting:

The mean depth of entrance channel from Pacific Ocean through mouth of Columbia River leading to port of Portland is 43 feet for width of 4,000 feet, and for width of 1½ miles, mean depth of 40 feet obtains. (From survey United States Army Engineers' Department, June, 1921.)

Rock jetties, extending miles into ocean, protect harbor entrance, with open-water space between of about 2 miles. (Constructed by United States Government at cost of $16,000,000.)

Channel entrance is well supplied with all necessary aids to navigation, including lightship, buoys, pilotage service, and other facilities for uninterrupted navigation day or night. (Listed in United States Government publications, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey charts, etc.)

Mean rise of tide at channel entrance, 7.5 feet, extending in diminishing amount up river to port of Portland Harbor.

The Pacific Northwest, one of the last sections of the United States to be developed, is fast fulfilling the prophetic words of ex-President Roosevelt:

"The Mediterranean era died with the discovery of America; the Atlantic era has reached the height of its development; the Pacific era, destined to be the greatest, is just at the dawn."

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want, first, to clear an impression upon the mind of my distinguished friend from Oklahoma, Mr. McKEOWN. He seems to think that there is a bug under the chip for the reason that the amounts of these different projects are not mentioned in the bill. This bill is prepared in exactly the same manner and in the same terms as other river and harbor bills that have been presented in recent years. There was a time when the River and Harbor Committee had the authority to appropriate money, and at that time, of course, the amounts were specified in the bills, because it was necessary to make specific appropriations for specific purposes, but for six or seven years that has not been the case, and now the money when it is appropriated is in a lump sum, handled by the Appropriations Committee, and the river and harbor bills never mention the specific amounts that are authorized on the particular projects. However, all have the assurance that the total amounts to only $39,151,000 for all these projects.

I want now to explain to the committee something about what I conceive to be the most important industry that is now, ever has been, or probably ever can be presented to the American people, an industry that is vitally interested in waterway transportation, an industry that enters into almost every other industry known to the American people—the sulphur industry.

I should like to tell something about the importance of it, but my time will not permit. There is hardly an industry in the United States that does not depend upon sulphur or sulphuric acid in some proportion or compound or in some form. It does not appear in the finished product, but is the means to an end. Without it you could not make cloth or textiles of any kind, you could not make paper, you could not vulcanize rubber, you could not galvanize iron, you could not pickle steel, you could not make explosives necessary for national defense; you could not perform any of those things without the use of sulphur and sulphuric acid; you could not have any artificial fertilizer, and more than half the world output of to-day is consumed in fertilizer. I shall insert in the RECORD, with the permission of the committee, some brief extracts from public documents and from some of the leading scientific works, and I hope gentlemen will find time to read them. I take time now to read one of those taken from Bulletin 102, issued by the Smithsonian Institution in 1917, by Joseph E. Pogue, director of mineral technology. He says:

Sulphur is a chemical element of major importance to man. In addition to its utilization in practically every form of industry, it enters into the make-up of both vegetable and animal tissue and is consequently essential to life itself.

Without sulphur the manufacture of commercial rubber would cease and in turn the countless activities dependent upon the use of rubber. Without it a great number of chemical industries would be crippled, involving the loss of hundreds of products catering to the needs of the individual, as well as to the machinery of state, such as paper, gunpowder, medicinal preparations, bleaches, dyes, insecticides, and matches. And with no sulphuric acid the manufacture of commercial fertilizers and of many explosives, not to mention an interminable list of other important products, would be impossible. The provision of an adequate source of sulphur properly administered thus assumes the significance of a national responsibility in which the individual has the concern of direct personal welfare as well as that dictated by his share in the obligations of state. To contribute to an understanding of how adequately this responsibility for the United States is fulfilled is the actuating motive for this paper.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ALMON. I presume the gentleman will either now or later insert in the RECORD the location of the sulphur mines of the country and show how these are affected by river and harbor improvement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall give all that information if I am permitted, and I shall show how vitally that industry depends upon waterway transportation.

Mr. KINDRED. Are not these remarks which apply to sulphur also true as to the great steel industry and other bulky freights?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true, but without sulphur you would have no steel industry of any consequence; it would be impossible.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The Intercoastal Canal runs right into these great sulphur deposits?

Mr. MANSFIELD. When extended to Corpus Christi it will run within 2 miles of 82 per cent of the sulphur output of the entire world. I will give the figures from the Bureau of Mines and from the United States Geological Survey. I will show you also that when we were forced to get sulphur from Sicily and Japan we paid $20, $25, and $30 a ton for it. To-day it is $14 a ton, and America is producing the major portion of it, more than 80 per cent, far more than that, and the district within 2 miles of this proposed canal is producing 99.9 per cent of the sulphur output of the United States. [Applause.]

I have here a letter from the Director of the United States Geological Survey, with statement showing the world production of sulphur for the years 1922 and 1923, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, January 10, 1925.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In further reply to your letter of January 7, I am taking pleasure in inclosing the world table on sulphur, which I promised in my letter of a day or so ago. You will note that the figures are for sulphur ore, refined sulphur, etc., and are therefore not comparable. The countries reporting sulphur production do not give the figures except as reported in this table. United States, Italy, and Japan, in the order mentioned, make by far the largest sulphur production.

Very cordially yours, GEO. OTIS SMITH, *Director.*

Production of sulphur in the principal producing countries in 1922 and 1923, in metric tons

Country and product	1922, quantity	1923, quantity
Algeria: Native sulphur	(1)	70
Argentina: Sulphur ore [2]	3	(3)
Chile: Sulphur rock	12,250	11,380
France: Sulphur rock	65	(3)
Greece: Sulphur rock	(1)	2,253
Italy:		
Crude sulphur, fused	167,339	256,342
Crude sulphur, ground	22,706	9,466
Japan proper:		
Sulphur rock	42,089	36,323
Refined sulphur [4]	34,642	37,416
Taiwan: Sulphur rock	3,281	(3)
Spain: Sulphur rock	72,806	65,371
United States: Crude sulphur	1,860,329	2,068,776
Yugoslavia: Crude sulphur	122	(3)

[1] No production reported.
[2] Railroad shipments.
[3] Data not available.
[4] Additional to the sulphur rock mined.

From this it will be seen that the domestic production in 1923 was 2,068,776 tons, while the foreign production was only 303,224 tons, not including sulphur rock amounting to 116,327 tons. This sulphur rock, the director informs us, is not comparable with sulphur.

On page 2, Mineral Resources of the United States, 1923, part 2, issued by the Geological Survey, appears the following language:

As usual, the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., and the Freeport Sulphur Co., of Texas, and the Union Sulphur Co., of Louisiana, produced over 99.9 per cent of the output of sulphur in the United State.

On page 5 of this bulletin is a partial list of commodities, in the production of which sulphuric acid is an essential. It is as follows:

Alcohol, alum, aniline, artificial fertilizers, artificial silk, beltings, binders, bleaching agent, celluloid, cements, chemicals, dyes, ebonite, elastics, explosives, fabrics, fire extinguisher, fireworks, food preserv-

atives, fumigant, fungicide, glass, glue, glycerin, illuminant, inorganic or organic acids, insecticides, laboratory reagent, leather, liquid fuel, livestock food, lubricants, matches, medicine, metallurgy, motor fuels, moving picture films, paints, paper, paper bleaching, photography, plastics, poison, refrigerating reagent, rodent exterminator, rubber hose, tires, and other rubber goods, shoe polish, soap, soda, solvent, steel pickling and galvanizinz, storage batteries, sugar, tanning, textiles, and water purification.

The annual report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1915, speaking of the sulphur development in Louisiana and Texas, on page 195 says:

Sulphuric acid is a commodity so extensively used in the manufacture of other chemicals that it has come to be regarded as a criterion or gauge of the activity of the country in chemical manufactures in general. It is probably used for a greater variety of purposes than any other chemical, one of the more important being the manufacture of superphosphate, used in artificial fertilizers, from phosphate rock.

On page 4, Bulletin 184, Bureau of Mines, for the year 1920, appears the following language:

Sulphuric acid is one of the most important of all chemicals, not only because of the large quantities manufactured, but also because of the wide use of the acid in many different industrial works. Sulphuric acid is to the chemical industry what iron is to metallurgy. The general public, however, does not realize this fact, for sulphuric acid does not appear in the finished product as does iron or steel, but is only an intermediate raw material, or is only a means to an end. It is essential in many industries, such for example, as in the manufacture of phosphate fertilizers, explosives, dyes, petroleum products, of various acids other than sulphuric, of ammonium sulphate, aluminum sulphate, and innumerable other chemical and metallurgical products. In recent years in the United States, especially in the East, the demand for sulphuric acid for chemical and metallurgical industries has been an accurate and sensitive barometer of the general business conditions. This demand for acid responds much more quickly to a general slump or boom in the industrial world than does the demand for iron and steel.

On pages 6 and 7 of the same bulletin, the following:

The growth of the acid industry during the year prior to 1914 was due very largely to the growth of the fertilizer business in the South, and to the increased amount of oil refining in the East and North. Ingalls estimated that of the approximately 1,600,000 tons of acid (50° B. basis) made in 1900, 800,000 tons, or nearly 50 per cent, was used in fertilizers, and 320,000 tons, or 20 per cent, was used in oil refining, the remainder, 480,000 tons, being used for pickling steel and for manufacturing other acids and chemical products. The consumption of nearly 500,000 tons for steel pickling and chemical manufacture indicates the rapid growth of these industries in the last decade of the nineteenth century.

On pages 18 and 19 the following:

Prior to the war the consumption of acid for phosphate fertilizer was about 2,300,000 tons (basis, 50° B.). Up to June, 1919, the consumption of acid for phosphate fertilizers has been more than 2,500,000 tons, or more than 50 per cent of the total production, and the consumption is without doubt going to increase year by year. Not only is the use of phosphate fertilizer still increasing in the South, but it is beginning to be an important factor west of the Mississippi River.

On page 416, Mineral Resources of the United States, 1916, part 2, from the Geological Survey, is the following language:

Sulphur is used for many different purposes, but the greatest consumption is in the manufacture of paper and in the preparation of chemicals. According to information from paper manufacturers about one-eighth of a ton of sulphur is used for each ton of sulphite pulp manufactured. According to census returns, the production of sulphite pulp in the United States in 1914 consumed 136,456 short tons of sulphur.

On page 58 of a similar volume for the year 1918, is the following:

The most important of the classes of manufacture, so far as the consumption of the sulphuric acid is involved, are (1) the manufacture of fertilizer; (2) the refining of petroleum products; (3) the iron, steel, and coke industries; (4) the manufacture of nitrocellulose, nitroglycerin, celluloid, etc.; and (5) general metallurgic and chemical practice. According to Utley Wedge, of Ardmore, Pa., the amount of 50° Baumé sulphuric acid consumed in the United States for various purposes during normal years is as follows:

	Tons
Fertilizers	2,400,000
Petroleum	300,000
Iron, steel, and coke industries	200,000
Explosives (pre-war conditions)	150,000
All other industries	200,000
Total	3,250,000

It will be observed that the item of 150,000 tons for explosives, mentioned above, refers to pre-war conditions. The total consumption of sulphuric acid for explosives, both military and domestic, for the year 1918 was 2,700,000 tons. Consequently about 2,550,000 tons were made use of that year for military purposes, and without these great sulphur deposits as a military asset we would have been considerably handicapped in the prosecution of the war. The Government operated these mines during the war, and before going overseas General Pershing placed a company of soldiers there to protect them from violence, and this guard was maintained until the armistice.

From Bulletin, United States Geological Survey, 1919:

Among the most promising fields for the increased use of sulphur is its application as a direct fertilizer. Tests conducted by agricultural experiment stations and independent observers point unequivocally to the conclusion that the use of sulphur on many soils is decidedly advantageous and that, in fact, it is now even questioned whether certain fertilizer substances are not really effective mainly because of the sulphur they contain.

These statements in regard to sulphur and sulphuric acid are not my own. They are the statements of the highest official authorities of our Government who have those questions to deal with. I will now supplement those statements with a few from an unofficial source taken from the leading scientific and technical journals.

In the periodical entitled "Raw Material," for the month of September, 1921, Doctor Davis, B. A., assistant fellow (sulphur fellowship) Mellon Institute of Industrial Research of the University of Pittsburgh, says:

Sulphur, the metallurgist's bugaboo when it forms more than a trace in his analysis, is nevertheless as essential in the production of steel and other metals as in nearly every other basic industry. Without sulphuric acid it would be impossible to pickle steel and galvanize it. It is gratifying to note that the dominant position in the production of this vital element has been wrested from Italy by the United States.

The growth of the sulphur industry has been concurrent with that of modern civilization, for in practically every industry sulphur, or one of its compounds, is used. To-day American sulphur has the dominant position in the world's market, although this position has been acquired wholly in the present century. Until 1903 American sulphur production was a question of a few tons per year, and practically all the sulphur used in the world came from Italy, or more particularly from Sicily.

The Manufacturers' Record of July 10, 1924, contains the following:

Sulphur enters at some stage of manufacturing into the making of a surprisingly large proportion of everything we use, and a complete list of its various uses would be almost impossible to compile. The industries in the order of their importance in the consumption of sulphur are as follows:

1. Acid phosphate (sulphuric acid used).
2. Paper and pulp.
3. Chemicals (other than sulphuric acid).
4. Sulphuric acid (other than for industries enumerated in this list).
5. Agriculture (other than acid phosphate).
6. Rubber.
7. Galvanizing.
8. Explosives.

The first item of the above list, both from the standpoint of tonnage consumed and of its importance to farmers and to the Nation, is that of fertilizers. Phosphates form a large part of the mixed fertilizers used in this country, and practically all of this fertilizing material is prepared by treating ground phosphate rock, known as "floats," with sulphuric acid for the purpose of making the phosphates soluble and so rendering them available as plant food.

The Scientific American of May, 1918, contains an interesting article by H. E. Howe, chemical engineer. He says:

Sulphur, always an essential, has assumed a new importance lately in that in some form or other it is the starting point in sulphuric-acid manufacture, and this acid is necessary in most chemical processes. Munition production would be impossible without large quantities of sulphuric acid. It is also required in the fertilizer industry, which has a direct bearing upon food supply, and is a raw material in refining processes, glucose manufacture, the dyestuff industry, metallurgy, and many other important lines. Sulphur, as such, finds application in gunpowder, matches, rubber vulcanization, germicides, bleachers, etc. So the progress of the race depends upon sulphur just about as much as upon any one single element.

The same periodical of April, 1924, says:

Sulphur is one of the most important raw materials found in the earth. In the chemical and allied industries such as rubber, food, paper, insecticide, etc., it plays a very essential rôle, more so than any other chemical element. First and foremost of its uses is the manu-

ture of the "king of chemicals," sulphuric acid, whose consumption is said to measure the progress of all industrial enterprise. Most people do not realize the peculiar significance of sulphuric acid, how much their welfare depends upon it.

The food we eat is fertilized with materials that are made with the aid of sulphuric acid; the dyes that are used to color our fabrics; the gasoline that drives our motor cars; the lubricating oil that oils the bearings of our machines; the metals that are made into various articles of adornment; and household utensils, such as knives, forks, etc., are all made with the aid of sulphuric acid. The acid enters into the process of dyeing, bleaching, and finishing of all textile fabrics. It is responsible for the dynamite that blasts out our coal, for the celluloid that is made into toilet articles, for the moving-picture films that entertain us after the hard day's work is over. The acid is used to make various products that enter into the manufacture of soap, glass, perfumes, drugs, and many other products. In fact, we can scarcely use an article that is not related to sulphuric acid in some way. Hence, it is not strange that the acid has been called the barometer of business, the indicator of the prosperity of the country. The importance of sulphur, more than half the production of which is employed in making sulphuric acid, is thus evident from this one use of the substance.

The American Chemical Society has recently had hundreds of tests made with sulphur as a building material. The result of these tests, as shown by the report of W. H. Kobbe, of New York, synopsis of which was published in the Washington Post of November 30 last, shows that Portland cement concrete absorbs 17 per cent by weight of molten sulphur, which adds 1,000 per cent to its tensile strength. A lean mix of cement and sand, breaking under tension of 150 to 200 pounds, has been increased to 2,000 pounds, notwithstanding the fact that the sulphur alone is comparatively very brittle and easily broken or crushed.

It is very evident to anyone who has made an investigation of the subject that there is no known element or commodity that is performing a greater service than sulphur to the Nation and to civilization. To eliminate it from our industries would be the setting aside of the progress we have made from the beginning. To it, more than anything else, is due the credit for making America great, as it is an essential in practically every industry in which America leads the world, and new and important uses are almost daily being found by the great army of experts and scientists who are constantly making experimentations.

The United States produces approximately 2,100,000 tons of sulphur, 450,000 of which are exported. The foreign production is about 400,000 tons. Our imports are practically nothing. We consume a little more than three-fifths of the world's supply, while the rest of the world consumes less than two-fifths.

We should consume all of the home production of sulphur. When we send it abroad it adds many fold to the supply of foreign commerce that comes in competition in the world markets with the products of American farms and American factories. By consuming it at home we add to our home production, and, to the same extent, diminish foreign competition. The product now being exported, if applied to fertilize the farms and supplied to the factories of the United States, would produce national wealth a thousandfold greater than that represented by the few millions now received for the export product. Cheap and adequate transportation is the solution.

We formerly received practically all of our sulphur supply from Sicily. The mines there came under the control of the Anglo-Sicilian Co., and the price rose from $15 to $25 and $30 per ton in New York. We then for a few years obtained large quantities of pyrites from Spain for the manufacture of sulphuric acid. This was our principal source of supply up to the time the Louisiana mine was placed in operation 20 years ago.

Raw sulphur, as a commodity of commerce, is not handled in small packages. It moves by trainloads, shiploads, and by barge-fleet loads, where such transportation facilities are available. The systematic method applied in mining and handling this most useful product should be considered in this connection.

Sulphur in the Texas district is found nearly 1,000 feet below the surface. Shaft mining is impossible. The Frasch method is applied. Wells are drilled like ordinary oil wells. Three iron pipes are inserted, the outer one 10 or 12 inches in diameter. Within that is another pipe 7 or 8 inches in diameter, and in that still another 3 or 4 inches in diameter. Superheated water is forced down the outer pipe under pressure of 250 pounds to the square inch. Compressed air is forced down the small pipe in the center under pressure of nearly 400 pounds.

The hot water leaves the larger pipe some distance above the lower end of the smaller pipes and melts the sulphur out of the pockets and fissures of the rock 1,000 feet beneath the surface. The molten sulphur, having greater specific gravity than the water, goes to the bottom, where the compressed air from the central pipe forces it to the surface through the intermediate pipe. It is then pumped through pipe conveyors to the bin.

The bin is usually about 150 by 300 feet, built on the ground to a height of about 45 feet. The boiling sulphur emptying into the center spreads over the bottom and the process is continuous until the bin is filled. The walls of the bin are built up a few boards at a time as the bin fills.

After the bin is filled the pipes are transferred to another bin which has been prepared. Several weeks are then required for the sulphur to cool off and become solidified. The boards are then removed from the sides, revealing a solid block of sulphur nearly as large as a city block, weighing several hundred thousand tons, and worth several million dollars.

Giant powder is then used to blow the block of sulphur to pieces. A temporary railroad is hastily placed along the side and steam shovels brought forward to load the sulphur on the cars, a whole train being loaded within a few hours.

The Freeport Co. has its docks at Freeport Harbor, 4 miles from the mine. A trainload of sulphur is there taken up an inclined plane to a height of 55 feet and several carloads at a time are dumped into chutes that convey the sulphur into the hold of the ship.

The Gulf Co. is not located at a port. Its output is taken by rail to Texas City, near Galveston Harbor, about 150 miles by rail, where the sulphur is dumped into concrete bins 600 feet long, in which belt conveyors carry it into the ship.

From the very nature of the traffic, sulphur can not profitably be handled by rail in long hauls. It seeks the first water transportation that is available. Under present conditions, it all enters the coastwise and foreign trade. The terminus of the Intracoastal Canal as authorized in the pending bill, is at Galveston, which lacks 45 miles of reaching the Freeport mines and 75 miles of reaching the Gulf mines. As the bill was originally reported, the canal would have passed within a short distance of both mines, and with slight local expense the sulphur could have been loaded by steam shovels from the bin to the barge.

The Freeport Harbor for several years has been partially filled with silt from the Brazos River. Ships have to load light, while the remainder of the cargo is taken on at Texas City or Galveston, 45 miles away by the proposed canal route, but 75 miles by rail. This entails a very heavy additional expense, amounting to several dollars per ton. The railroad rate alone is 97½ cents per ton, while the extra cost of handling the ship and cargo is very great, and must be borne by the consumers of sulphur.

Every person in the United States who eats food, wears clothes, operates a farm, builds wire fences, uses fertilizer, rides in an automobile, buys tires, "lube" and gasoline, is a heavy consumer of sulphur, though he may not have realized it. Every newspaper publisher in the United States is a heavy consumer, as sulphur is one of the principal items of the cost of making paper, type, inks, presses, linotypes, and every article used in the printer's trade. The high cost of all of these things and thousands of others has been added to by the difficulties in the distribution of sulphur.

The Chief of Engineers within the past month has approved a change in the Freeport Harbor, by diverting the Brazos River, at a cost of $1,400,000, and local taxpayers propose to pay $900,000 of the amount. The jetties there were built by local interests, at a cost of approximately $1,500,000, and this was done many years before it was even dreamed that oil and sulphur existed there.

The Freeport Sulphur Co. is operating two mines, one at Freeport, the other at Hoskins Mound, 20 miles to the east. The Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. operates the great mine at Gulf, some 30 miles west of Freeport. The Union Sulphur Co., of Louisiana, is reported to have abandoned its operations in that State and is opening up a new mine 46 miles north of Freeport. This new mine will be in full operation within six months, it is announced.

With the Louisiana mine closed, and with all four of these Texas mines in operation, then the entire American production will be within less than 50 miles of Freeport Harbor and nearer to it than to any other port. With the Intracoastal Canal extended to Corpus Christi, as approved by the Chief of Engineers and as originally reported by the Committee on Rivers and

Harbors, then all of these mines, except the one now being opened up by the Union Sulphur Co., will be right on the line of the canal.

The Intracoastal Canal will afford cheaper transportation for the inland trade to all points to the east, and in the Mississippi-Ohio Valley section. The Freeport Harbor improvement will afford cheaper transportation to the coastwise trade, including both the Atlantic and Pacific seaboards.

The Intracoastal Canal now extends from Galveston to Corpus Christi, by way of these sulphur mines, but it is not of sufficient width and depth to handle sulphur. The enlargement of this section of the canal, as recommended by the Chief and Board of Engineers, together with the proposed modification of the Freeport Harbor, will result in the saving of several million dollars each year to the people of the United States, all of whom are consumers of sulphur. In fact, the saving of a single year will more than pay the entire cost of these improvements. Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering, volume 20, says:

> From a practical standpoint, the main features to be considered in sulphur operations are transportation, fuel, and water. As the product mined is cheap, it is apparent that a low transportation cost to the main sources of consumption is required to maintain economical prices.

I have considered this question at this time solely from the standpoint of a single commodity. If nothing else should be taken into account, the work would be amply justified. When we further consider that the territory affected is one of the main sources of supply of half a dozen other basic commodities, such as salt, oil, sugar, rice, lumber, and cotton, who, after thorough investigation, can fail to indorse the language of the division engineers in approving the Intracoastal Canal, when he said—

> Probably nowhere in the world are conditions so favorable for the economical construction and the efficient use of an inland waterway of the first class as in the case here presented.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this river and harbor bill authorizes the construction, the repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors. The chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], very fully explained, in answer to my question this morning, that this bill is not an appropriation bill, but is a bill approving certain projects investigated and approved by the Chief of Engineers, and authorizing the Secretary of War to cause preliminary examinations and surveys to be made at certain named localities.

In debate this morning with the chairman I called attention to Cambridge Harbor, Md., which by this bill is in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 210, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, adopted and authorized as a project. I called attention to Cambridge Harbor as one of the class of projects to be authorized by this bill; and I also called attention to Wicomico River, Md.; to the Honga River and Tar Bay, Md.; to the Choptank River, Md.; to the Elk River, Md.; and to Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md., as illustrations of the localities to which approval is extended for preliminary examination and survey.

The pending bill provides a definite plan for the development of rivers and harbors, a definite plan extending over five years in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. No appropriations are made by this bill, but the estimates and approved projects are more or less incorporated in this bill, not as appropriations, however, but as estimates, which by the bill are authorized. For example, the hearings of the committee referring to Cambridge Harbor, Md., specify $15,000 as the cost of development.

I want to call the particular attention of the committee to the present method of river and harbor development. I am against so-called "pork-barrel" legislation, but under the present system, so ably handled by the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee [Mr. DEMPSEY], the technical experts of the Government, as represented by the Chief of Engineers, are required to make estimates, regardless of locality, for the various needs of river and harbor development.

It is interesting to note, for instance, the very great river and harbor development which is going on throughout the year in the Baltimore, Md., district, which comprises not only Baltimore Harbor and Channels but the Susquehanna River above and below Havre de Grace, the Elk and Little Elk Rivers, the Chester River, the Corsica River, Queenstown Harbor, Claiborne Harbor, Tilghman Island Harbor, Tred Avon River, the La Trappe River, the Choptank River, the Tuckahoe River, the Warwick River, Cambridge Harbor, Slaughter Creek, the Nanticoke River, Tyaskin Creek, the Wicomico River, the Lower Thoroughfare at or near Wenona, Deal Island, Crisfield Harbor, Brook Creek, the Pocomoke River, and Twitch Cove and Big Thoroughfare River, all in Maryland. I think a great many of our citizens, even residents of Maryland, do not realize the great amount of work which is being done in the various units of the Baltimore district which I have enumerated. This district includes Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries north of Cove Point at the entrance to the Patuxent River on the west side, and also north of Onancock River, Va., on the Eastern Shore; also the channel at York Spit.

In reference to Baltimore Harbor, the existing project provides for a main channel 35 feet deep and 1,000 feet wide, with certain ramifications. The State of Maryland and the city of Baltimore, chiefly the latter, have at various times in the past expended about $750,000 on the Patapsco River. In addition, the city has spent about $12,000,000 in improving the harbor, $9,200,000 having been spent on docks, waterways, and bulkheads and $2,800,000 for dredging.

The engineers recommended that there could profitably be expended on the Baltimore Harbor during the fiscal year 1926 $600,000. Of this, they recommended $292,800 for maintenance and $308,000 for new work, exclusive of available funds. The recent appropriation bill provided for the maintenance. There exists available funds for new work, but the $308,000 recommended has not yet been obtained. Exclusive of available funds, the amount estimated to be required for appropriation for completion of the existing project is $1,110,000.

The chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, Mr. DEMPSEY, in answer to my question this morning, stated that not only his committee but that the Chief of Engineers felt that the great port of Baltimore should be given every possible facility. There is nothing needed to the port of Baltimore or to Cambridge Harbor in the way of authorization which is not provided by this bill, although we hope to get added appropriations later on. The question of expenditure is primarily one for the War Department's engineers. I therefore feel that the Representatives from Maryland should support this measure, and I shall vote for the pending bill. [Applause.]

There has been a large amount of money expended on the Susquehanna River above and below Havre de Grace. As a matter of fact the amount expended to June 30, 1924, for new work and maintenance was $314,920. On the Chester River, over $76,000 has been expended; on the Corsica River, over $40,000 has been expended; on the Queenstown Harbor, over $71,000 has been expended; and so on throughout the other elements which make up the Baltimore, Md., district. I cite these instances in order to show that under the present policy of the Rivers and Harbors Committee thousands of dollars are being expended on the present development of waterways in many localities whose residents are totally unaware that these expenditures are made by the Federal Government.

Under the pending bill it is contemplated that not more than $10,000,000 shall be expended a year for the next five years on the projects to be adopted, and the chairman of the committee, Mr. DEMPSEY, estimates the annual expenditure at $6,000,000 or $7,000,000. Again I repeat that I feel that this measure is one which should receive the support of all Representatives from Maryland. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for two and one-half minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am a new Member of Congress. I have had a bill before the Congress since the time I came here. It is a bill of great consequence, for it provides for the building of a deep waterway from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico. It was originally considered as a part of the general waterway legislation but I felt that under the present conditions it was not the best policy to interfere with this general rivers and harbors bill, therefore, early last year I gave notice to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that I would gladly withhold my bill until this general bill could be passed. I want to say to you men to-day that I have made a thorough study of the rivers of this country for the last 10 years, and I do not believe there has been a bill presented to the Congress at any time as important to-day to the people as this river and harbor bill, and especially the part relating to inland river improvement. The farmer to-day is clamoring for cheap transportation. His only opportunity for cheap transportation, in my opinion, is to utilize the rivers of the country, and I know from what I have learned and experienced that if we are able to dig a canal down the Mississippi River from St. Paul to New Orleans and finally connect with Lake Michigan, which will

be necessary in order to afford water for this transportation, it will reduce the general freight rates of the country and it will reduce the freight rate to the farmer of that great West from the Alleghenies to the Rockies, and the time will come when they can ship their grain on an average of 6 cents a bushel reduction from what they can at the present time. If you want to build up this great Central West and take care of the people who live in that part of the country, who are producing 80 per cent of the food products of this country, then you will support this river and harbor bill and will finally come to the conclusion that it will be just as important for you to support the proposition I am presenting to the Congress, in another bill, and vote to connect the Great Lakes with the Gulf of Mexico. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following works of improvement are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans recommended in the reports hereinafter designated: *Provided*, That no money shall be expended on the projects herein and hereby adopted during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and that not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be expended thereon in any fiscal year thereafter:

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is an amendment in order at this point of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The rules have no definite provision as to the manner of consideration of a bill, whether by paragraphs of by sections. The rule has generally been stated that revenue and appropriation bills are to be considered by paragraphs and other bills by sections. The rulings, however, in all instances base the matter upon the convenience of the House. The bill before us was for a long time in fact an appropriation bill and as far as the present occupant of the chair knows has always been considered under paragraphs, even since it no longer carries appropriations. Every reason that would obtain for the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill in that manner would obtain as to the bill before us, so that the Chair, unless the House should decide differently, will hold that this bill should be considered by paragraphs and an amendment to the first paragraph is now in order.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARBOUR: Page 1, line 11, after the word "thereafter" insert: "*Provided further*, That before any work of improvement herein adopted and authorized shall be commenced the Secretary of War shall require local or other interests to contribute toward the cost thereof such amount as he may deem fair and reasonable in view of the local benefits that will result from said work, and said amounts shall be deposited with the Secretary of War and applied on the cost of said work."

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, one thing that has impressed me during the last two sessions of the Congress in my service upon the Committee on Appropriations, where we have before us all of the appropriations for river and harbor work, is the fact that we are appropriating for a great many projects in this country that are hardly justified. The officers of the War Department have said to our committee that it is their policy, whenever they can consistently do so, to require local cooperation. The engineers' report is full of cases, you may say, of minor projects, projects that were perhaps important at one time but which have ceased to be important because of improved highways and railroads built to points which were previously served by water transportation.

The commerce on many of these projects is almost entirely local, and my idea and purpose in offering this amendment is to require local communities in such cases to contribute to the cost of the projects or else not carry them out.

On the Pacific coast local cooperation is the general rule. The War Department officials have stated to our committee that on the Pacific coast local contribution in river and harbor work amounts to about 50 per cent of the cost. It was stated to me a short time ago that the city of Los Angeles has contributed about $30,000,000 for river and harbor work there, as against $9,000,000 provided by the Federal Government. On the Mississippi River one-third of the cost is required to be contributed by local communities in flood-control work, and in some instances local communities have contributed as high as 50 per cent toward the work. If this is right in some cases, it should be right in every case.

This amendment provides that the Secretary of War shall exercise his discretion and declare in what cases and to what extent local cooperation shall be had. Such local cooperation shall be based upon the benefit that will accrue to the particular locality from the construction or maintenance of the project. There are some cases I can readily imagine, as in the case of continuous channels, where it might, perhaps, not be practical to assess local benefits; but in most of the harbor work proper there is a distinct local benefit conferred, and in my opinion the local communities should contribute to the expense of that work. If we do this, if we adopt this amendment, it will not in any way interfere with any proper project in this or any other bill, but it will guarantee that only those projects that are right and proper shall be carried out. If they are not right and are not justified, the local communities themselves will not contribute any money toward their construction. If local communities do contribute, then it will be an evidence of good faith and their own belief in the importance and worthiness of the project. And it will do this: It will take away from river and harbor bills the stigma that they have always carried of being pork-barrel legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let us understand what the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] is. Congress adopts these projects; Congress appropriates the money; and the gentleman from California suggests that we say that the Secretary of War shall legislate in our place instead, that we shall put on a rider here which shall, in effect, end this bill right here and now. We might just as well stop right here and now and not have any bill, and the gentleman's Los Angeles Harbor would not be improved under his proposition. He leaves it entirely to the Secretary of War as to whether a dollar shall be expended for it.

Are we ready and prepared to adopt such an amendment? Are we ready to abdicate and favor any executive officer legislating in our place instead? Why go through the form, why pretend to legislate? Why should we spend our time here in the Hall at all if in the end——

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And would it not also have a tendency to inject politics into the matter, which it has been absolutely free from heretofore?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Absolutely; and everybody would be taking his way to the office of the Secretary of War to advocate his particular project.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. And would it not transfer the right to legislate from this Congress to the Secretary of War, whose office would be a legislative department?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Certainly. It would be a complete abdication, which we would have no right to do.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. We are already doing the very thing that my amendment seeks to do.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; but openly and knowingly. The way we do it is set out before us in the report. The Secretary of War recommends what is to be done in each one of these items, and we adopt the project in accordance with that recommendation. We do not go on here, after we have legislated, and say "You may reconsider this legislation, or alter, or change it, or take it away altogether if you choose." We do not do that at all. The Secretary, after a painstaking and thorough investigation, says "The local communities shall contribute so much and in such a way." We adopt that report, but we do it knowingly, after a discussion. We can alter it if we choose to. If we think in a particular item there should be a change, a change is made. But to make a sweeping, all-embracing abdication of our right to legislate in favor of a single officer would be an unprecedented and unheard-of and thoroughly wrong thing, which no Congress would consider.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. FREDERICKS. I notice in the gentleman's remarks about Los Angeles Harbor that he is perhaps under the impression that the amendment was offered in the interest of Los Angeles Harbor. I think that is not the case. My colleague from California [Mr. BARBOUR] has offered the amendment on the general principle, but it has no application to the fact that Los Angeles Harbor is contributing a portion of the expenses of the development, and the gentleman's amendment is not offered in any connection whatever with Los Angeles Harbor, I am sure.

Mr. BARBOUR. I only mentioned Los Angeles as an illustration of the argument I am making.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Los Angeles has provided generously for its own terminals, as have also the other great harbors of the country. We have provided in this bill that New York shall furnish $15,000,000 for terminals and port facilities. All of that is provided for in the regular legislative way. This amendment is utterly vicious and should be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mississippi River, between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: At Fort Madison, Iowa, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 96, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I avail myself of this privilege to say that so far as I know, we of the great inland part of the country are in favor of this bill. We are in favor of the development of every harbor and river that will in any way aid the people of this country; but I do believe that this Congress at this session ought to decide whether or not it is really in favor of river transportation. We will be given a chance, I hope, to prove that we are sincere or prove that after all that the charge of "pork barrel" has some foundation. That chance ought to be given before March 4. What good will it do to have the channels of our rivers made navigable and at the same time to permit conditions to obtain which render river transportation impossible? If we do that we are not sincere.

I do not believe it is possible to ever have river transportation in this country with fourth-section violation—that is, violation of the fourth section of the interstate commerce act. What good will it do us to develop the rivers of the country and then permit the railroads, in effect, to make it impossible to get to the rivers? They can and will drive the traffic from the rivers. What good will it do for us to develop the Mississippi River from New Orleans north if you are going to permit the railroads to prevent boats handling transportation on that river? They can do that if violations of the fourth section are allowed. There is but one way of avoiding it. You know as well as I do that it is a beautiful theory to talk of river transportation, but this country is not enjoying it to any great extent, nor can it so long as the Interstate Commerce Commission has the right to grant the railroads a rate which will, in effect, kill river transportation. The only way is to pass a long-and-short-haul bill.

This significant fact ought to be remembered. The railroads are not asking for fourth-section relief against the industrial and business centers of the East. They would not dare do that. Notwithstanding the fact that there is river and water transportation for 900 miles, railroads are not asking for relief on east-bound traffic to meet the water transportation, but they are constantly asking for relief on west-bound traffic. We may just as well face the situation squarely; until this Congress passes a long-and-short-haul bill there can be no successful river transportation of the freight of this country. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The main argument advanced by the authors of this bill—and I am favorable to it—is that it will develop river transportation and force the railroads to reduce their rates on long hauls and short hauls alike. What has the gentleman to say about that?

Mr. COLTON. That would be very good if it were the fact, but the gentleman will find that they reduce the rate where boats can compete, and then as soon as they start inland they raise the rates to make up for the loss they incur in attempting to put river transportation out of business.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The truth about it is that when they are in competition with water transportation and reduce their rates they make the rest of the country that has no water transportation pay the bill.

Mr. COLTON. That is it exactly. I can cite you many cases where industries have been driven out of business simply because of the condition I have just referred to.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Has not the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to regulate the discriminations the gentleman has just described without any further legislation?

Mr. COLTON. Yes. And the advocates of the long and the short haul bill would not be asking for any change in the present law if the railroads were not constantly coming to the Interstate Commerce Commission and asking for fourth-section relief for this and that or the other commodity, and forcing those inland communities to come here all the time and defend themselves against the rates asked for by the railroads. This now has to be done at great expense and trouble and keeps the inland communities in constant unrest.

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

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah may proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. I will.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman feel that the railroads should have the right to compete with water carriers so that both water and rail carriers can serve the public?

Mr. COLTON. Certainly, but not at the expense of people who live inland. [Applause.] There is no objection to their competing, but it is unfair to make the people who do not happen to live on waterways pay the bills. May I say the present practice not only meets competition but drives it out of business.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If I understand the gentleman's proposition it is, in effect, to deny to the railroads the right to meet water competition?

Mr. COLTON. Absolutely not. There is no thought on the part of those who advocate the long and the short haul that that will be done. Why are the railroads not seeking relief for the traffic in the East, where there is both water and rail transportation? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I will say this, that a great deal of the movement west, especially in the late summer, the fall, and the early winter, is the carrying of cars without anything in them at all; they have got to be moved westward in order to carry the products of the West east, and if they can be carried clear through to the coast, for example, and thereby get a rate that will compete with the rate by water through the Panama Canal, they can carry that coast to coast traffic, otherwise they can not.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman is injecting a new element here, and I think he will find that a careful examination of the situation will not justify his statement. The long-and-short-haul bill is not being opposed on the ground he states. The chief argument advanced in opposition is the Panama Canal trade when, as a matter of fact, that forms only a very, very small fraction of the trade that is now being moved to the West. The intercoastal traffic for 1923, the last year we have a record, was 12,377,000 tons; of this 7,436,000 tons was eastbound tanker-oil tonnage and was not competitive, leaving only 4,971,000 tons intercoastal merchandise. It would not be over 2 per cent of the gross railroad business.

Mr. HOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Certainly.

Mr. HOCH. We appropriated a few days ago $3,000,000 for the Inland Waterways Corporation, which operates Government barges on the Mississippi and Warrior Rivers. The testimony was that the rail rates along Mississippi River are approximately 60 per cent of the comparable rail rates elsewhere in the country. In other words, the railroads are making a rate paralleling the Mississippi River which is 60 per cent of the rate they charge generally elsewhere. If

that is true does not that enforce the gentleman's argument that that rate is either too low or that the one to the interior points is too high?

Mr. COLTON. Yes; and further, if it is a matter of competition, tell me why it is that freight, for instance, being shipped to China takes a lower rate than freight for the Pacific coast? The rate on steel rails for instance is 40 cents if they are destined for China, but for Ogden or Salt Lake, or even coast cities they take a rate of $1. They are asking for a higher rate on other commodities.

Now, gentlemen, I only want to say in conclusion, that if we are to start on a policy that will mean to this country real river transportation let us be honest and see that the railroads do not absolutely kill it. Let us pass at this session the long-and-short-haul bill. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I sympathize with the contentions made by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON], but I thoroughly disagree with his remedy. I think there is a lot in what the gentleman says about the interior of this country being penalized by rates between water points, but unless the gentleman wants to fasten that condition upon himself perpetually, then I think we had better begin not only to improve the waterways of this country but to utilize them.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. I am for this bill and expect to vote for it, but I want the rivers utilized.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I want to discuss that question. I was interested in the gentleman's comment about what the railroads are doing. They have made a lot of cutthroat rates along the waterways of this country. I am happy to say, however, that the manager of the barge line tells me that the Interstate Commerce Commission, pursuant to section 500 of the Esch-Cummins Act, wherein we declare it to be the policy of Congress to develop the waterways and the railways as parts of the transportation system of the country, have yielded to this idea of having more than one unit in the transportation system, to wit the railroads, and have been adjusting the rates, and they tell me that while they have not gone nearly far enough in that adjustment, they have done many things in their rulings which is making possible the use of our waterways.

I understand from the manager of the barge line that if we had the channels improved so that they could use them during the low-water seasons of the year, they could make a good profit throughout the year. For instance, take the barge line from St. Louis to New Orleans——

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Make a good profit and at a rate lower than that charged by rail.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. That is just the point I am coming to.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COLTON. But there is nothing to prevent the railroad from even making a lower rate, or at least asking for the privilege of doing that.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Whenever we get our waterways developed and in operation so that our heavy, bulky freight will begin to go over the waterways of the country, and as we further develop this policy of using our railways and waterways in coordination with each other and give the Interstate Commerce Commission time to work out the system, I believe they are going to remedy this evil. I have explicit faith in that, but you can not expect them to do this overnight.

The Mississippi section of the barge line from St. Louis south during the first six months of every year since they have operated, when they had a sufficient channel because the water was high enough to carry their equipment over the sand bars, have been able to earn a profit. They earned a good profit last year during that period of six months. They earned a good profit the year before during that six months' period carrying freight at three and a half mills per ton-mile, while the average rail rate of the country, according to the Interstate Commerce Commission, is 10.78 mills per ton-mile.

As an illustration, you have this stretch between St. Louis and Cairo, one of the most important stretches of waterway in this country, because by the very nature of things St. Louis is the railroad center. We can not use our waterways in this country effectively except in conjunction with our railways. We must coordinate them. We want to have them work together and work with each other. We want to use our waterways wherever they are available and then use our railways where waterways can not carry this heavy freight, and pay the railways a compensatory rate for every bit of service they perform. That is the doctrine we ought to apply in this country.

On this section of the Mississippi River from St. Louis to Cairo what is the situation? In 1910 we adopted that project. The project, according to the report of the engineers, was to cost $21,000,000 and was to provide an 8-foot channel at low-water mark. Congress wrote into the bill at that time a provision that the project should be completed in 12 years. That 12-year period was up two years ago, and instead of having spent the $21,000,000 in order to complete the project we have spent less than $2,000,000; and what is the result? Instead of having a channel from St. Louis to Cairo during the low-water period of the year we have our sand bars. I have gone over that stretch of the river with tows of barges. I have been in the pilot house as we have gone down the river, and on nine-tenths of that river the banks are brought within 2,500 feet and you have a channel from 15 to 30 feet deep.

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

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman point out to the committee how far from the waterway the traffic to the waterway has been brought?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I want to speak on that point, but first let me finish this other discussion, and then I will take up that question.

Let me show how Utah will be affected by the improvement of the Ohio River. But first I will take the Mississippi section which we have been considering. I went over it in a tow, and for about nine-tenths of the distance I found the banks within about 2,500 feet of each other and there was always a good channel.

That tow carried enough freight to load 600 freight cars or 12 full trains of 50 cars to each train and 50,000 pounds to each car, carrying that freight at 3½ mills per ton-mile as against a rate of 10.78 mills per ton-mile by the railroads, and making the trip from St. Louis to New Orleans in six days' time. The barge line does this for six months in the year, and yet when the low-water season comes you will find there are stretches on the river that have not been improved where the river spreads out a mile and a half wide. Let us make the expenditure, and let us bring the banks down to within 2,500 feet and then the river will scour its own channel, and when you give the Mississippi Barge Line a deepened channel during all seasons of the year from St. Louis to Cairo, they will operate at a profit, carrying freight at 3½ mills per ton-mile, and eventually I predict they will carry it for much less than that, as against 10½ mills per ton-mile charged by the railroads.

We do not want rail and water competition. There ought to be coordination; they ought to work together. The interior of this country is interested in the barge line. This idea that only those on the banks of the river are interested is wrong. I want to call your attention to the fact that the War Department last year, at my request and the request of others, made up a chart showing who it was that used the barge line and who got the benefit. We asked them to make it up by congressional districts, and to my surprise when the report came in I found that there was not a single congressional district in the State of Ohio clear to the New York line but what had used the barge line, shipped freight by rail all the way to St. Louis or Cairo, and then south by water. There was not a single congressional district in the States of Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, or Missouri—not a single district in one of those States that had not shipped freight by rail to Cairo or St. Louis and then south by water. The amount they saved was large. Take Judge GREEN's district in Iowa, right across the river from Omaha; I found that his district alone had shipped freight, mostly grain, by rail to St. Louis, so that with the 20 per cent differential between the water rate and the railroad rate they had saved, in that district alone, $32,000 in one year.

Now, coming back to Utah, I sympathize with Utah, and the Intermountain States; we have suffered the same thing in Missouri, in St. Louis. I was out at Utah a few years ago and I talked with the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD] and others, and found the penalty that they were paying for living in the interior. At that time we had in force, in this country, the system of Pittsburgh plus on steel. When they wanted to build they had to buy their steel in Pittsburgh, or, if they did not, they bought it in St. Louis, but wherever they bought it they had to pay the rate from Pittsburgh through Salt Lake on to San Francisco plus the freight rate back to Salt Lake. That Pittsburgh plus system was abolished six months ago.

Now, what will happen when we improve the waterways? You will load steel at Pittsburgh, carry it down the Ohio River for one-fifth of the rail rate, and you will carry it on the Mississippi to New Orleans, then over the intercoastal canal to Houston and take the short cut by rail across to Salt Lake City.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I will.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. In order that we may reap the benefit, do not we have to come to the Interstate Commerce Commission and get them to prohibit a violation of both sections of the fourth section of the transportation act?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman, and I fear it may become necessary to have an overhauling of the transportation act; as long as the railroads carry freight at a low rate where they run along the banks of the river, you in the interior are going to pay the penalty for it. The way to do is to improve the waterways and use the waterways.

Mr. COLTON. That is what we are contending. It will not help us to permit the railroads to double the freight on the short hauls after you get the freight to the Mississippi River.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Your freight is not going to be any higher, because the railways are carrying the freight at water rates along the river now.

Mr. COLTON. But they come here and ask for a higher rate.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Well, present the case to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If they do not respond, come to Congress and I will be with you.

Mr. COLTON. That is it exactly; we do not want to have to come to Congress every time. We want Congress to regulate it now.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. You can not do it on this bill.

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

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on the improvement of our waterways. Transportation is still one of our most pressing problems. A wise and just solution of this problem will have an important bearing on our prosperity.

In the beginning let me make it clear that, although I am strongly in favor of a revival of river traffic, I am not antagonistic to the railroads of the country. By no means. I am not opposed to the railroads, neither to the owners nor to the employees. I fully recognize that nothing is more essential to the well being of the American people than the railroads. Even health and life ofttimes depend upon them. It is therefore not my purpose to criticize the railroads in order to justify the development of our waterways. We all know that in the main the railroads of this country have been operated with great efficiency. This has been due partly to able executives, men of vision and understanding, and partly to loyal and faithful employees, who have had the interest of the people at heart. What a wonderful body of men the railroad employees are. Think for a moment of the trainmen. They leave their homes at all hours of the day and night. They go out into the rain and the snow and the storm. They constantly face danger, but they never shrink or falter. Their courage and heroism are unquestioned. Many are maimed and crippled for life. When the supreme test comes, no matter when or where, they are faithful even unto death. Unconsciously again and again we pay them the highest possible tribute. Almost daily we give ourselves into their keeping with absolute faith that, if need be, they will sacrifice themselves in our behalf. In some respects the railroads are marvels of efficiency. Even the greatest systems, notwithstanding their vast mileage and heavy traffic, sometimes do not have a single fatality among their passengers during an entire year. It can be truthfully said that there is no finer service anywhere than that given by the railroad men of America.

Perhaps the best way to show the importance of the railroads is to give a few figures. There are to-day operated in the United States 258,314 miles of railroad. This is enough mileage, in round numbers, to encircle the globe ten times. There are 68,990 locomotives, 57,166 passenger cars, and 2,380,482 freight cars. In 1923 the railroads carried 1,387,942,018 tons of freight a distance of 416,211,000,000 miles, and 1,009,000,000 passengers 38,297,000,000 miles. Nearly 2,000,000 employees are required to keep the roads in operation. An industry of such magnitude is certainly entitled to our most careful and thoughtful consideration.

But even with their very efficient employees and their great equipment the railroads sometimes find it difficult even now to carry the freight of the country. In the future this difficulty will be constantly accentuated, for the tonnage in the United States is rapidly increasing from year to year and but few new railroads are being built. Some, in fact, are being abandoned. During 1924, the year that has just closed, 579 miles of new lines were completed and 437.56 miles of track were taken up and abandoned. In addition 255.11 miles of track were abandoned but not taken up. From 1831 to 1916 there was an increase of railroad mileage every year, but since 1916, with only one or two exceptions, there has been a net decrease each year. It is evident, therefore, that all natural channels for transportation which involve no economic loss should be utilized. This situation forcibly impels us to direct our attention to the navigable streams of the country.

Rivers, fortunately, do not need to be built. Providence has built them for us. All we need to do is to improve them. Surely they should not go unused. Certainly Providence did not expect us to let the vast carrying power of the great streams of the country go to waste. The logical thing to do is to supplement rail transportation with water transportation.

In various ways water transportation will prove advantageous. My district, for instance, is far inland—1,000 miles from the Atlantic and 2,000 miles from the Pacific. The Mississippi flows past its door. It lies in the very heart of the Mississippi Valley. That valley is a great granary, the greatest in the world. There is none other like it. Much of the grain produced there must necessarily find a market in foreign lands. It is apparent and self-evident that our surplus grain should go down the Mississippi River and then on the ocean to the markets of the world. This is the cheapest route, and this route can be made a great benefit to the farmers of the Mississippi Valley. But not only is the development of the Mississippi River important to the farmers, it is also important to the manufacturers. It will mean a wider market for them. In many instances it will mean cheaper transportation not only for the outgoing finished product but also for the incoming raw product.

What a marvelous stream the Mississippi River is! It rises far in the north, almost at the Canadian line, flows in a southerly direction for more than a thousand miles, empties into the Gulf of Mexico, and becomes part of the sea. It touches and borders 10 States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. It drains, in part at least, 18 other States. The Mississippi Valley is within itself a veritable empire.

Mark Twain, that genial writer, beloved by every American, I am proud to say once made his home in my district. For a time he lived in the city of Keokuk, Iowa. This city, by the way, has been the home of many eminent men. Two of them took an important and conspicuous part at the National Capital—George W. McCrary, who, as a member of this House, introduced the resolution for the Electoral Commission, which settled the Hayes-Tilden contest, and who afterwards served as Secretary of War, and Samuel F. Miller, who was appointed to the Supreme Bench by Abraham Lincoln, and who was one of the ablest jurists that ever served on that high court.

Possibly Mark Twain would have become a great writer even if he had never lived in Keokuk. We do not know; but I am inclined to doubt it. Certain it is that he was much benefited by his association with the intelligent and kindly people of that city.

Mark Twain spent some years upon the Mississippi as a pilot. The name which he assumed when he became a writer suggested itself to him while on the river. He was an authority on the Mississippi. Let me therefore quote part of the opening chapter of his book entitled "Life on the Mississippi." Said he:

> The Mississippi is well worth reading about. It is not a commonplace river, but, on the contrary, is in all ways remarkable. * * * It discharges 3 times as much water as the St. Lawrence, 25 times as much as the Rhine, and 338 times as much as the Thames. No other river has so vast a drainage basin; it draws its water supply from 28 States and Territories—from Delaware on the Atlantic seaboard and from all the country between that and Idaho on the Pacific slope—

a spread of 45 degrees of longitude. The Mississippi receives and carries to the Gulf water from 54 subordinate rivers that are navigable by steamboats and from some hundreds that are navigable by flats and keels. The area of its drainage basin is as great as the combined areas of England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Austria, Italy, and Turkey, and almost all this wide region is fertile; the Mississippi Valley proper is exceptionally so.

Romance and story are interwoven with the history of the Mississippi. One of the large paintings in the Rotunda of the Capitol portrays the discovery of the Mississippi by De Soto. What thoughts must have passed through De Soto's mind as he gazed upon that mighty stream for the first time! It is inspiring to look upon that picture. It is inspiring to read the explorations of the Mississippi by Marquette and Joliet. It is inspiring to think of the pioneers who, in the crude vessels of their day, made their way on the Mississippi River to new and distant homes. It will, however, be still more inspiring to see it become the useful, patient, and helpful servant of the millions that are now here and of the millions that are yet to come. To-day the Mississippi is ready to bear our burdens. It beckons us to make use of its might and power. It will be the part of wisdom to heed that appeal.

In youth, as a rule, we are care free. Generally speaking, not until we grow older do we realize the need of conserving our resources. Nations are much like individuals. In the early days the United States took but little heed. For instance, it permitted its forests to be destroyed with almost reckless abandon. Now, however, we as a people are beginning to see that a new policy must be adopted, that the rights of posterity must be guarded and protected, that we are trustees for all the ages, and that waste of our natural resources is wholly unjustifiable and indefensible.

Let us, therefore, utilize the great Mississippi. It has vast possibilities. It may be made an important factor in the development of our country. Let us adopt an adequate plan for its improvement. Half-way measures are not sufficient. Such measures are little better than none. Along some lines half-way measures may have considerable value, but not in improving a great river like the Mississippi.

I want to indorse most emphatically the provision that has been incorporated in the pending river and harbor bill for improving the Mississippi between St. Louis and Minneapolis. It is a complete plan and by all means should be adopted. If put into operation it will surely justify itself.

In this connection I want to express my high regard for the men in private life who through the years have constantly stressed and emphasized the importance of the Mississippi. Many obstacles have arisen from time to time, but these men have never wearied. On their part it has been a fine patriotic service. They have not hoped for any gain or reward. Their only expectation has been to serve their people and their country. Let us commend their spirit. Let us emulate their devotion.

Permit me now to call your special attention to the proposed improvement of the harbor at Fort Madison. The facts clearly show that this improvement would not be necessary had it not been for the action of the Federal Government. Such being the case, surely it is only fair and right that this improvement should be made by the Federal Government. If the people of Fort Madison, high-minded and honorable as they are, did not have a just and valid claim, I assure you that they would not ask for aid from the Federal Government.

These are the facts: The city of Keokuk is situated in the Mississippi Valley, 21 miles below Fort Madison. In 1913 the dam across the Mississippi at Keokuk was completed. This, as you know, is one of the great dams of the world. The construction of this dam was authorized by an act of Congress. It could not have been built without such an act. Therefore the Federal Government is properly chargeable with direct responsibility for the existence of the dam. As a result of this dam a large lake was formed, extending up the river 45 or 50 miles, from Keokuk to Burlington. This lake is of sufficient width and depth to make navigation on it dangerous in high winds and storms. In order to make navigation safe, vessels on the lake must have a place of refuge. Fort Madison is the logical place for a refuge harbor. Its size and location make it so. It is the only city between Keokuk and Burlington and lies on the Mississippi about midway between the two.

As it is vessels can not land at Fort Madison during high winds and storms. To enable them to do that the harbor must be protected. As the conditions making protection of the harbor necessary have all been brought about by the Federal Government, I know of no reason why the Federal Government should not provide the necessary protection. Before the construction of the dam at Keokuk there was no lake at Fort Madison, and before the lake came into existence there was no danger in navigation there and no need of a protected harbor. If a court of equity had jurisdiction, does anyone doubt that it would hold the Federal Government liable? Certainly not. Congress should do justice as fully and completely as would a court of equity.

In 1914, when the city of Fort Madison began to see the effects of the dam upon the harbor, it constructed a breakwater to form a protection for that part of the wharf used by small boats. This breakwater has been partly destroyed by the waves and must be repaired without delay if it is to be of further service. Time has demonstrated that this breakwater, even when repaired, will not be sufficient. There must be another breakwater for the large vessels, this to be located at the new modern river terminal which Fort Madison proposes to construct. The purpose, therefore, is to repair the small breakwater at once at an estimated cost of $10,000, and to construct a large breakwater, 450 feet in length, at an estimated cost of $31,000, when the city of Fort Madison shall provide a modern river terminal at the foot of Pine Street. Maintenance of $300 per year is also included. Less than this can not be done and make navigation upon the lake safe again. It is the very minimum.

Even if this entire improvement is made, Fort Madison will still suffer loss. The money it spent in 1914 for the breakwater above referred to will never be repaid. The city front has been greatly damaged by the waters of the lake, and no allowance will be made for that. At the very best, therefore, the city of Fort Madison will be a heavy loser. On the other hand, even if the Federal Government makes all of the proposed improvement, it will still be far ahead. The formation of the lake made a good channel in the river for the entire length of the lake, whereas if the lake had not been formed it would have required a large sum to make a proper channel. The benefit from the lake to the main channel will far exceed what the Government may pay for the proposed improvement. But even if the Government should actually sustain a loss it would still be its duty to make the improvement, for human life is at stake. The people are entitled to safety. Navigation was safe before the dam was built. It must be made safe again. A condition that endangers life is wholly intolerable.

In behalf of the city of Fort Madison I appeal to you for naught except that to which it is rightfully entitled. The people of that city are not asking for a gift; they do not want one. They simply want that which is justly due them. They had a safe harbor before the dam was built. All they ask is that this be restored to them. They submit their case to your reason and conscience.

It should also be borne in mind that the people of Fort Madison are not the only ones affected. Every passenger, every owner of a vessel, and every shipper of merchandise is vitally concerned in safe navigation on this lake. Such a danger spot must not be permitted to exist on the Mississippi.

In conclusion let me say that the pending bill is a comprehensive and well-considered measure, and has my earnest and hearty support. I am for it not simply because it takes care of the Mississippi. I am for it because it gives fair and proper consideration to all parts of the country. It is constructed upon broad and patriotic lines and deserves the support of every Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Section 500 of the transportation act provides:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote, encourage, and develop water transportation, service, and facilities in connection with the commerce of the United States, and to foster and preserve in full vigor both rail and water transportation.

That expresses perfectly my attitude in regard to this very important question. However, we of the interior feel that that declaration is not being lived up to, and I invite your attention to the attitude of some important railroad people as expressed only a few months ago in an intermediate rate conference at Salt Lake City, when the freight-traffic manager of one of the great western roads was asked this question by Mr. Prickett, attorney for the Intermediate Rate Association:

> Mr. Blakeley, you agree with us, I guess, that the Panama Canal was built for the benefit of the entire country.
>
> Mr. BLAKELEY. I can not agree to that at all.
>
> Mr. PRICKETT. Sir?
>
> Mr. BLAKELEY. I can not agree to that.
>
> Mr. PRICKETT. For whose benefit was it constructed? Is it your idea that it should be for the benefit of the entire country, the entire territory?

Mr. BLAKELEY. No; I will say this: That from the time of the advancement of that proposition the railroads—at least the railroad that I am employed with—opposed it and tried to get the interests of the interior States to join in objecting to the construction. We felt then, and we feel now, that the ultimate result will be that the manufacturing of the country is going to be done on the seaboard, and that the interior and the Mississippi River territory are all going to be prejudiced by canal operation. We would all be better off if somebody filled it in.

There came another railroad man immediately after Mr. Blakeley concluded his testimony, Mr. Burnham, of the Great Northern.

Do you agree with Mr. Blakeley—

Asked Senator GOODING, of Idaho—

that the Panama Canal should never have been built and ought to be filled in?

I will do that; yes—

Replied Mr. Burnham.

Is there any other railroad man that agrees with that statement—

Asked Senator GOODING—

I think you ought to go on record, because I think that is a dangerous expression from an American citizen; I don't care if he is a railroad man.

To that Mr. Blakeley said, in rejoinder:

I said the intermountain and western country would be better off if it had not been built, if it were filled up.

Why? Because they make a competitive rate to the Pacific coast points and want to tax the interior to balance the thing up. I pointed out to you a month ago that the railroads were proposing to make a rate of $1.10 a hundred on dry goods from Chicago to the Pacific coast points and charge all intermediate points, beginning out in Iowa and Kansas and Nebraska, and continuing the rate on through the intermountain territory, of $1.58 a hundred pounds.

What are they proposing with regard to steel? They are hauling steel from Chicago to San Francisco for the Chinamen for 40 cents a hundred and for the American in San Francisco for $1 a hundred. They are now proposing to continue, in an application now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, to haul the steel from Chicago to San Francisco for the Chinamen for 40 cents a hundred but to reduce the rate to the people in San Francisco to 80 cents, but they want to continue the rate to Salt Lake City and on back as far as some point in western Nebraska at $1 a hundred. In other words, they can haul a car of steel from Chicago to San Francisco for the Chinamen for $320, but to haul it to San Francisco for an American citizen living in San Francisco they want $640, while they want to charge Salt Lake City and points back in Kansas and Nebraska $800 a car, or two and a half times as much as they charge the Chinaman for three times as long a haul.

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

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, all of this discussion, while exceedingly enlightening and helpful, is not germane to the bill and should properly come up under an interstate commerce bill. Debate has been exhausted, and I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the two minutes requested by the gentleman from Washington all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that at the end of two minutes all debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto shall cease. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the vice president of the Southern Pacific Railroad says that even $800 to Salt Lake City and for those points in western Kansas and Nebraska is not enough, that it ought to be $984 a car, while they are hauling steel for export to San Francisco, 1,600 miles farther, for $320.

Now, the chairman of the committee says this discussion is not germane to the bill. I want to point out that there has been $1,200,000,000 expended on canals, harbors, and waterways. We maintain that the usefulness of that expenditure has been reduced at least 50 per cent by the interstate commerce law and the rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the law. There is pending at this time in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House the so-called Gooding bill, which passed the Senate last session, which is meant to correct this condition and prevent the throttling of water transportation by the railroads. It has come to us from many sources that this bill is going to be kept in the committee until too late for us to get any action on it during this session of Congress. We do not want to believe a great committee of the House will smother a bill that concerns 50,000,000 people. We want you to know that this discussion is germane to this bill, because we are not primarily interested in railroads or boats but we are vitally interested in transportation. We want to go along with you on water transportation and we want you to go along with us on the long-and-short-haul proposition, not for nor against railroads but in the interest of all the people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be made by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, such investigations as may be necessary for the preparation of a general plan for the most effective navigation improvement in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power on those navigable streams of the United States and their tributaries where such power development appears feasible and practicable, together with an estimate and report of the cost of conducting such investigations as to all such streams and tributaries, at a cost not to exceed $500,000, with recommendation that $250,000 be immediately appropriated.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my limited time I shall not have the opportunity to discuss generally the improvement of inland waterways, but only that phase of it which directly affects the constituency which I have the honor to represent.

I believe in the systematic improvement of all inland waterways, where practical, for the general good, and in the improvement of the Missouri River for my particular locality and constituency.

I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NEWTON] some time ago wherein he quoted Mr. David Lloyd-George in regard to the waste entailed by allowing the Mississippi to flow idly and unused by St. Louis—a great river capable of bearing on its tide the products of a great agricultural empire and sending them out to the seven seas. Had the former premier of the British Empire stood at Kansas City as he stood at St. Louis he might have truly said the same of the Missouri River; for it, too, is a great river—one of the greatest on the globe. From St. Louis it stretches its prodigious length 2,900 miles, and if we measure it from the Gulf of Mexico it has a length of 4,200 miles. Its mean volume of water is one of the most constant of the great rivers of the globe, hurling over 100,000 cubic feet of water into the Mississippi at St. Louis every second, and as it mingles with the Mississippi it dominates the Father of Waters and gives to the Mississippi the color of its tawney tide from St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico. In fact, from every rule of naming a river, it should have been called the Missouri from Montana to the Gulf of Mexico.

Here is one of the richest valleys in the world, with 500,000 square miles of fertile fields where God with spendthrift generosity has flung into the lap of the prairies the wealth of a continent—prairies whose opulence of production is only in its dawn. We got our title to most of it from Napoleon, and when he authorized the treaty by which it was ceded to the United States he touched the map with the tips of his fingers and declared, "There will be the richest valley in the world;" and his judgment has long since been justified, yet we have only scratched the surface of this vast empire. But if the great Middle West is to continue to prosper it must have adequate transportation facilities at reasonable and equitable rates.

Between it and the seaboard stretches nearly 1,000 miles of railroads, but these railroads can not keep pace with the production of this vast area. The increase in production is many fold over the increase in transportation facilities. Our railroad facilities are inadequate to meet the demand of our producers, so transportation is delayed and the producer and the consumer are alike losers. This condition exists by reason of our failure to improve our inland waterways as well as our commerce on the high seas. Our fathers who formed this Government did better.

When Alexander Hamilton faced that hostile convention in New York called to ratify or reject the Constitution of the United States, one of his most impelling arguments was his declaration that England with her subsidies had driven the commerce of the Colonies from the seas. He plead for a government to which the Constitution gave the power to encourage and protect a merchant marine, and his final triumph in securing the ratification by the New York convention was largely influenced by this fact. At his suggestion the second law passed by the First Congress under the Constitution was one for the protection and encouragement of our merchant marine, and influenced by that sort of legislation during the first quarter of a century of our existence as a nation under the Constitution our commerce and merchant marine flourished, until in 1825 Webster truly said:

> We have a commerce that leaves no seas unexplored; navies that take no law from superior force.

But internal dissension and domestic differences diverted our efforts from that course for over three-quarters of a century, so that when President Roosevelt sent our fleet around the globe it was necessary to employ 37 foreign vessels to transport food for the 15,000 men, because we had no ships available. And in the World War, when this country had organized and equipped 4,000,000 men to deal the deciding blow for the free peoples of the earth and their democratic ideals, it was necessary to employ British ships to transport our troops and provisions, because we had no ships of our own. England presented a bill of $282,000,000 for transporting our men and supplies. I am not criticizing the bill, but I am criticizing the monumental stupidity by which our Nation was caught in such a dilemma.

I plead for a systematic and sustained improvement of the Missouri River, as well as of the other navigable rivers of this country. There are those who question the navigability of the Missouri River, but to those who are conversant with the history of the Missouri River there can be no doubt of its navigability. At Kansas City when the public-spirited enterprise of Lawrence M. Jones and others brought a steamboat and its cargo to Kansas City from St. Louis in 1906 the cannon boomed, the whistles blew, and bells rang, as if for the first time it had been demonstrated that the Missouri River was navigable. But only the most superficial knowledge of this old river is necessary to convince one that it is navigable now as it was over half a century ago, when the Missouri River was a teeming artery of trade and when the old river steamboat was the cradle of commerce of the West.

It was in the shadow of the smoke of the old pioneer river steamboat that civilization and Christianity reared their first altars in the western wilderness. Protected and nourished by that river commerce in the pioneer days, now and then, here and there, a little village straggled out of the fringe of the desert to become the busy mart of yesterday and the metropolis of to-day. Kansas City, Leavenworth, Atchison, St. Joseph, Council Bluffs, Omaha, Sioux City, Yankton, and a score of other towns grew up under the impulse of this pioneer steamboat traffic.

Before the Civil War and for some time thereafter the country adjacent to the river was dependent upon the steamboat for transportation, and that river traffic was the foundation of the prosperity and greatness of St. Louis. At the inception of that river traffic the great West was a vast untamed wilderness. At its close, when the railroad usurped the rich heritage of its commerce, it was a region wearing the insignia of culture and refinement, a country dotted with busy cities, and of unusual agricultural importance, an empire dedicated to an unshackled civilization, and pregnant with incomparable opportunity. By the magic of that river traffic "the wilderness and solitary places" had "blossomed as the rose."

In those pioneer days a steamboat used to pass Kansas City, en route to St. Joseph, every day. I have been often told by pioneers of Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo., that it was no unusual sight to see from 8 to 10 steamboats at the Kansas City and Quindaro landings—the latter place now only a memory, but once the rival of Westport Landing. In that old fleet of steamboats that used to ply the Missouri we know that there were between 700 and 1,000. Of that fleet there is left nothing save the romance of its history. If that phantom fleet could be reassembled to-day upon the bosom of the old Missouri, and each boat given 400 feet, the procession would reach from Kansas City beyond Leavenworth, a distance of about 30 miles.

But that commerce, valuable as it was, was not won without danger and difficulty. The fact is that the barriers to navigation in those days were infinitely greater than they are to-day. At many places along the river the country was infested with bands of hostile Indians. The steamboat was the advance agent of civilization and the savage resisted it with devilish persistence. There were no snag boats to rid the river of the greatest enemy of the steamboat and improvement by the Government was not dreamed of. Yet, with all the handicaps during this great development of the West, a rich river commerce flourished, and it was left for this generation to question the navigability of this great waterway which was a great artery of trade and commerce before the birth of this generation. If three score years ago, I ask, with all the disadvantages of the frontier to contend with, such a traffic could be sustained, what may we not do to-day with all our improvements and the perfection of marine construction of these modern days?

The Missouri has not changed since the pioneer days—unless perhaps it has improved. Of course, it changes its channel now and then and here and there carries off a farm. I am told that it changes its channel so often between Iowa and Nebraska that the proud inhabitants of those great States are not always sure whether they are over in Nebraska voting for Bryan or over in Iowa, "where the tall corn grows," voting for the junior United States Senator from that imperial Commonwealth. Even though changeable as a woman's mind, and fickle as the wind, it is still the same great waterway that Marquette found in 1673; the same great river that three score years ago carried on its tide the commerce of a vast pioneer country.

It must be conceded by all fair-minded men that railroad facilities can not keep pace with production over the vast Middle West. Some time before his death the late James J. Hill estimated that in the great Middle West production had increased 126 per cent in the preceding decade, while transportation facilities had only increased 22 per cent for the same time. The railroads can not keep pace with production.

It must not be understood that this agitation for river improvement is born of antagonism to the railroads or that it is organized opposition to the railroads and railroad interests. The influence of the railroads upon the development of the West can not be estimated. We understand the vital importance of this sort of transportation and how in the economy of civilization and in the history of the world transportation and commerce have marched hand in hand with Christianity in the conquest of the world.

I remember as a child when I lived out in Kansas where the great prairies stretched their endless vistas toward the western sea, out where there was no tree nor shrub to break the monotony of the vast horizon, that the first and only thing that reminded me of my home in Iowa was the whistle and roar of the old pioneer Santa Fe engine. It was out along the old Santa Fe and Union Pacific lines that civilization threw out her first lean, thin picket lines. The pioneer and the railroads were comrades in a common battle against the desert, and no one knows, save him who has experienced it, what a desperate fight the desert, malignant and jealous of its ancient sway, put up to hurl back the advance guard of civilization. The old pioneer railroad helped the rugged frontiersman with his naked hands to push back the frontier toward the setting sun.

The movement for the improvement of inland waterways is not antagonistic to the railroad interests, and it is a demonstrated fact, both in this country and in Europe, that where railroads parallel a navigable stream the railroad profits will increase if the stream is systematically navigated; that while the waterway carries the more bulky commodities the railroads carry the lighter and more profitable kinds of freight, and do it efficiently and promptly.

I have seen 250,000 bushels of wheat piled upon the ground where it lay for a month in Kansas because there were not enough cars to carry it away. If that grain could float down the Missouri in barges with other farm products, the railroads could handle it to the river promptly and other freight as well.

Every foreigner who visits our country marvels at the waste of our idle waterways. Our people themselves do not realize the importance of these waterways. They do not seem to know that water transportation is the cheapest in the world; that if our rivers were properly improved it would add from 4 to 6 cents per bushel to their wheat and other grain, and in doing so would increase the value of every acre of land in the great valleys of the Middle West. It would bring raw material up

the river at low rates, cheapen the cost of manufactured products, and encourage the development of industrial life which would consume the products of their land.

The logic of inland waterway improvement must be carried to the grass roots, and the people must learn that river transportation is not only the first potential factor in the taming of the desert and the conquest of the plains, but that it, too, will help to solve the problems of the farmer of the great Middle West.

Adequate improvement of the Missouri River is an economic necessity if the Middle West is to prosper. The systematic navigation of the Missouri River will put a vast agricultural empire in cheap and direct communication with the markets from which it is now virtually excluded. The farmer and the merchant of the great prairies must learn that an ounce of Missouri River navigation will do more to lower and equalize freight rates than a pound of legislation; that hundreds of millions in value would be added to the farm lands in the territory affected by it; that it would open up inaccessible coal fields estimated to cover 30,000,000 of acres; and that would reduce the cost of fuel in every furnace from Fort Benton to the Gulf of Mexico. It would add value to every bushel of grain and every pound of pork or beef raised on the 500,000 square miles of land in the valley through which the river runs.

When the people thoroughly realize this there will go up an imperative demand for systematic river improvement that will be heard and heeded here in Washington, and when that occurs a new and brighter era will dawn for the great Central West and the modest little town on the Missouri to-day will become the metropolis of to-morrow.

I was about to say that you could not build a great city without water. That may sound like it, but it is not meant as a reflection on Milwaukee. There were, anterior to Greece, three great commercial powers—Babylon, Phœnicia, and Carthage—and the foundation of their greatness was their water traffic. Babylon, with the Euphrates running through its heart. Phœnicia, whom tradition gives credit for the invention of the alphabet and books; Phœnicia, who scattered her arts to the western world; Phœnicia, whose fleets covered every sea. And Carthage, which so long flung defiance at the power of Rome; Carthage, whose armies behind Hannibal thundered at the very gates of Rome; Carthage, whose commerce brought hissing through the teeth of Cato the curse of Rome, "Delenda est Carthago." And Rome never conquered Carthage until she had stained the Mediterranean red with Punic blood and swept the commerce of Carthage from the sea.

Turner, one of the greatest of modern landscape painters, painted a canvas, and he called it "The Building of Carthage." And what did he paint? Was it the gilded domes of Carthage that challenged the sunrise? Was it blocks of marble rising into stately temples or lifting granite walls that shouldered out the sky? Like every great work of art, it was the refinement of simplicity—a little boy and a little girl sailing a toy ship by the side of the restless, pulsing sea; and it was a triumph of artistic expression.

The same is true in our modern days. Why has old England dominated the commerce of the world and made English the language of commerce? Because "Britannia rules the wave." England is "mistress of the seas." The one monumental blunder of this country has been the neglect of its water transportation, inland and on the sea. The flag of our country is all but driven from the high seas. Before the war we were paying England, France, and Germany over $200,000,000 annually for ocean transportation. With like stupidity we have neglected our inland waterways.

Had we followed the example of the founders of this Republic we would not thus be exposed to the danger of being caught "naked to our enemies." It is the patriotic duty of Congress to promote not only the improvement and development of our inland waterways but our ocean traffic as well.

In the district which I have the honor to represent we have a city of the greatest potential significance situated at the mouth of the Kaw—Kansas City, Kans., divided from Kansas City, Mo., only by a line in the center of a street. A city which in the value of its manufactured products ranks sixteenth in importance in the United States. A city whose packing industry, the second in the United States, purchases over $150,000,000 worth of livestock for slaughter every year. A city within whose bounds is situated the Fairfax industrial district, which, when completed, will be the most perfect of its kind in this or any other country. A city whose school system and colleges are unrivaled. A great home-owning city. A city whose continued prosperity, like that of its sister city, Kansas City, Mo., depends largely upon the improvement and navigation of the Missouri River. Make the Missouri River again a teeming artery of trade and no limit can be placed upon the growth and greatness of these two eminent cities of the great Central West. [Applause.]

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Chairman, I want as a matter of general interpretation of this bill, for the RECORD at least, to see if I understand it correctly.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. HOCH. The opening paragraph provides for the adoption of a number of projects, and then it provides that only $10,000,000 may be spent each year upon those projects. As we get along, particularly to this item that we now have under consideration—the Missouri River—that is an old project already adopted. It will not be construed, will it, that its readoption in a somewhat modified form here will be held to be such an adoption within the meaning of the opening paragraph, where the expenditures must come within this $10,000,000?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The provisions as to the Ohio, the Missouri, and the Mississippi Rivers are not, any of them, submitted, and the Chief of Engineers advises us that they will not cost any money. It is simply to make changes and adapt them to modern conditions. At the time of the adoption of the Mississippi project we did not have any long barges, as we now have, and we did not anticipate that we needed cutting off the sharp turns.

Mr. HOCH. I was wondering whether the adoption of that language there will force the expenditures upon the Missouri River to come within this $10,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; because the Chief of Engineers advises us that the modification of these projects will entail no additional expenditure, and that they will be brought within the limit of the original projects. It is a modification, not as to cost and expenditure but as to method of construction alone. It is not a matter of expenditure at all.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then I take it that what the gentleman says about the Missouri River likewise applies also to the Ohio and the Mississippi.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. That is my understanding.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This does not affect the Ohio.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. There is no modification of the Ohio project.

Mr. HOCH. It does modify the Missouri project. It ought to be understood that that is not a new project, so that the money spent under that would not come under the $10,000,000 limitation.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. No. The Secretary explained that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 349, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document: *Provided*, That the amount hereby authorized to be expended shall not exceed the sum of $6,500,000.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LINEBERGER: At the end of line 2, page 9, insert "*And provided*, That in computing the local contribution for breakwater construction contemplated by the report mentioned local interests shall be given credit, according to the estimated costs as given in the report, for such portions of the work as may be constructed or contracted for by them with the approval of the Chief of Engineers prior to the commencement of work by the Government."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want to know how much this changes this authorization?

Mr. LINEBERGER. In no degree whatever.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does it not go back and pick up some amounts?

Mr. LINEBERGER. It changes in no way whatever the authorization. It simply permits the cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles, which are to meet the breakwater appropriation, 50 per cent of it, to spend under the direction of the Chief of Engineers and by his permission any moneys which they are to contribute to this project at this time, because the Government appropriation will not become available for nearly two years.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman remembers that in the Army appropriation bill there was a provision carried on the 50-50 basis, was there not, on the representation that the city or county would furnish 50 per cent?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Why, then, the necessity of this amendment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not understand that the amendment is offered with the intention of pressing it at this time before the House. It is offered for the information of the House, to show what there is in the situation.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I simply offer the amendment at this time with the understanding that if it is not acceptable it will be withdrawn. I make that statement as a preliminary to my remarks. I hope, however, that there will be no objection to it when I have made my explanation.

The amendment is offered for the specific purpose of permitting the city of Los Angeles and the city of Long Beach, who are contributing to the breakwater item in this project to the extent of paying 50 per cent of the cost thereof, to spend funds which have already been raised and which are now available for this project, subject to the approval of the Chief of Engineers, so that they may be given credit for this work when the project is ultimately completed. Otherwise such moneys as they might spend on the project would not be credited as local contribution to the project.

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

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will be glad to.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the gentleman know whether any other cities of the United States are doing as well as his city, proposing to go 50-50 on these improvements?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I have no criticism to make of other cities of the United States, but I will say that our project is somewhat unique in this respect. We have a great harbor out there, and we realize that it is essential for us to back our views and our hopes and aspirations for this great project with our own money, and we have voluntarily offered to do this.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania. If this were now accepted, would it mean that the Government was obliged to complete that project?

Mr. LINEBERGER. No. It simply means that this money will be spent in accordance with plans approved by the Government. I hope under the circumstances the committee will adopt the amendment. It is merely an amendment which clarifies the situation, and which permits us to spend money which we have raised and upon which I understand we are now paying interest.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in order that I may ask a question of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that there was rather a firm agreement on the part of the majority and minority members of the committee to the effect that no substantial amendments would be countenanced on the floor by the committee.

In other words, that nothing would be looked upon with favor that increased in any way the obligation of the Government with reference to this bill. I do not understand that the amendment offered by my friend in any way involves any increase of obligation, but is merely by way of interpretation of what might be called existing law.

Mr. LINEBERGER. That is it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And it does not seem to me that an amendment of that purport would in the slightest degree violate the agreement entered into by the majority and minority members of the committee.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will say that I spoke to the majority leader about the matter at the suggestion of the chairman, and he has no objection whatever to the amendment. It is merely a clarifying amendment, and I hope the chairman will see fit to accept it. If there is any reason for changing it, or if there are any suggestions to be made about changing its wording that can be done in the Senate. I shall have no objection to any wording which the chairman or the Senate committee may see fit to substitute as long as the principle underlying my amendment is carried out.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman will yield, the understanding of the chairman is that there was not only a discussion of the general question of the attitude of the committee toward amendments, but there was a discussion of the attitude of the committee toward the particular amendment suggested. I will say frankly that the chairman and the members of the committee, as I understand it, would be glad to admit this particular amendment, but in view of the fact that we were fearful that other amendments might be offered and we might get into a crowd of amendments here, the committee adopted the rule, as I understood it, specifically with regard to this amendment that we would oppose it. We do not oppose it on the ground that it is wrong, but simply because we believe that we should not get into the question of amendments here on the floor. It is simply in pursuance of what I understand to have been the action of the committee and to observe good faith toward all that I suggest that the amendment be not pressed now.

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

Mr. LINEBERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say to the committee that gentlemen have been suggesting to the committee since we entered upon the consideration of the bill, from time to time, numerous amendments. Many of them we would be glad to accept, but we feel it is not safe and is not proper to accept them. This bill can be passed in its present form, and we do not believe it is safe to admit amendments. The difficulty is, as I say, that we not only have dealt with that question generally but we have dealt with it specifically as to this particular amendment, and I do not see how, as far as the committee is concerned, we can do anything else except to call to the attention of the gentleman who offers it the fact that we did take that action. I understand it was taken with his acquiescence, and I do not see how in good faith we can do anything except to ask that the amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, that is a matter between the chairman of the committee, the other members of the committee, and the gentleman from California, but the observation I made was along another line.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I understand that.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] is absolutely correct in his statement regarding the matter, but this amendment is of a vitally different character from any other amendment that could possibly be offered to this bill. As a matter of fact, gentlemen, on a $3,500,000 contribution on the part of local interests it means from $125,000 to $150,000 a year in interest. I am perfectly willing to withdraw the amendment with the understanding that the chairman and those of the committee who may form the conferees on the part of this House will use their influence to the end that this amendment be inserted in the Senate committee, because it is absolutely essential if we are not to be severely penalized. I do not want to jam up the machinery or to throw a monkey wrench into it; neither do I want to break faith with the committee. But this amendment is very essential, either here or in the Senate. It is very vital so far as this project is concerned, and I would like to have a statement from the chairman, if he can consistently give it, as to what we may expect in the matter.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not think it would be advisable—and I do not think the gentleman, as he reflects, will believe—that those who may possibly be conferees should at this time state what their action will be. Of course, we will be subject to the instructions of the House. I will say frankly, as an individual and not as chairman of the committee, but simply as one who has investigated the amendment which the gentleman has offered, that I believe at the proper time, but not on the passage of this bill in this House, the gentleman should have the relief he seeks, and I do not believe there are going to be any instructions from this House contrary to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Would it not be a totally illogical position for this committee to assume that this amendment, which is meritorious and which the chairman of the committee acknowledges to be meritorious, should be withdrawn merely because some other amendment might be proposed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I do not think so. There is just one course which the committee has unanimously agreed to adopt and that is to resist amendments.

We have agreed to it, and there is no other way to keep faith among ourselves or to secure the passage of the bill as it is, except by standing by the agreement.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The committee is keeping faith, but I submit, in all fairness, the gentleman ought to permit this House to pass upon a good amendment. I can understand the gentleman's desire to resist bad amendments, but to hold that you are going to resist good or bad amendments in order to keep faith without giving the committee as a whole the right to pass upon a good amendment, it seems to me is illogical.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I do not desire to continue the discussion, neither shall I break faith with the committee; therefore I ask leave to withdraw the amendment, with the hope that those who oppose it here now for technical reasons will heartily favor its insertion in the Senate committee or in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Petaluma Creek, Calif., in accordance with the report submitted in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 3, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in connection with the introduction of this bill some few days ago a very distinguished local editor made some rather pointed comments concerning "pork-barrel" legislation. A few days following this General Taylor, of the Corps of Engineers, replied thereto with a very convincing rejoinder. Subsequent to that reply of General Taylor another distinguished local engineer entered the controversy and made a counterattack upon the bill, using again this language so familiar to everyone in connection with the consideration of a river and harbor bill, namely, "pork barrel."

For the purpose of satisfying my own mind and for the purpose of the record, I will just turn to one item in the bill wherein occurs the word which seems to be the particular target of every paragrapher who wants to take a wallop at Congress in connection with the consideration of bills of this sort. I do not know about the merits of this particular item, but I have simply selected it among a number of other "creeks," so called, in order to take advantage of the opportunity to ask the chairman if he will not kindly tell us exactly what steps are taken with reference to the improvement that we now have under consideration. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the chairman of the committee, for the purpose of enlightening the committee, and through the committee the House and the country, give us this information with reference to this particular item in order that we may know whether or not items that have no merit in themselves easily slip into these well-considered bills. Will the chairman favor us with that information?

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is, first, in the adoption of any project a provision for a survey. This survey is made by the resident engineer. If he finds that the project is unworthy, that ends it. If he finds it is worthy, the project then goes to the district engineer, and the same thing is done there. He either condemns it, which ends it, or if he favors it it then goes on to the Board of Engineers here in Washington. The Board of Engineers has the same prerogative. If it condemns the project, it is killed. If not, it goes to the Chief of Engineers, and then the Chief of Engineers is the final target which it must pass. Each one of these four separate steps entails a separate examination of all the data available, and only as a result of an approval finally by the Chief of Engineers does it come before the committee for consideration.

If the gentleman will let me say a word further on this question of "creeks" I will give the gentleman an illustration of what the improvement of creeks means from the four following actual experiences.

Mr. KETCHAM. All relating, may I ask the chairman, to so-called "creeks"?

Mr. DEMPSEY. All of them. Petaluma Creek, Calif., has been improved at an expenditure of $331,895. This creek carries annually a traffic of over 250,000 tons, with a value in 1923 of over $21,000,000. Newtown Creek, N. Y., has had expended on it $834,000. It carries annually between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 tons of commerce with a value of $445,000,000. They are the 1925 figures. East Chester Creek, N. Y., has had expended on it only $265,282. That creek carried in 1923, 576,787 tons of freight of a value of $6,276,751. Wappinger Creek, N. Y., has had expended on it almost nothing—thirty-two thousand and some dollars—but in 1923 it carried 38,939 tons of freight of a value of $7,963,818.

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

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two additional minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KETCHAM. I ask this extension, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the indulgence of the Chairman one minute further. Does the same policy with reference to every so-called "creek" that finds a place in this bill characterize the proceedings taken before the committee include an item?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The procedure is exactly the same. I would say to the gentleman that in many instances, of course, the preliminary examination does not result in a survey. It entails a very small expenditure, on an average about $5, to make the preliminary survey, and really it entails no additional expenditure because we appropriate a lump sum for all surveys. So if there be 300 surveys or if there be only 30 the same amount is expended on all of them, and the engineering force always makes the examinations come within the lump sum.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, is there anything to this very delicious and widespread humor concerning "creek" appropriations?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would say to the gentleman that there is no business, for instance there is no system of railroads but what occasionally has a failure. You are bound occasionally in anything you undertake to make mistakes, but there are fewer mistakes in number and in value in river and harbor appropriations than in any other line of appropriation made by Congress, and that is because we have infinitely more safeguards thrown around them.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time may be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the rivers and harbors items in the Army bill there is an appropriation of $40,000,000 which was based on the report of the engineers, and if it had reached $54,000,000, as reported, the little rivers in the United States which the newspapers delight to say Congress is spending its money on—all these little rivers only get $83,000?

Mr. KETCHAM. I did not recall the exact figures, but I knew the amount was so small as to be almost negligible in an appropriation of this size. And it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that an editorial like the one referred to, which attempts to discredit the whole program of waterway developments for the sake of a little humor, inexcusable even in a crossroads weekly, is unworthy of so trenchant a pen as that wielded by the great editor.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. And further, if the gentleman pleases, these same little rivers last year, according to the report of the engineer, carried over 7,000,000 tons of freight with a probable saving of a dollar a ton.

Mr. KETCHAM. I thank the gentleman for the information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ponce Harbor, P. R., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 532, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Supplementing what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] has just said relative to the various criticisms that are made and have been made in the past relative to river and harbor appropriations, I think to a very large extent that is an inheritance from the old times.

It was my privilege when I first came to Congress to serve on the Rivers and Harbors Committee. As I recall it, I opposed in my feeble way practically every bill before the committee during my term of service there. I did it very largely from the viewpoint that our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], took at that time when a member of the Senate, probably the best-versed man on rivers and harbors in our time and generation.

There was too much agreement in those days between the Members as to what should or should not go into the river and harbor bill, with a view of securing the necessary votes to pass the bill in the two branches. That was the factor in the opposition usually as far as I was concerned. The distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. BURTON, as I recall it, talked one of those measures to death at the expiration of a session of Congress. This bill, Mr. Chairman, as I see it, is framed in a very different manner. So far as the law is concerned, possibly it is the same. The process the chairman of the committee has just told us of has been in existence for a good many years, but it has not been rigidly lived up to. This bill I conceive, with what little study I have been able to give it, is framed in a very scientific manner and in a manner that will be productive of the best interests of navigation and commerce in the various projects affected. It is an economical bill. As our transportation needs have materially increased in recent years, they must be more generally cared for on the part of the Government, and the development of river navigation must keep pace with the demands of the times. I think the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, under the leadership of the able chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], is to be congratulated on the skill the committee has shown in making proper provisions for the navigation of rivers and harbors and the meritorious exclusion of items which have given rise to the so-called disagreeable phraseology of "pork." [Applause.]

I for one do not find items of that character in this bill, and therefore in spite of the fact that I am on record many times in opposition to river and harbor measures, it will be a privilege as well as a pleasure to vote for this bill, one which I think will redound to the general benefit of our country. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that all river and harbor projects heretofore, herein, and hereafter adopted shall be completed within five years from the passage of this act or of subsequent acts adopting such projects, if physically practicable: *Provided*, That in any case of such impracticability the Chief of Engineers shall clearly set forth the reasons therefor in his annual report.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the project to deepen the Hudson River, as proposed in this bill.

It has been one of the great arteries of commerce for considerably over a hundred years, especially since Robert Fulton first successfully introduced steam navigation and especially after the completion of the old Erie Canal. It is a great natural waterway with a depth for ocean-going vessels for a distance of 100 miles above the Battery, but because of insufficient depth from Hudson to Albany ocean vessels can not reach a distributing point.

Mr. Chairman, once the channel is opened, as proposed, its usefulness for navigation will never be impaired for want of an adequate supply of water to maintain its present level. It is fed from a lake in the Adirondacks which lies at an altitude of 4,322 feet above sea level. It is amply supplied with tributaries, the principal ones being the Mohawk, Indian, Schroon, Saconda, Hoosic, and the Croton Rivers; also the Batten Kill, Fish, Catskill, Esopus, Rondout, Kinderhook, Jansen Kill, Wappinger, and Fish Kill Creeks, many of which would be classed as rivers in some parts of the country. The largest tributary is the Mohawk River which supplies more water than the main stream of the Hudson. These larger rivers and creeks are supplemented with innumerable small streams and a watershed comprising approximately 8,100 square miles above Troy which insures an abundant and steady supply of water for navigation purposes.

The improvement proposed in this bill is of vital importance to the commercial, industrial, and agricultural interests of our State and of the country at large. The Hudson Valley itself has a larger population in proportion to its area than that of any other large stream in the United States, excepting the Delaware River. The great Trunk Line Railways of the New York State Barge Canal connect the rest of the State and the Great Lakes region with the Hudson Valley, with Albany as one of the chief receiving and distributing centers.

It was in 1807 that Robert Fulton first introduced steam navigation on the Hudson. That was 118 years ago. The water-borne traffic on the river since that time has been enormous and has at all times been of material benefit to a large portion of the United States. One of the contributing factors to the traffic on the Hudson was the Erie Canal. The first canal boat left Buffalo for New York October 26, 1825. The actual cost of the canal was $7,143,789, but by 1836 it had turned into the State treasury more than it cost. I find that "from 1817 to 1882, when tolls were abolished, the gross revenues of the Erie Canal were $121,461,871. The cost of operation and maintenance amounted to $29,270,301, showing a profit of $92,191,570. The cost of construction and enlargement in the same period amounted to $49,591,853; so a profit of $42,599,718 was shown." This item represents what was turned into the State treasury as profit. The greatest gain, however, was to the people at large in the reduction in freight rates. Statistics show that "the charge for transportation from Buffalo to Albany which had been $22 in 1824 fell to $4 per ton in 1835." The freight carried annually on the Erie Canal from 1825 to 1836 averaged more than 1,000,000 tons, which, based on the reduction in rate, saved shippers approximately $198,000,000 during that period.

Later the people of the State of New York authorized by popular vote the expenditure of $101,000,000 for the barge canal. A large section of the United States has benefited from this improvement, and it seems to me that in view of the contribution which the people of the State of New York have made to insure adequate water transportation and the benefits which the country has received because of it entitle them to favorable action on this item.

There is another reason why I am in favor of this bill. It is my firm belief that the time is not far distant when the Hudson River will be part of an all-American ship canal from the ocean to the Great Lakes. There is a measure now pending before Congress to authorize the construction of a ship canal from Albany to the Great Lakes. [Applause.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word about this provision. It does not prevent, and is not intended to prevent, the completion of the projects in less than five years. I call the attention of you gentlemen who live on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to this fact, that I have had recently an interview with the Secretary of War regarding the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. You know the Government is expending a great deal in barge lines on these rivers. The Secretary assures me that under appropriations made by the committee this year he will be able to allot to these rivers all that can be efficiently and economically expended. So those who live along the Ohio and Mississippi need have no fear that this provision will retard the progress of their work, and that they will have sufficient funds to prosecute the work on the rivers expeditiously.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows

Page 10, after line 22, insert:

"SEC. 2a. That, within limits to be prescribed by the Secretary of War, it shall not be lawful to throw, discharge, or deposit, or cause, suffer, or procure to be thrown, discharged, or deposited from any source whatever, any free acid or acid waste in any form, or any material which will become acid after being in the water, either directly or indirectly, into any navigable water of the United States, or into any tributary of any navigable water; and every such deposition of such free acid, acid waste, or acid-forming material shall be a separate offense, and where the deposition or flow is continuous each calendar day of its continuance shall be regarded as a separate offense."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the Clerk has read far enough to show that the amendment is not germane either to the bill or to the section where it is offered. The question of the pollution of streams is an entirely separate and different question from the improvement of navigation on those streams. The one has no possible or at the most a very remote relation to the other.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Mr. Chairman, my contention is that this has to do with navigation on navigable streams, in that the matter over which we seek to confer jurisdiction upon the War Department will be clearly shown and understood to interfere with navigation. The acids deposited in the streams interfere with the operation of the dams; as a matter of fact, it utterly destroys the metal parts of the dams. This is to protect Government property for the purchase or construction of which you are now legislating. I think it is germane to the bill providing for the expenditure of money for the promotion of navigation to enact legislation to protect the mediums of this navigation and to place with the War Department the right to issue regulations for the protection of the property of the Government in these streams under their jurisdiction. Surely the gentleman will not contend that the

War Department under existing law would have no jurisdiction over the protection of this property in the harbors or for any of the other purposes for which the money is authorized to be expended. The purpose of this amendment is to confer that jurisdiction upon the War Department to protect the property in the navigable streams.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The bill before us is well defined by its title—

A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

It does not deal with the subject even of navigation generally, or the control of navigation, but it deals with the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors. The suggestion the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROSENBLOOM] has made with reference to the effect of these acid wastes upon the preservation of such public works would be the only ground upon which his amendment possibly could be sustained, but the main purpose of his amendment goes much further than that. It is to prevent the pollution of the waters, and the danger to which he refers is only incidental thereto. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The purpose of my amendment is the result of four years of earnest effort to have the Federal Government take some jurisdiction over its property in the navigable streams of the country. It is utterly ridiculous to come here session after session and vote millions upon millions of dollars for the building of dams in our inland streams and other methods for the protection and advancement of navigation when at the same time the people along these streams have no more interest in this property than to utterly destroy it. We held hearing after hearing upon this matter, and General Beach, who was then in charge of this work for the Government, made the positive statement that it was useless to continue to improve inland waterways unless we undertook in some way to prevent the destruction of the property by depositing acids in these streams. In the hearings at that time, on page 276, he made the positive statement and cited instances where after nine years it was absolutely necessary to take out the metal parts of the dams constructed in these internal streams and that it is necessary for Congress to legislate. Along the Ohio River, Ohio will pass certain legislation and so will West Virginia, and farther down we have Kentucky, and so on, and unless the power is vested in the War Department to take charge of this matter the States are absolutely powerless.

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

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. If the gentleman's amendment should prevail, would it not, without notice, seriously affect the sewerage of a great many large towns and some of the smaller cities of the country?

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. In reply to that question, this bill is not nearly as strong as I would like to have presented the matter. It merely vests with the War Department the right to issue rules and regulations covering this practice of dumping deleterious matter into the streams. It does not make the dumping of the matter into the streams an overt act. It does not say that they have offended when they have actually deposited this harmful matter. It merely vests with the War Department the right to make rules and regulations, and for this reason: A drastic law preventing an offense might work untold hardship on many industries. It might require years to properly meet the problem, and that it is a problem must be admitted; and whether the Sixty-eighth Congress enacts legislation of this kind or not, in the years to come Congress will have to do so. In the early days when there were but few people living along the streams, with few industries offending in this way, the stream would naturally purify itself; but in the last few years, with the growth of population along the streams, with the increase in our industries, we have converted our internal navigable streams into nothing but open sewers for the deposits of all waste and acids, without any thought or consideration given to the people who must use that water in their daily supply, who have no other supply of water for their domestic purposes, who are confined to the use of that water. It is my purpose merely to grant this authority at this time to the War Department to meet this in its own way and in its own time, so that it might prevent some drastic legislation being enacted that would work a great deal of hardship to the industries who are now in opposition to the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the gentleman recall that at the last session a law was passed referring matters of this kind to the Secretary of War with instructions to make a report to the Congress within two years?

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. My recollection of the legislative situation is this——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 10, line 15, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I do, for this reason. I simply make this suggestion to you that it is not good legislative policy to set out in an act what the policy of the Congress is, because you can not bind the following Congresses. You set out a large program here. What is the necessity of trying to tie the hands of future Members? I do not think it is good policy. I think it sets a very bad precedent. While I am on my feet I want to call attention again to the difference between this bill and the bills that used to be brought in by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, in that the amount was set out in the bill after each project. If in the future you are going to adopt this policy I think it is a very bad policy, from which you will have to recede in the future, because I do not think the President of the United States when this bill comes to him can sit down and say that he can approve that bill and know what he is approving in its entirety. While it is true the report sets out the different amounts of each item, yet the statute does not do it, and the only time that rule has been changed was commenced in 1922 and followed by this bill. I think you will find that in the RECORD. If that is not correct, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, who so long served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, will know.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it has been the policy of this committee to report the bill always in just the form adopted here. It is the recognized principle, and has been, as the gentleman from Ohio said, ever since he has started to serve on that committee, so it dates back probably 25 years. Now, on the other question——

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will.

Mr. McKEOWN. I do not want to make a misstatement, but I have made a careful examination of the records and I find the other acts did set out the amount.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman is talking about the appropriation acts; he is not talking about the project acts.

Mr. McKEOWN. Just recently this committee gave up the practice of——

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, this committee has always had legislative authority. It has always passed bills in just the form this bill is presented, and in no other form, and there is no other form in which they could be passed. Now, passing to the second thing, and that is the adoption of a five-year policy: We have already adopted in this bill here the Mississippi, the Ohio, and Missouri Rivers, and if we do not adopt this section we single out those three rivers and name them alone and leave the rest of the country without the five-year policy, which would be an improper discrimination, which would not be fair or would not be nation-wide; and that is what we want to adopt—a nation-wide policy. We could probably have left out the three sections as to these three rivers; but having adopted them, it follows logically that we should adopt this section, which provides for all the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The improvement of the Missouri River from its mouth to the upper end of Quindaro Bend, in accordance with the existing project, with a view to completion within a period of five years from and after the passage of this act, in accordance with the general provision herein made as to completion of projects, and for the purpose of securing a permanent navigable channel with a minimum depth of 6 feet and a minimum width of 200 feet, with a reasonable additional width around the bend in said river.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the Rivers and Harbors Committee has never reported a bill authorizing the construction of projects and navigation improvements in our interior rivers so important to commerce on these rivers, so vital to industrial growth, so indispensable to joint navigation improvement and power development as is found in section 3 of the bill now before the House.

I congratulate the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the country, and thank the chairman of the committee for his forceful and unanswerable argument for the completion of the navigation-power survey of the Tennessee River and its tributaries. I consider the authorization in the bill and the direction of the Corps of Engineers to investigate and survey the navigable streams of our country and their tributaries one of the most constructive pieces of legislation ever proposed by the Rivers and Harbors Committee or ever considered by this House. [Applause.]

We very often read in the press, and the statement is frequently of late made with pride in Congress, that the Panama Canal is paying its way and the cost of its operation and maintenance, with reasonable interest on the investment. Whenever we survey the navigable rivers of this country and their tributaries and build navigation-power dams, flood control and reservoir dams, these navigation-power projects will not only pay for their maintenance and the cost of their operation, but power will pay also a reasonable rate of interest on the cost of their construction and in addition pay back to the Treasury through a retirement or sinking fund at a low rate of compound interest annually the entire cost of all such projects, and in the end they will have cost the Government nothing. [Applause.]

The Cumberland River in my State is a remarkable example and economic opportunity where it can be shown that the entire cost of the navigation power developments on this stream, using the credit of the Government only, will pay 3 or 4 per cent on the locks and dams, pay for their maintenance and operation, and return to the Treasury of the Government in a period of years the entire investment—give slack-water navigation and develop one of the most important and finest coal fields in this country.

Not long ago the Cumberland Hydroelectric Power Co. applied to the power commission for a preliminary permit for the construction of three high dams near Burnside, Ky., for power purposes on the upper Cumberland River and the south fork of the same—all three of these dams would provide slack-water pools leading directly into the coal fields, and in addition would increase the low-water flow and make feasible the development of power along that stretch of the Cumberland River which Congress had planned to improve with nine low-navigation dams with no power development at any of them. A preliminary permit was drawn up by the Federal Power Commission setting forth in detail and prescribing certain requirements which the power commission usually provides for in such cases, and then when the papers were fully satisfactory to the power commission they were sent over to the Chief of Engineers for his approval of the only question which the United States Government has any legal right to pass upon, namely, the question of navigation. The Chief of Engineers found that this preliminary permit provided only for long chutes through the dam, so that while these dams would bring slack water directly into the coal fields, no locks were provided for or other means that would make possible the shipment of coal through these dams.

In other words, in spite of the fact that since 1871 the United States Engineers had referred to the great coal field as the prospective source of important commerce on the Cumberland River, and had stated that "there are numerous outcrops of coal of a splendid quality from 2 to 5 feet in thickness along the banks of the river awaiting only its improvement to be mined and shipped to market," and in spite of the fact that the United States had been endeavoring for 37 years to bring satisfactory navigation to these coal fields and had expended more than $7,000,000 on the project, the Power Commission had so little information or interest in the navigation improvement that it proposed to permit these dams to be built from shore to shore and thus effectually prevent the development of any navigation in and out of the coal fields and the growth of a navigation traffic which would justify future improvements.

The Chief of Engineers declined to approve this preliminary permit, and when finally issued on March 24, 1924, this permit carried the following provisions:

> The permittee shall * * * provide in its plans and drawings of project works for locks and appurtenant navigation facilities at each of said dams, the general dimensions of such locks to be in accordance with instructions of the United States district engineer at Nashville, Tenn.
>
> With said plans the permittee shall submit an estimate in reasonable detail of the cost of installing the said locks and in making through navigation possible with the proposed draw down of the pools.

The Cumberland Hydroelectric Power Co. is now engaged in making the surveys under its two-year preliminary permit. The company's attorney at a public hearing held at Burnside, Ky., gave notice to the Government that the company is ready to make any reasonable arrangement with the Government to lease the three navigation-power dams which it is now proposed to substitute for the nine low-navigation dams which were planned between Carthage and Lock and Dam No. 21. Mr. Martin J. Insull in a letter to the district engineer suggests a lease of these three navigation-power dams at a rental equivalent to 3 per cent interest on that part of the Government's investment devoted to navigation and 4 per cent interest on that part of the investment devoted to power purposes.

In view of the possibilities for power development made feasible on the Cumberland River between Carthage and Lock and Dam No. 21 because of the proposed storage-power dams above Burnside, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House passed a resolution on March 6, 1924, requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the projects heretofore adopted by Congress for the improvement of the Cumberland River above Nashville—

> with a view to so modifying said projects as to provide for the development of water power in connection with the improvement of navigation and to secure a possible reduction in cost to the United States.

In pursuance of this resolution the district engineer at Nashville is now engaged in making the necessary studies of that section of the river, but to make a complete survey of the Cumberland along the same lines which are being so profitably followed in the case of the Tennessee River will require a larger appropriation than is now available to the district engineer, and it is desired under the appropriation referred to in this amendment to enable the engineers to work out and disclose the power possibilities of the Cumberland River and tributaries in the same way in which they are now being worked out on the Tennessee River. I do not refer to the Cumberland River as an example because it is in my State, but because it is in the United States and also because of the great possibilities of power development on that river, which would not only increase the prosperity of that section but would greatly add to the wealth of the United States. We are in the midst of an era of electrical development, and I am so convinced of the very great importance of the development of power in all available streams that I would be glad if I had the opportunity to vote an appropriation of $500,000 to make a detailed survey of that great international stream, the Columbia River, rising in Canada and flowing through the State of Washington to the Pacific Ocean, or, indeed, of any other stream where there is the possibility of great power development.

Having in mind the action of the power commission relative to the dams on the Cumberland River, I wish to enter a protest against what would seem to be its effort to assert authority which has not been delegated by Congress against the lawful authority and proper functions and duties of the United States Engineers. In the navigable streams of our countries and their tributaries the important things to be considered and the order of their consideration are: First, sanitation; second, navigation; third, power development; and, fourth, in the arid States, reclamation. It is not too much to say that there is confusion and conflict of authority between the power commission and its policy of reaching out in an unauthorized field and the authority of the United States engineers, which has been undisputed during all the past years. As I have pointed out in the case of the Cumberland River and the three dams, the power commission proposed not navigation first, but power first, and actually proposed to construct a dam near Burnside, Ky., on the upper Cumberland, from shore to shore, with no locks. This would develop several thousand hydroelectric horsepower, but it would leave the power in the great Cumberland coal fields entirely cut off from transportation and thus allow it to remain idle and undeveloped in the years to come, just as it has remained idle during all the past ages. There ought to be an end to the duplication of effort and useful work between the power commission in its attempt to exercise authority and duties lawfully and properly belonging to United States Engineers.

In a bill introduced by Senator RANSDELL in the Senate, No. 3328, and which I wish every Member of this House would read, the power commission is asking Congress to make the very surveys of our navigable rivers and their tributaries which the bill now before the House authorizes to be made by the United States Engineers. The powers of the power commission are clearly defined by statute and its attempt to exercise authority over the Corps of Engineers, the United States Geological Sur-

vey, or any other bureau or agency of the Government should not be permitted.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when we consider the great importance of our inland waterways and power sites, and their potential value, it is difficult to understand why the American people have been so slow in the development of these national assets and resources. Thomas H. Benton, the father of our transcontinental railway systems, in 1849, in introducing a bill for the construction of the Pacific Railroad from the Mississippi River to San Francisco, called attention to the limitless resources of the West and the wonderful possibilities that would result, not only to the American Republic but to the world, by the construction of those great highways, and he gave expression to this significant thought—that for the right or privilege of building these transcontinental railroads any other nation would go to war and would tax coming generations for their construction and maintenance. May I paraphrase the remark of "Old Bullion" by saying that for the privilege of developing the potential water power and resources of this Nation, and for the privilege of improving and utilizing our inland waterways as great arteries of trade and commerce, any other nation would go to war and tax coming generations for the cost of such development?

My friends, the development of our inland waterways marks the beginning of a new era in which our almost limitless water-power resources will be harnessed and utilized and inland waterways will be efficiently developed as potential factors in our transportation problems. There should be no conflict between railroad transportation and water transportation. There is room and need for both systems. Each will supplement the other. There will be an abundance of traffic for both. Undoubtedly traffic has outrun transportation facilities. Our commerce is increasing more rapidly than our railroad facilities, and with the increase in production in all the industries of this Nation, it is only a question of time when the railroads will find that they are absolutely powerless to expeditiously handle the rapidly-growing traffic and serve all the needs and the demands of the people. By carrying the heavy and slow-moving commodities by water, the railroads would be relieved and be able to afford better service on fast freights and less bulky commodities.

Objection has been made to the amount of the appropriation authorized by the pending bill, which is approximately $39,000,000. I do not consider this objection as worthy of much consideration in view of the fact that the improvement of our inland waterways is of paramount importance, not only to the great commercial and industrial interests, but to the agricultural classes as well. No vocational group is more interested in river transportation than the farmer, because the improvement of our inland waterways means ultimately reduced freight rates not only on farm products but on all the supplies that the farmer buys. Anything that reduces the cost of transporting farm products from the farm to the ultimate consumer automatically benefits the farmer to the extent of such reduction. Water transportation has always been cheaper than railroad transportation, and without the competition that would exist when our inland waterways are developed, the railroads would have no competition and could advance freight charges steadily.

May I say that the Missouri farmers and the farmers of Kansas and the Northwestern States are getting the benefit of water transportation to the extent of 3 or 4 cents per bushel on their wheat and corn shipments. In other words, the fact that there is water transportation from St. Louis by the Mississippi River to New Orleans has caused and compelled the railroads to reduce their freight rates on wheat 3 or 4 cents per bushel, and the farmers get the benefit of this reduction. Because of the existence of even limited water transportation facilities, the price the farmer gets for his wheat at his local market is 3 or 4 cents more than he would get, if there was no water transportation facilities between St. Louis and New Orleans.

By reason of this water route the freight rate on farm commodities between the farm and Liverpool, the great world market, is much less than it would be if the farm products had to be carried all the way to the seaport by rail. And if the Missouri River is made navigable between Kansas City and St. Louis, there will be an additional reduction in freight rates of approximately 4 cents per bushel.

The farmer is vitally interested in every movement that will bring about competition between carriers, and anything that will reduce freight rates means so much more money in the pockets of the farmer for his products.

For approximately $200,000,000 all river and harbor projects in the United States of any consequence can be completed within 5 to 10 years, and with this expenditure we will secure the greatest, most complete, most efficient, and most economical system of inland transportation in the world. When this inland waterways system is completed, the saving in freight each year will probably exceed the total cost incident to the improvement and development of all of our harbors and internal waterways. This expenditure will be returned every year in reduced freight rates.

I much prefer to spend public moneys of the United States for the permanent improvement of our rivers and harbors than to expend these funds on our Army and Navy. The appropriations by the present Congress for the maintenance of our Army and Navy, military and nonmilitary activities, for the fiscal year of 1926 will aggregate between $600,000,000 and $700,000,000, or practically three times the total cost of the completion of all approved projects for the development of our inland waterways and harbors. If we should reduce our expenditures for the military and naval activities of the Government one-third, we would effect a saving of more than $200,000,000, a sum sufficient to complete a superb system of inland waterways which would carry annually many million tons of freight at greatly reduced rates. These waterways will be a permanent and a profitable investment. I, for one, favor the completion of these projects within the next 5 or 10 years so the American people may immediately get the benefit of this competitive system of transportation.

We are getting exceedingly slight benefits from the enormous appropriations made each year for the support of our War and Navy Departments. These appropriations yield no profits. Expenditures for naval and military activities are gone and gone forever. I am in favor of a radical reduction in our appropriations for the support of our naval and military activities, and the money saved in this manner will be sufficient to construct and complete an inland waterways system of transportation that will return dividends each year to the American people.

In one year, two years, or five years, what will we have to show for the $600,000,000 this Congress is appropriating to support our War and Navy Departments? Practically nothing. How much better it will be if this $600,000,000 or a very considerable portion of it could be expended in permanent internal development projects.

Since the passage of the Federal reserve act there has been no bill offered in Congress that will accomplish greater good for the people of the United States than this bill which we are now considering and which marks the beginning of a new epoch in transportation and in the development of the commerce of this Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved June 5, 1920, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors, passed between March 4, 1913, until and including the laws of the second session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, shall be compiled under the direction of the Secretary of War and printed as a document, and that 600 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the War Department."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McKEOWN: Page 11, line 21, after the word "Department," insert a new paragraph, as follows: "That no part of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for any work done by private contracts if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the estimated cost of doing the work by the Government."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee ought to be willing to accept that amendment. It simply follows out the law as heretofore passed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. McKEOWN. The committee ought to accept that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the time has passed when a point of order can be made against the amendment. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It was impossible here for me to follow it, because a gentleman came to talk to me about the bill. It was simply an inadvertence. I ask unanimous consent, despite the fact that the gentleman had started to speak on his amendment, that I may reserve a point of order against it.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I would not like to consent to an agreement like that. I think a great deal of the gentleman, but I would object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York present a unanimous request?

Mr. McKEOWN. I will not yield for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. McKEOWN. This safeguard has always been in these bills. Why should it not be in this bill? You put it in other bills; you have done it in past years. Why not put it in this one?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is not that existing law at the present time?

Mr. McKEOWN. No. Even if it were, there is no harm in putting it in. It has been in other appropriation bills.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I think it is permanent law.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Does not this apply to the matter? In section 8 of the act of 1918 it is provided that—

no part of the funds herein authorized to be appropriated shall be used to pay for any work done by private contracts if the contract price is more than 25 per cent in excess of the cost of doing the work by the Government plant.

Mr. McKEOWN. You use the words "by the Government plant"?

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. If that is the law now, I did not so understand it. It is not permanent law, as I understand it, although it has gone into particular bills. There should be no objection to it in this bill. It safeguards the rights of the Government. There should be no objection to it in this bill. It is in other bills, and it seems to me, in fairness to the country, that this provision ought to be in. Then there will be no contention about it. Otherwise some contractor might hold that it was not put in.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN].

In so doing I speak not only for myself but for the very ripe and valuable experience of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. The unwisdom of this amendment, fair as it may seem on its face, is in this, that the Government has some 500 craft of various kinds with which it is equipped to do this work. You can not tell what the cost of work is to be, in many instances, until after it has been started. You can not estimate just precisely what a certain part of a contract may cost. It may be divided into several parts. You might not want to advertise for bids. You might have to adapt yourself to circumstances that would make this provision most unwise and most unprofitable; and worse than all, the greatest delays, as has been pointed out here repeatedly in the discussion, are the delays on the Government work. Take the Ohio, for example. Suppose we were bound by this provision to delay another two or three years. We have $87,000,000 invested there. We are not receiving a cent of return. We need only $25,000,000 to complete the work. Suppose by reason of this amendment we were obliged to delay that work. During the period of delay we are losing returns on that investment.

Here is another thing: Here is an amendment, offered on the floor of the House without consideration by the committee; an amendment that goes to the very vitals of the bill; an amendment which the engineers have not recommended; an amendment which will probably impede instead of expediting that work. Ought we to accept it and legislate on a vital and far-reaching matter of this kind without any consideration whatever by the committee?

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman believe that this amendment is so fair to the Government and to the people that he ought not to object?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I believe, on the contrary, that it might cost the Government many millions of dollars. I believe it is experimental and dangerous, and I believe it should be defeated. I ask for a vote. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want a division on that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Housatonic River, Conn., up to the railroad bridge at Milford.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT: Page 13, lines 20 and 21, strike out the word "railroad," in line 20 and all of line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the words "dam at Shelton, Conn."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, that is purely a typographical error and the committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nansemond River, Va., including the western branch thereof.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I noticed in the Baltimore Sun this morning that a bill has been introduced by Senator BUTLER which proposes legislation for the removal of the differential in favor of Baltimore.

I have always been strongly in favor of river and harbor bills because I believe the development of the rivers and harbors of the country is greatly to the benefit of all the people and is the greatest economy that could be practiced. I have been opposed to the parsimony which we have exercised in the last few years, through which we have allowed many of our channels to silt up and fill in to a large degree, costing vastly more money to dredge them when they are again reached.

In Baltimore we have a project which has been carried on fairly well until the last few years, in the last two years the appropriations being cut down very much. We are getting an appropriation for this year which is scarcely enough to maintain the channels in the harbor of Baltimore, much less to proceed with the work. While I am in favor of this bill, which will carry an additional expenditure of $10,000,000, it does seem to me that the Appropriations Committee ought to at least appropriate enough money to carry on the work in connection with projects which have already been adopted by Congress, and certainly in the case of the Baltimore Harbor that has not been done and can not be done under an appropriation of $38,000,000 for rivers and harbors, as provided in the recent appropriation act. I should like to see all of these works carried on; I should like to see the harbors and channels which we have already dredged kept to the depth which was proposed, and I should like to see a larger appropriation in order that all the projects may be completed within the next five years and not only the projects under this bill, though I am strongly in favor of each and every one of them.

Then, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that while Baltimore enjoys a differential rate it is no more than she should enjoy. Senator BUTLER, of Massachusetts, and his friends should not desire in any way to pass legislation which would in any wise impinge upon the natural resources and natural location enjoyed by Baltimore. For instance, our port is nearer to the great centers of population back of the Atlantic seaboard than is New York, Philadelphia, and other ports. One can scarcely realize that Baltimore is nearer St. Louis than New York by 200 miles—63 miles closer than Philadelphia—109 miles closer to Chicago than is New York, and 118 miles closer to Indianapolis. It is closer to Detroit, and even though one can scarcely realize it Baltimore is closer to the city of Buffalo than is the city of New York itself, and more than a hundred and fifty miles in addition to each than is Boston, the metropolis of the Senator's State.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The gentleman does not say that because Baltimore is closer to a particular place than some other place that it is entitled to a cheaper rate.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I maintain that if the distance is less to Baltimore than it is to some other port it ought to get the advanage of its natural location because of the lesser distance.

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

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want the gentlemen in this House to give this matter advance consideration, so that if such legislation does reach this House you may be in a position to see that the city of Baltimore, which has always stood for the great improvements of the whole country, and which is one of the foremost seaports of this country, having a population of some 800,000, may retain its just consideration and this fair rate to which it is entitled by its natural location.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. I take it, then, that the gentleman will be in favor of the Gooding bill when it is reported here.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know all the terms of the Gooding bill, but I am in favor of Baltimore city having this differential because of its lesser distance from these great sections of the United States.

I feel that the Senator from Massachusetts has his mind largely upon the city of New York, which has ever been against the differential and which has largely monopolized the foreign shipping of the country. There are strong reasons why such a large volume of trade comes to Baltimore besides the question of differential, and not the least among these is that of economy.

I saw not long ago a circular itemized which showed that a ship of 5,165 tons capacity can be handled in the port of Baltimore cheaper by $4,177.81 than in the port of New York. Another circular showed the difference in cost of a shipment from Pittsburgh to Baltimore or New York, in which every item is given, and which shows a saving in favor of Baltimore of 19.7 per cent, and still another circular showed the same shipment via warehouse, and depicts a saving through Baltimore of 47 per cent.

Why then should shippers adhere to congested centers when other ports are just as advantageous, less congested, and so much more economical.

Baltimore has expended on its harbor more than $13,000,000 and there has been voted and placed at the disposal of the port commission an additional $50,000,000 for piers, warehouses, and so forth, which when expended will provide at Baltimore the "model port of the Atlantic seaboard."

Who would care to go as far north as Boston or as far south as Jacksonville when such ports as Baltimore, Norfolk, and Newport News are so much nearer. It must be remembered that even on voyages as far south as the Mediterranean, not to mention northern European ports, ships from the Atlantic and Gulf ports must travel north and skirt the coast of Newfoundland before being able to traverse the great circle which is the shortest route from the United States.

While speaking of geographic locations, may I make an observation brought to my attention by my friend Mr. W. M. Brittain, director of the Export and Import Bureau at Baltimore, that even to the east coast of South America, where are situated the South American ports of greatest traffic importance, such as Rio de Janeiro, Santos, Montevideo, and Buenos Aires, the port of Halifax, Nova Scotia, is nearer than any United States port, and the distance of those South American ports from the British Isles and continental European ports is the same as from most United States ports. It is well to observe, therefore, that Baltimore, "the most western of the eastern ports; the most northern of the southern ports; the most southern of the northern ports," occupies a unique geographical position.

If one will but pay a visit to the harbor of Baltimore, viewing it on both sides of the Patapsco, he will find arising a vast number of factories with their towering stacks, indicating the progress which has been made in the last few years. That great section of Canton and Curtis Bay has developed so rapidly one can scarcely believe they are the same places which he beheld only a few years ago. They have come because of the water facilities, deep channel, low taxes, and transportation advantages.

Just so long as we continue to improve our harbor and its facilities just so long will factories continue to seek locations in our midst. I have always stood and worked for the harbor of Baltimore. It is one of its great, if not its greatest, assets. The future destiny of Baltimore is tied up in its water transportation. Its location is superb, its climate equable, its people most hospitable and businesslike.

The Congress owes it to this most progressive city, which combines in its habits and institutions the colonial and modern periods, both fair treatment and the policy of live and let live.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Gentlemen of the committee, that which the Senator from Massachusetts gave to the papers this morning, and concerning which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] has just discoursed, is only one of the five classes which necessitates a violation of section 4 of the interstate commerce act. Many people of this country believe that freight rates should be fixed and based upon distance alone. That is not only wrong in practice but it is vicious in theory, because the economics of the situation entail that you take into consideration more factors than just distance. It is necessary for the people of the South and the ports of Texas, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, and every Southern State in this country to have an equal chance with New York, with Boston, with Philadelphia, and with Baltimore in order not only that we might build up the ports of the South and the States in the southeastern part of the United States, but that we might relieve the traffic to Boston, to New York, to Philadelphia, and to Baltimore. It is necessary that the differential which Baltimore claims to be hers be given to Savannah and Galveston as to some ports like Boston and Philadelphia. It might be better for this country that grain be hauled to Galveston as cheaply as it is hauled to Baltimore. Not only is it for the benefit of Galveston in that case but it is for the relief of our congested ports on the North Atlantic seaboard.

Now, this propaganda has been spreading everywhere, and the Gooding bill passed the Senate by a vote of 54 to 23. The Senators from Maryland did not vote for the proposition, I am glad to say. I ask the House to consider this matter most cautiously. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has seen fit to set this matter down for hearings beginning the 21st of this month. If we are to be swept off our feet as the Senate of the United States was, then one of the most inimical measures to the welfare of this country that ever passed the Congress of the United States will be placed on the statute books. I trust that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will consider that measure very thoroughly, and I hope that the Members of this House will likewise consider it, because it is a most persuasive argument that if Baltimore is 500 miles nearer to the grain market of Chicago than is Savannah or New Orleans its rate ought to be cheaper, and yet there is nothing in the world more fallacious than that.

It will require some study for the Members of this House to see that the economics and the equity of the situation demand that we give these different ports the same rate whether they are 500 or 1,000 miles from the place of production, the market of consumption, or the port of exportation.

Sound rate making is not measured by that standard. If distance were the only factor entering the making of rates that proposition would be incontrovertible; but distance is only one of many elements to be remembered, and because distance is only one of the factors, I assert that when the welfare of the whole country is considered and every angle is reviewed, the ports of Galveston, New Orleans, Savannah, and every other southern port might be awarded the same rate as Baltimore. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Channel connecting the St. Johns River, Florida, with the Florida East Coast Canal, at or near Jacksonville.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 18.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: On page 18, strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in justice to the committee I want to say that last year I appeared before them and they gave me a very careful hearing, and at that time it seemed absolutely necessary that this survey should be made. Since the introduction of the original bill last year the engineers have begun a survey on another project which will make this survey unnecessary, and therefore I think in justice to my-

self and to the committee I ought to move to strike out the item for this survey, although it is in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ohio River, with a view to the construction of an ice pier on the south side of said river in the vicinity of Covington and Newport, Ky.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether the War Department has adopted any policy relative to the construction of ice piers along these navigable streams.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not heard anything from the War Department as to ice piers. The only question that has come before the committee is with regard to ice boats.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Are there any of these piers constructed now along the Ohio River?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not understand that there are.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The reason I ask the gentleman the question is in the Sixty-sixth Congress, I believe it was, an item was put in the bill in the Senate for the purpose of constructing an ice pier at Henderson, Ky., because of the fact that when blizzards come and the Ohio River freezes over, the refuge for these boats is in the mouth of Green River just above Henderson, and at that time the War Department made an unfavorable report on the item because of the fact they were not constructing such piers, and I was wondering whether there had been any different policy initiated since then.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No policy has been initiated. I imagine the engineers would recommend such construction if it was necessary to preserve the works in that river which have been constructed with a view to a 9-foot channel.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Are there many of these ice piers constructed in any of the big rivers?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have never heard of one.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Deeper waterway from the Great Lakes to the Hudson River suitable for vessels of a draft of 20 or 25 feet: Preliminary examination and survey to be made by a board of engineer officers.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KVALE: On page 20, line 17, after the word "Ohio," strike out lines 18, 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is not a fact that three distinct and separate preliminary surveys of this waterway have been made by three separate boards of engineers, both State and National, and that in every case it has been found not to be feasible?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I do not understand either one of those things to be the fact. There were two surveys made by eminent engineers some years ago—a good many years ago. The result was that, without recommendation, they reported what the route would be and what the cost would be. My recollection of the estimated cost is that it was about $200,000,000. Since that time tremendous progress has been made in construction work. Dredges to-day will do many times the work they could do at the time that survey was made. A more recent survey was made, but the language of the bill was misleading. It provided for a ship canal. I do not believe anyone who has studied the question believes that a ship canal is useful across the State of New York or anywhere else. Barges and lake vessels can navigate at about one-third of the cost of ocean ships.

Mr. KVALE. Is it not the intention to make it a ship canal?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; it is not the intention to make it a ship canal. A ship canal, in my judgment, is utterly impracticable, and to show that that is so you only need to cite one fact. Transportation on the ocean on the average is at a cost of 3 mills per ton per mile. Transportation on our inland waterways, such as the Great Lakes, is 1 mill per ton per mile. You can not substitute 3-mill transportation for 1-mill transportation in the name of economy. It can not be done, and for one I wholly disbelieve in the practicability of a ship canal. A deeper waterway might be advisable, and this language leaves it to the engineers to report whether or not it is advisable.

Let me say to the gentleman in regard to this matter that there has been some report that this is a survey which is going to cost $100,000. There is no intention to have a survey which is to cost $100,000 or $20,000 or $10,000.

Mr. KVALE. How much is it expected it will cost?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is expected that the larger part of the work will be done right in the office of the engineers. They have most of the data and they will apply the surveys already made to existing conditions of improved machinery, and I doubt if there will be any survey, and certainly not any considerable survey, of the land itself.

Mr. KVALE. I will say to the gentleman I have been given what I considered reliable information as to these preliminary surveys, and that is why I offered the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Klamath River, Calif.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that that request had better be made in the House rather than in committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Columbia River, above and below the city of Kalama, Wash., with a view to providing a ship channel to the wharves at Kalama, Wash.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 21, after line 22, insert new paragraphs, as follows:

"Chehalis River, Wash.

"Willapa Harbor, Wash.

"Olympia Harbor, Wash."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] will first permit me to make a brief statement. These three proposed surveys of harbors in southwestern Washington are offered after what I understood to be a general understanding that they would be accepted, and that I was to offer them on the floor rather than press them in committee. However, I now learn that a new plan, or rather a new understanding, has been made, and that it is working full force this afternoon; that being the case it is perhaps unnecessary for me to explain, and clearly unnecessary for me to make an appeal, but to do as Members of the House generally are forced to do these days, under the new order of things—make the appeal in a roundabout way to Members of the other body, with more hope of success there on actual merit. A word, however, as to Willapa Harbor. A Government dredge is en route from the east to Grays Harbor, twenty-odd miles away. A few days' work by that dredge will take care of Willapa Harbor. It is all part of the engineering plan, but requires all of the congressional preliminaries. The cost is merely nominal.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact the information as to these harbors is practically secured when the engineers get the report of the others that are named.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; the expense is a very light addition to the regular daily expense of the engineer's office, located close at hand. I hope the gentleman will not press his objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Gentlemen of the committee, the committee found it to be a necessary rule, as the result of long experience, to adopt a policy of not accepting surveys or amendments which would increase the amount appropriated on the floor.

The committee can readily see how unwise, how impolitic, how harmful it would be to adopt any other policy. I am far from saying that the amendments suggested by the gentleman from Washington are not wise, I am far from saying that they are not good amendments, but I am saying simply that we do not know and we can not tell. We have a subcommittee on surveys, and it is the duty of that subcommittee to investigate every application. We are most generous, most liberal in receiving and adopting survey items. But it is impossible in the rush on the floor to have a hearing, we can not send a subcommittee into the cloak room and have them hear this matter and determine it, and while it is with the greatest regret, and while I would be delighted as an individual to accept the

amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington, I feel that it can not be done under what is a conservative and proper rule, and therefore I am obliged to ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to make a statement to the Members of the House. Southwestern Washington probably has as many navigable rivers and harbors as any other district in any State. Most of these receive and dispatch ocean-going business in large volume. One of these harbors, Grays Harbor, has at this time 18 ocean-going vessels, including several of 8,000 tons each bar bound, owing to conditions which need and are promised correction. There has been great delay in the construction of an authorized sea-going dredge; delay, too, in getting it under way. All of this is depressing to those who provide the great cargoes and who have contributed dollar for dollar with the Government in developing this harbor and bringing about this cargo business. We are near the end of the bill. Heretofore in consideration of rivers and harbors legislation when the last page is reached the request has been made by the chairman, when the Members from the State of Washington have sought to have a hearing or offer amendments, that we ought not to take the time, for we are at the end of the bill. I have offered this proposition for the survey of these three harbors, the survey to be made by the Board of Engineers in that part of the country where the district engineers are located at Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash., both places within a few hours' ride of the three harbors in question.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee has had no chance to consider these items. If we open the door to matters about which we have not had a chance to investigate, we are liable to get something in the bill that is a mistake. These propositions can be considered by the Senate, and for that reason I do not think we ought to adopt without consideration projects of this kind. If they are meritorious they can be presented to the Senate committee, where they can be given a proper hearing. We have not had a chance to consider these amendments in the House, and I hope they will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

San Juan Harbor, P. R.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SWING: Page 22, after line 18, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to modify from time to time the harbor lines at Newport Harbor, Calif., established in pursuance of section 3 of the river and harbor act of July 27, 1916: *Provided*, That in his opinion such modification will not injuriously affect the interests of navigation."

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear at the very beginning that this amendment does not in any way add a new project, present or future, direct or indirect. It does not in any way obligate the Government directly or indirectly to expend one penny. This case is somewhat like the one referred to a moment ago as being the result of a typographical error. In 1916 this Congress inadvertently, I believe, fixed the harbor lines of the harbor at Newport in a rigid, nonflexible way, which has caused an injustice and hardship to the people of that community. The people there are courageous and progressive and are expending $1,000,000 of their own money to improve their own harbor, but they have come up against this act of Congress. I think there is no city in the whole United States that is in the position this little city is in, because so far as the other cities of the country are concerned the Secretary of War has discretion to modify the harbor lines to meet the developing requirements of commerce. In the case of Newport the Judge Advocate General has held that the Secretary of War has not the power, although he may desire to modify the harbor lines to conform to the present requirements.

Many things have changed since the lines were fixed by this Congress in 1916. They do not fit the requirements of to-day at all, and yet that city can not go ahead with its improvements to be made with its own money, because Congress by a mistake and inadvertently in 1916 fixed the harbor lines, differently from what they are in any other city in the United States, rigid and nonflexible. The Members of this Congress alone can grant that city relief so it can go ahead and expend its own money to develop the harbor in accordance with the best plans and in accordance with the ideas of the Army engineers. Are you going to refuse them that right?

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

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. What is the language of the act of which the gentleman complains?

Mr. SWING. The act of 1916, river and harbor bill, paragraph 3, fixed the lines of the harbor by a direct reference to a map, thereby, according to the decision of the Judge Advocate General, making those lines rigid, nonflexible, and unchangeable, except by act of Congress. We are asking you to give the Secretary of War the same jurisdiction over this harbor that he has over other harbors. It will probably be two or three years before another river and harbor bill comes into the House, and in the meantime all of their work is tied up. Do not do this injustice to these progressive, courageous people. Do not hamstring them and hog tie them when they are trying to go ahead with their development.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is any other town or city in the United States in the same shape?

Mr. SWING. No.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise with much reluctance to oppose this amendment, and with more reluctance because I am obliged to confess that its necessity is partially the fault of the committee. The gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] appeared before the committee and there was some discussion of this item. That was perhaps a year ago.

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Surely the gentleman from New York does not take the position that because the committee may not have had a chance to go into it the House as a Committee of the Whole has not the right to correct the mistake?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I simply take this position, and it is all I do take in the way of a position. The House had before it the proposition of one of the members of the committee, a gentleman also from California, to be permitted to amend the Los Angeles item so that that city could go on and expend its own money without waiting for the expenditure of Government money, and thus save that locality the interest upon its money for the period of a year. We have not had a hearing upon that question. It was not examined by our committee. It appears, as many things may appear on first blush, to be a wonderfully good thing, but on careful examination it may appear not to be good at all. The position that I take, and all the position I take, is that offhand, and without examination, the suggestion of the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] and the suggestion of the gentleman, his colleague [Mr. SWING], may both be meritorious, but that we have not had an opportunity to examine them.

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

Mr. DEMPSEY. In a moment. It is not as though the gentleman would lose his rights. He will not lose his rights; they will be preserved. He will have opportunity to appear before the Senate committee to have an investigation and to have the matter deliberately determined by a committee, so that we may find whether there is merit in the proposition. If there is merit he will have the opportunity to have it reported in the regular way and incorporated in and made a part of the bill.

Now, I simply say as to this and throughout this bill so far the Committee of the Whole, no matter how meritorious on first blush it might seem, has adhered rigidly to the rule that there should not be amendments on the floor where there were no hearings before the committee.

Mr. SWING. If the gentleman will permit, the reason why I interrupt is your statement that there had been no hearings. I do not know what the chairman considers a hearing. I offered myself as a person who was fully conversant with the facts; I testified for some 15 minutes and explained the matter in response to questions which were propounded; I was assured by the chairman that he thought the proposition was meritorious, and the only question raised was that I should submit the wording to the engineers of the War Department for their approval, which I did, and was advised that one of their engineers drew this very amendment, and I so reported back to the chairman, and he told me that the bill had been reported, but to offer the amendment on the floor of the House and he would not object to it.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has stated it correctly I think that is just what happened.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have not at any time disputed what the gentleman says; on the contrary, what I did say was to remark

that I was very loath to oppose this amendment, and particularly so in view of the fact that it was partially the fault of the committee that this had been omitted from the bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think the chairman is right. I appreciate the chairman's attitude about accepting any amendment, being himself under the rule of the committee hog tied to satisfy the whim of this man and that man who did not want the bill to come up at all, and so we all came in hog tied. But here is a proposition that was actually considered and we held hearings upon, and therefore it is on a different plane, I think, from other amendments which have been offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit the War Department to take earth, stone, and timber from the national forests for use in the construction of river and harber and other works in charge of that department, subject to such regulations and restrictions as he may prescribe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from New York that the numbering of section 7 should be changed, and without objection the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on that very proposition I venture to suggest that the Chair is not right. On page 11 we have section 4, section 6, and next is section 5, but if the gentleman will refer to section 4 he will find that it amends section 6 of another law, and the numbering of the section is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 6 referred to on page 11 is not a section of the bill before us, but is an amendment to section 6 of another act. So we have on page 11 section 4 and later section 5, and on page 12 section 6, and on page 22 section 7, but due to the insertion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, as the Chair understands it, the correction has to be made in line 19, page 22.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKEOWN. I desire to make a point of order against this section on the ground it is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 7 now section 8?

Mr. McKEOWN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is obliged to overrule the point of order, because in the first place the rule specifically makes all parts of the bill in order, and secondly, the point of order is too late.

Mr. McKEOWN. I desire to offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, beginning in line 19, strike out all of section 7.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am, of course, opposed to this bill as it is now. Here is a provision that is going to lay open the doors to destroy the property of the Government that we are trying to conserve. Now, you have national forests, and you say you are going to give to the Secretary of War the power and right to go out there and take the timber and the stone and the things that belong to one department to be used over here in this construction work of rivers and harbors.

I say you ought not to embark upon that policy. You have expended millions of dollars to conserve and protect the forests and other natural resources of this country, and now you come in on a river and harbor bill, reported by a committee that has no jurisdiction at all over the forests of this country, with a new provision, to wit, to take away this protection that we have hitherto had and give to the Secretary of Agriculture the right to grant permission to the War Department to infringe upon those resources. If you want to go that far, you will do it over my protest, because I am not willing now to say that you shall go out and take the forests and use them as you will, although you do take the money that may be in the Treasury.

Mr. WATKINS. This only gives the Secretary that authority. Otherwise we should have to go out and buy those things from private interests, and the private interests might charge too much.

Mr. McKEOWN. I have tried to get an amendment adopted to protect the Government. The next thing you will be giving them the right to take the timber from the forests and the stone out of the parks of the country. You are starting on a program that, if carried out extensively, will absolutely deplete the natural resources of the Government. You may not pay much attenton to it, but you will wake up some day to regret having taken this step. The private interests of the country will get permission and go along and take off of our public lands Government timber at an inadequate price, and you will find that scandal will come out of this very movement. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON: Page 22, after line 24, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 9. That the portion of Black Warrior River between Dam No. 17 and the junction of Locust and Mulberry Forks, in the State of Alabama, shall hereafter be known as Lake Bankhead."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has the hearty concurrence of the delegation from Alabama and the approval of the Chief of Engineers. This lake is at the headwaters of the Black Warrior River, a stream that has been improved by the United States and which is expected to carry a very considerable amount of traffic. It was Mr. Bankhead's pet child. I became a friend to it partly by his arguments and partly by inspection so long ago as 1897, and I offer this resolution as a friendly tribute to a man who was for 33 years a Member of this House and the Senate. [Applause.]

He was my friend, faithful and just to me. I associated with him perhaps more closely than with any other Member of the opposite party during the time of my service. John H. Bankhead wore the gray. He fought in the lost cause. But in the long tract of years when he was a Member here he was an outstanding character, a patriotic legislator, always a true and loyal friend of our own United States. [Applause.] He loved the State of Alabama in which he was born, but the scope of his activity, his interest, pertained to the country and to the whole country.

It is oftentimes said that the fame, the reputation, of a Member of the House or of the Senate is ephemeral. Members come and go; they live and strive; they succeed and fail. And it should be an object of special interest to us to confer that distinction upon any Member, past or present, which shall be like a monument to his memory.

This is not a monument of bronze or marble, but it is a great public work which in the future will confer benefits widespread over the State and the Nation, and when in years remote people look upon the lake and see that it is named Lake Bankhead they will inquire, "After whom was it named?" And it will be said that he was an Alabamian, one who performed his duty to his country faithfully and well, a man worthy of all praise and honor. And thus let us hope that notwithstanding the feeling that our services here may soon be forgotten we are doing all that we can to preserve the recollection of those who have served here, their good works and their achievements, and that like the waves of the ocean gathering increased momentum as they swell toward the shore, their kindly acts, their deeds, may have increased appreciation and be held in everlasting remembrance. [Applause, Members rising.]

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would not attempt to paint the lily or gild refined gold in trying to add anything to the beautiful tribute paid the late Senator Bankhead, whose memory is so revered by all Alabamians. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] for the spirit that prompted him to offer this amendment. In the name of Alabama I thank him. I deem it a great privilege to serve in this Congress with the colaborer of Senator Bankhead, who so much appreciated the bigness of the man as a great legislator and a great American. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who, by his outstanding ability, his great achievements, and by his sincerity in dealing with the Members of this House has gained the esteem and admiration of every man on this floor, that on both sides of the aisle we feel it an honor and an inspiration to serve with him and to know him. [Applause.]

For the information of the House, I would say the Legislature of Alabama some time ago passed a joint resolution designating this lake as Bankhead Lake. It is, as you know, at the head of the Tombigbee-Warrior system, the longest canalized river

in the world, which stands to-day as a monument to the enterprise and genius of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the late Senator Bankhead, two of the great leaders on the Rivers and Harbors Committee of bygone days. May I here mention another distinguished Alabamian, who for many years devoted so much of his time and talent to the proper development of this great river system, the Hon. George W. Taylor, who lives to-day on its banks in the beautiful little city of Demopolis, Ala.

May I say, also, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] that the Tombigbee River system is living up to the hopes of Senator Bankhead and himself. Last year it carried almost a million tons of commerce, enough to fill 1,000 trainloads of 40 cars each, from the coal fields and along its banks down to the seaboard at the port of Mobile. This waterway will continue to grow in importance and usefulness as the years go by.

On behalf of the Alabama delegation in Congress and in the name of all Alabamians I again express our appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for the beautiful and deserving compliment he has paid to a great and good Alabamian, an outstanding American in his day and generation. I ask for the adoption of the amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRAMTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11472, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered by the rule. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 179, noes 6.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. DEMPSEY, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FIRST DEFICIENCY BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents a conference report on a bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11308) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the rivers and harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think so far the House has given only three days within which to extend remarks on any bill.

Mr. McDUFFIE. That is all right. Mr. Speaker, I request that Members have three days in which to extend their remarks on the rivers and harbors bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama modifies his request and asks that Members have three days within which to extend their remarks on the rivers and harbors bill. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to amend that request so as to include every Member of the House and not only Members who spoke on the bill.

The SPEAKER. That was the request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BILLS LAID ON TABLE

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, two bills were introduced in the House previously to the bill which has just been passed and I ask unanimous consent that the bills previously introduced be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate concurrent resolution No. 22.

The SPEAKER. The Chair misunderstood the gentleman. The Chair can not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

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

Mr. GREEN. I hope the gentleman will not do that. I want to call up a matter which is privileged.

Mr. BLANTON. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

WORLD WAR FOREIGN DEBT COMMISSION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9804) to amend the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign Governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, as amended February 28, 1923.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill passed by the Senate and now on the Speaker's table be substituted for the House bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this is a very debatable question, and it is very doubtful whether we should permit, in view of our constitutional rights in this House, the substitution of a Senate bill in this matter for the House bill. As it is so late in the evening I do not desire to take up the time of the House, but if unanimous consent is pressed I would have to object. I will be glad to reserve the objection because I would like to be heard on the whole issue later on. This involves the whole debt problem and I would like to have it opened up by the House for full discussion.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman from Iowa to go on with the House bill unless the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] wants to postpone the matter for the purpose of general debate on the subject. It is a unanimous report from the committee, and, of course, if the parliamentary question of the origination of the bill is in question, then it will be better to pass the House bill and send it over to the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. If the gentleman from New York objects, I will simply go on with the House bill.

Mr. FISH. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. This bill is on the Union Calendar——

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question: This bill extends the life of the commission?

Mr. GREEN. For two years; yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The act under which this commission was appointed, of course, provided that the appointments should be made by the President and that the members of the commission should be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Has the gentleman given consideration to this question? Does it lie within the power of the Congress to continue a commission thus created and appointed. I confess it is a new thought to me. We can, of course, continue the power of the House committee, and by joint resolution we can continue the life of a joint commission of the House and Senate; but these are officials, and two branches of the Government at least have participated in their selection. Of course, this question is being asked without any reference

to the personnel of the commission. I assume the same personnel would be appointed.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Iowa has the floor. I am talking about the legal question involved.

Mr. GREEN. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the question has been considered. I have no doubt of the authority of the House which passed the original bill fixing the expiration of the life of the commission at a certain date to amend that bill by changing that date.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TILSON. Does it not refer solely to the authority conferred and has nothing whatever to do with the personnel? The personnel of the commission might change or we might not have the power to change it here, but we are simply referring to the authority granted and extending that authority regardless of the personnel.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the gentleman's view if that be passed will it be necessary for the President to make appointments again?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know. I should suppose that they would continue to serve.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. They could not be appointed for a longer time than the continuance of the law under which they were acting?

Mr. TILSON. If we were to continue the authority and they are appointed under that authority, it would follow that their time would be extended.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, President Harding did me the honor to appoint me a member of that commission. I was furnished a commission, and according to my recollection—I have not looked at it for two years—it was simply an appointment as a member of that commission, and did not specify any particular time. However, I may be in error about that.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. As far as I recollect the question raised by the gentleman from Tennessee was not raised in the Committee on Ways and Means. If you wanted to extend the life of the personnel of the commission you might offer an amendment not only extending the time but the commission for two years.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To my mind that also might raise a very serious question whether we have the right to extend the time of presidential appointees and to that extent interfere with his power of appointment.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. This is the first time that I have had that phase of it called to my attention.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, it all resolves itself into the question of whether Congress had the right to create a commission. Did we have the right to create the commission at the time? If we had the power to do it in the first instance we have the power to do it now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I make the suggestion to the gentleman from Iowa that although he probably is quite clear about it, some of us have a little doubt about it, and would the gentleman mind letting it go over and let us look into the question?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, if this goes over will it come up to-morrow morning?

The SPEAKER. It is a privileged matter and can be called up at any time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I hope it will not be called up to-morrow.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, under the special order to-morrow is Calendar Wednesday and a privileged bill would not be in order.

The SPEAKER. It could not be called up to-morrow.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Let me ask the gentleman from Iowa when does the commission expire?

Mr. GREEN. On February 9. Does the gentleman from Tennessee object to my request that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; I do not think there would be any objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances and in deference to the minority leader I will let the matter go over until next Saturday morning.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. FAVROT, for indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. BACON, for one day, on account of illness.

To Mr. WOODRUM, for three legislative days, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota by unanimous consent was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Mary Jane Miller (H. R. 10606), Sixty-eighth Congress.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 10144. To amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force, the United States park police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924.

RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for submitting for the consideration of the House of Representatives a bill authorizing an appropriation to deepen the channel in the Hudson River in order to permit ocean-going vessels to navigate as far as Albany.

This development of the Hudson River has been long overdue, and will promote commerce and industry not only in the section contiguous to the Hudson River but will reduce the cost of transportation of grain and agricultural products from the Western States to the eastern cities and markets of the world.

The port of New York is already congested and lacks adequate docking facilities. The rapid increase in tonnage at New York Harbor necessitates the development of other ports, and there is no reason why the Hudson River, which is navigable for 100 miles, should not be dredged to permit these ocean-going ships to continue as far as the city of Albany.

I am very much in favor of any project that tends to develop the natural waterway facilities and harbors on the Hudson River, and consider it a disgrace that this improvement has so long been neglected by Congress.

The Luckenback ships are now bringing timber regularly from the Pacific coast to Poughkeepsie, but have had some little trouble in the Haverstraw Bay Channel, several of their boats having scraped along the bottom.

This bill includes a provision which I introduced for a survey of Haverstraw Bay for the purpose of developing and maintaining a 30-foot channel. It also provides for a survey of a rock in front of the Dutton Lumber Co.'s yard at Poughkeepsie and for removing the same.

It is obvious that it would be unwise to proceed to deepen the Hudson River above Haverstraw Bay unless that channel is likewise deepened. Although the object of deepening the channel from Hudson to Albany is to develop a terminal and port at the capital city, still there is no reason why the other cities along the Hudson, such as Poughkeepsie, Newburgh, and Beacon, on account of their splendid railroad facilities west, should not be benefited from the opening up of the river to ocean-going vessels and establish their own docks and warehouses.

I am glad that Congress is turning its attention to the internal improvements and development of our waterways, which affects the interest and welfare of all our people. For some years after the war our attention was engrossed upon foreign relations and we have been overlooking the immediate interest of our own country. I am in favor of well thought out, well considered, and honest appropriations to develop the waterways of our country, based on a constructive program, keeping ever in mind the practical needs of economy.

I regret that our river and harbor bills are not always perfect and that some minor pork-barrel projects creep into them. As a general proposition, the river and harbor bill is carefully considered and safeguarded by the committee, and I favor the passage by Congress of such measures for the internal improvement of our country. This policy has been the one upon which our great Republic has developed our commerce, agriculture, and manufactures, and it is on account of this policy that our prosperity has been largely due.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Speaker, the wealth of natural resources and the industry and intelligence of the American people have brought this country to the forefront among nations in manufacturing enterprises. In America we have the highest standard of living of any country on earth, and to maintain this standard in competition with other nations whose standards of living are low and whose labor is poorly paid, our

manufacturers have been obliged to utilize the latest improved power-operated machinery in order to make each workingman's production as large as possible.

This industrial program has been carried on in all parts of the country, but especially in the region east of the Mississippi River, where 79 per cent of our power requirements are now to be found, although 72 per cent of our water-power resources are west of the Mississippi.

As a result the use of power for manufacturing purposes during the past 50 years has increased amazingly. In 1869 our industries employed only about 2,350,000 primary horsepower, while at the last census in 1919 our industries employed nearly 30,000,000 primary horsepower, an increase of 1,200 per cent. The use of electricity in manufacturing operations was first noticeable in 1889, when the census returns showed approximately 15,600 horsepower of electrical energy employed in manufacturing. At the last census, in 1919, after a lapse of 30 years, this electrical power had grown to 16,317,000 horsepower. In other words, the last census showed that something over 55 per cent of the power used by our industries was electrical energy.

The value of all of our agricultural crops in 1899 was about $3,000,000,000. Twenty years later it was about $15,500,000,000, but our manufactured products, which in 1899 had a value totaling $11,400,000,000, reached the enormous total of $62,400,000,000 in 1919, or more than four times the value of all our farm crops put together. (Figures for farm crops do not include livestock.) The importance of fully utilizing our power resources, therefore, can not be overestimated.

By far the largest user of power is the iron and steel industry, for steel works, forges, foundries, rolling mills, and machine shops required more than 8,000,000 horsepower, or about 27 per cent of the entire amount of power used in the country at the last census. Second in importance is the lumber industry, which required about 2,930,000 horsepower, or about 10 per cent of the total, while the third largest user was the textile industry, whose cotton, wool, and silk products required about 2,530,000 horsepower, or about 8½ per cent of the total. The fourth largest is paper, which utilized 1,850,000 horsepower, or a little more than 6 per cent of the total power used in manufacturing. In 1917, in addition to the power used by industries, about 4,200,000 horsepower was used for electrical operation of railroads. In recent years the use of electrical power has been extended to mining operations with marked success, and to-day nearly all of our important mines and stone quarries are operated by electricity.

If we fully utilize our water power, how much power can we develop in this way in the United States? Is the supply unlimited, or is it comparatively small?

In 1920 the United States Geological Survey estimated the developed water power of the world at about 23,000,000 primary horsepower, of which about 9,243,000 horsepower, or about 40 per cent, was in the United States. Their estimate of the world's undeveloped water power totaled approximately 430,000,000 primary horsepower, of which they gave the United States credit for 28,000,000 horsepower, or about 6.4 per cent of the total. Other estimates, however, indicate that the possible water-power development in the United States is vastly greater than 28,000,000 horsepower.

The first estimate of our water power from a national viewpoint was made by M. O. Leighton, then of the Geological Survey, who prepared a report on the undeveloped water powers of the United States for the National Conservation Commission, created by Theodore Roosevelt in 1908. This estimate was based upon such Geological Survey records as were available, certain river surveys made for navigation purposes by the United States Engineer Corps, railroad surveys, and miscellaneous maps and reports of various State and other organizations. From this assortment of data Mr. Leighton, having no appropriations or time for field work, prepared an office study, and concluded that without storage the minimum undeveloped water power of the United States was 36,916,250 horsepower, while his estimated maximum was 66,518,500 horsepower, without storage. By considering storage, he estimated that the total was some 212,000,000 horsepower by one method of figuring and 230,800,000 horsepower by another method.

In 1912 the Commissioner of Corporations, an officer in the Department of Commerce and Labor at that time, reviewed the Geological Survey's estimate of 1908 and called attention to the statement of the Geological Survey to the effect that—

> The surveys and examinations necessary to a thorough and accurate report of the water-power resources of the United States have never been completed. In certain parts of the country the facts are sufficiently well known to make it possible to present a tolerably accurate statement. In other parts the information is fragmentary, and therefore power estimates must be considered approximate.

The Commissioner of Corporations concluded that without storage the minimum potential water power in the United States was 26,736,000 and that the maximum was 51,398,000 horsepower. In discussing the question of storage the commissioner said:

> Various estimates have been made as to the total water-power possibilities of the United States, including storage, but none of them has been based upon sufficiently reliable data to warrant unquestioned acceptance. The difficulties of estimating the possible power development of a stream are multiplied when an attempt is made to estimate the supplementary reserve force that can be put into it by storage. * * * Different authorities show a wide variation for comparatively limited areas.

Summing up his observations on the undeveloped water powers of the United States the commissioner says:

> In view of the actual conditions and in the light of facts that have been developed during the course of this investigation, it is evidently but little better than pure speculation to estimate what may be the ultimate water-power development of this country.

The only other estimate of the potential water powers of the United States which is generally known is that of the Electrical World, which from time to time publishes revised estimates of the undeveloped water powers of more than 10,000 horsepower, classified according to their various drainage basins. This estimate, given in the Electrical World for July 30, 1921, showed a total maximum undeveloped water power of 52,829,500 horsepower.

As an example of how far wrong these estimates are likely to be, the Geological Survey estimate of 1908 for the Tennessee River and tributaries in Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia was a maximum of 1,950,000 horsepower. This was before Muscle Shoals or Hales Bar was even surveyed. Deducting 850,000 maximum at Muscle Shoals and 54,000 maximum at Hales Bar, leaves 1,046,000 horsepower for all other developments in the Tennessee River and its tributaries.

Major Fiske has testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee that as a result of the survey he is making of the Tennessee Valley he has found 52 power dam sites outside of Muscle Shoals, and in estimating their power possibilities he said:

> Outside of Muscle Shoals the rest of the Tennessee River, including all the tributaries, 3,000,000 horsepower is a fair estimate at this stage of the proceedings.

In view of these facts I am very much inclined to agree with the conclusions of the commissioner of corporations that it is but little better than pure speculation to undertake to estimate what may be the ultimate water-power development in this country. The reason is plain. We have never gathered sufficient data to make possible a reliable inventory of our undeveloped water power.

The present methods of granting 50-year licenses to private companies to develop whatever water powers they choose, wherever they may choose to develop them, without any general plan that would assure us of securing the greatest and most efficient use of our undeveloped water power, is a short-sighted policy and one that may cost us dearly in the future. We can not expect that these private power companies will so design their projects as to secure the greatest development of a stream as a whole, nor in such a way as to give us the greatest possible navigation benefits. These companies are in business to secure the greatest possible return on their investment and not to carry out any national plan of water power development or of navigation improvement whatever.

If we continue to permit the development of our water powers in this haphazard way, we will awaken some day to find that the power companies have skimmed the cream and left us only the skimmed milk. We will also discover that the plan which would provide for the greatest possible development of the water power would compel the rebuilding of expensive dams and power plants, and we will find the expense will often be prohibitive, just as the expense of widening the most crowded streets of many of our great cities is prohibitive.

According to present estimates, only about 15 per cent of our water-power resources have been developed. It is not too late, then, to make surveys and prepare a general plan of development which will efficiently utilize the potential water

power of our streams and give us the best possible development for navigation, flood control, and irrigation at the same time.

In 1908, in submitting the preliminary report of the Inland Waterways Commission, President Roosevelt said:

> Our river systems are better adapted to the needs of the people than those of any other country. In extent, distribution, navigability, and ease of use they stand first. Yet the rivers of no other civilized country are so poorly developed, so little used, or play so small a part in the industrial life of the Nation as those of the United States. In view of the use made of rivers elsewhere, the failure to use our own is astonishing, and no thoughtful man can believe that it will last. * * *
>
> There is urgent need for prompt and decisive action.

While many bills have been introduced since that time for the purpose of encouraging the comprehensive improvement of our great river systems, the fact remains that up to this hour there has never been a Government survey completed which covered both power and navigation, except at Muscle Shoals.

In dealing with this subject we must remember that the authority of the Federal Government over the streams of the United States is strictly limited to considerations of navigation improvement. We have no constitutional authority to legislate as to the utilization of water, whether it be for water power or irrigation, except as these subjects are related to questions of navigation or where power sites are located on Government lands.

The survey which is now being made of the Tennessee River has disclosed no less than 52 power-dam sites where water-power development to the extent of more than 3,000,000 horsepower is feasible. If the cost of developing these dam sites is $150 per horsepower, this means that an investment of $450,000,000 is warranted. It can not be questioned that we have expended our funds wisely, when with an investment of about $500,000 we are able to point the way to an increase in national wealth of $450,000,000. But this is only the beginning, for the last census shows that in the principal industries every horsepower produces manufactured goods worth about $900 annually. If this 3,000,000 horsepower were employed but half the time, the value of its products on this basis would be $1,350,000,000, while if fully employed, it would amount to $2,700,000,000—a truly astonishing figure.

If this can be done in a single stream and its tributaries, what will be the result when we apply this policy to our great river systems throughout the country? I would not venture to make a prediction, but the wisdom of such a policy is proved beyond dispute by the results which we are securing on the Tennessee River. Private capital in the Tennessee Valley is competing for the privilege of building dams at these favorable power sites at its own expense, and there is no lack of opportunity for us to receive the full Government rate of 4 per cent interest on any investment we may care to make in these navigation power dams, not only for power purposes but for navigation purposes as well, and there is ample opportunity to provide for the refund of the entire capital cost of the work by means of sinking funds, so that the Government may have its navigation improvement virtually without expense.

It should be remembered that interest on the investment is by far the greatest item in the cost of generating hydroelectric power for the physical operation of a hydroelectric plant requiring no coal, and very little labor is a very insignificant matter, and I would particularly call to the attention of the House the fact that where private power companies can spend a given amount in a development built with private funds on which they pay 8 per cent interest, the Government, paying only 4 per cent interest, can spend twice as much with the same capital charge, and can therefore undertake projects which are not attractive to private capital at all.

Granted that we should make these surveys as promptly as possible and conserve our water powers before it is too late, the question remains as to who should make the survey.

Under the Federal water power act, while the Federal Power Commission is given the authority to make surveys, it is also provided that before any work is authorized the entire matter must be referred to the Chief of Engineers to be passed upon and approved from the standpoint of navigation. We could have a dozen Federal Power Commissions and they might spend any number of millions of dollars in surveys covering the entire United States, but no work could be started until the Chief of Engineers had determined that the plans were satisfactory to the Government under the only constitutional authority which we possess, and that is the authority to control navigation.

We may as well face this matter squarely, for in undertaking these surveys we are called upon to make an important decision. If we provide the funds to enable the Federal Power Commission to prosecute this work, then we should turn over to the commission the control of navigation of our inland streams also.

If we do not do so the United States Engineers would have every right to disapprove of the work of the Federal Power Commission and to decline to permit the work to proceed until they themselves had made their own investigations, including the necessary surveys. To adopt such a plan and build up a large engineering force under the Federal Power Commission when the United States Engineers already have the organization for effectively carrying out these surveys, to my mind, would be an inexcusable duplication and waste of effort.

Furthermore, the United States Engineers have been in charge of our inland waterway improvements for a hundred years, and if we take this field of usefulness away from them we sacrifice the experience of a century in dealing with our rivers.

The obvious way to do this surveying effectively is to put it into the hands of the Corps of Engineers who already have the exclusive authority to control our navigation improvement. The record of the Corps of Engineers is a most honorable one and I know of no bureau in which politics have played so small a part and whose record is more free from scandal and dishonesty than that of our Engineer Corps. They are well equipped to undertake this task, and with the work in their hands there would be no confusing conflict of authority, but we could rest assured that the work would be well done, and that power development in the future would be so carried out as to utilize our undeveloped powers to the best advantage and give us the greatest possible navigation benefits as well.

Such a program will not hinder the development of water power but will give a tremendous impetus to it. With this information at hand the Government will know from its own records what should be done and will not have to depend upon information furnished by interested individuals and companies which is the case at present. Our surveys would not be confined to so-called navigable streams but would extend to their tributaries, for every dam which controls the flow of a tributary in any material degree affects the navigability of the main stream itself, and as a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concluded in 1916, the power of Congress—

> is not limited to the navigable sections of streams but extends to the tributaries and feeders of the same, for without the control of these the power over the navigable sections might become wholly impotent. (U. S. *v.* Rio Grande Co., 174 U. S. 690.)

These studies of our streams will undoubtedly disclose thousands of feasible power sites not at present recognized. One has only to consult such a map as this one of the Columbia River Basin to see at once that in these small areas shown in pink, where power surveys have been made, the streams are literally lined with proposed dam sites.

I am told that while it is admitted that no bureau of the Federal Government has ever made any general navigation, power, irrigation, and flood-prevention survey of the Columbia River and its tributaries, it is claimed that the States of Oregon and Washington have had engineers in the field for three years making a joint study of the possibilities of the Columbia River. While I do not doubt that this is so, the fact still remains that the control of navigation is not in the hands of the States on an interstate stream but is controlled by the Federal Government and administered through the United States engineers, and no matter how many State surveys are made on interstate streams no structures affecting the navigable capacity of these streams will be permitted without the approval of the Chief of Engineers, who may or may not agree with the State engineers as to the findings resulting from their surveys and studies. Since the Chief of Engineers is the final authority to pass on the project, is it not a matter of common sense that he should also be given authority to work out the necessary plans with his own forces, so that he may have his own information as the basis for his decisions?

I do not claim to be conversant with the details of the rivers within the drainage area of the Columbia River. I do know, however, that Mr. E. W. Kramer, hydroelectric engineer of the United States Forest Service at Missoula, Mont., published in the Electrical World of July 16, 1921, a review of the hydroelectric possibilities in Montana.

It will be noticed that one of the principal tributaries of the Columbia River is what is known as Clarks Fork, which has a watershed of about 22,000 square miles, or something less than

10 per cent of the entire drainage area of the Columbia River, which amounts to 259,000 square miles. For a short distance near the head of the stream Clarks Fork, as will be seen from the map, traverses the State of Montana. In his article Mr. Kramer gives a list of 10 undeveloped power sites on this short stretch of Clarks Fork, totaling 578,500 primary horsepower, provided that Flathead Lake is utilized for a small amount of storage, this storage being confined to 30 feet of water in the lake.

One of the outstanding features in the Columbia River Basin is the possibility of improving the primary power by means of storage reservoirs at the headwaters of the streams. As will be seen from the map, the Columbia River has its source in Columbia Lake, in British Columbia, and traverses several large lakes before it reaches the international boundary. No studies of the Columbia River in the United States which ignore the Canadian storage possibilities will do justice to the Columbia River within the United States. It is no more possible to consider the American and the Canadian parts of the Columbia River separately than it is possible to consider the American and Canadian portions of the St. Lawrence River separately. The improvement of both streams is an international problem and should be handled by international commissions. Just what the increase in the useful power on the American side will be by securing a reasonable regulation of the flow of the Columbia River by utilizing these lakes as storage reservoirs I am not able to say, but I can give Members an indication of what storage does in increasing the useful power of a stream by referring to data given by Mr. Kramer in his paper.

He states that there is an undeveloped power site on the Clarks Fork River in Montana, near the Idaho line, where without storage the available head of about 77 feet will develop 38,000 primary horsepower. With 30 feet of storage on Flathead Lake the primary power developed would be increased to 92,000 horsepower, which is an increase of 142 per cent.

No such survey as is now being made of the Tennessee River and no such study of its combined navigation and power possibilities has ever been made by the United States Government within the basin of the Columbia River, and while the official estimate of the Electrical World gives the Columbia River Basin credit for 4,809,210 horsepower within the United States, while the St. Lawrence Basin is credited with only 4,262,520 horsepower, I believe that an international study of the Columbia would result in a plan under which the estimate of the useful power of the Columbia River and its tributaries would be largely increased.

While the first three annual reports of the Federal Power Commission made no reference to the desirability of a nationwide inventory and plan for utilizing our national water resources effectively, the results of the survey inaugurated at the instance of our committee on the Tennessee River could not be overlooked, and in their fourth annual report the Federal Power Commission concede all the contentions which were made in the Tennessee River case in the following paragraph:

> It is universally recognized that the future of American industry and transportation is dependent upon the use of electric energy and that in the production of such energy water power should be used to the full extent of its economic feasibility. If, therefore, we are to develop these powers to the fullest productivity, free of all avoidable waste, and are to secure at the same time the correlated use of the waters for navigation, irrigation, and other beneficial purposes we must change from the haphazard methods heretofore employed and proceed to prepare real plans of comprehensive stream development.

Such a general plan which we now recommend and which has brought such satisfactory results on the Tennessee River is exactly in line with the message of President Roosevelt who said:

> It is poor business to develop a river for navigation in such a way as to prevent its use for power, when by a little foresight it could be made to serve both purposes. We can not afford needlessly to sacrifice power to irrigation or irrigation to domestic water supply when by taking thought we may have all three. Every stream should be used to the utmost. No stream can be so used unless such use is planned for in advance. When such plans are made we shall find that, instead of interfering, one use can often be made to assist another. Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such.

In order to make clear what is meant by the most effective development of the power of a stream considered as a whole, that is, considering whole stream as a unit, let me cite the Coosa River as an example of haphazard stream development and then refer to three outstanding examples, one in New England, one in the South, and one in the West, which illustrate how a stream as a whole should be treated in power development.

Rising in northwestern Georgia the Coosa River, as shown by the map, flows in a southwesterly direction directly toward the Gulf and joins the Alabama River at a point 11 miles below the town of Wetumpka, Ala., and the Alabama continues by a direct route to the Gulf which it reaches at Mobile.

The valley of the Coosa River, while comprising but 13,000 square miles, equal to about one-third of the area drained by the Tennessee River, resembles the Tennessee Valley in the remarkable variety of its natural resources suitable for industrial use. Hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore and workable coal, practically inexhaustible quantities of white marble comparable with Italian marble; numerous deposits of blue marble; cement materials in an unlimited supply; high-grade limestones, suitable for building purposes; immense beds of kaolin; china clay, and fire clay; as well as clay suitable for making paving bricks, and smaller deposits of bauxite, ocher, manganese, and other minerals, all combined to furnish a substantial basis for the expectation that on such a direct route to the sea a water-borne commerce of considerable proportions ought to be readily developed.

The Coosa River has another peculiar advantage in the fact that it has a greater fall per mile along its lower reaches instead of in its upper regions. This constitutes an ideal condition for power development and one that is rarely found on ordinary streams, for, as a rule, the greatest fall in a stream is near the headwaters where the water supply is very limited. In the Coosa, however, there is ten times as much fall per mile in a 50-mile stretch near the mouth as exists 200 miles farther up the river.

This fall, instead of being a hindrance to navigation, as is the case under the old scheme of providing a large number of low navigation dams and locks, is a real advantage if the improvements are designed to develop the power, for the power can return to the Government a fair rate of interest on its investment, and by means of a sinking fund this same power can refund to the Government the entire cost of the improvement, both for navigation and power.

In spite of these advantages, however, the history of the Coosa River shows that our expenditures for so-called improvements have not resulted in more commerce but in less commerce. In 1894, 20 years after the commencement of Government improvements on this river, we had expended $1,075,700 on the Coosa River, and the following year the traffic amounted to 150,878 tons. In 1923, after appropriations and allotments totaling $2,598,095, the traffic had dwindled to 11,314 tons, or about five or six good train loads of freight in the entire year.

Since the beginning of investigations in 1872 there have been no less than 12 different surveys, but none of them considered the power development along with the navigation improvement until in June, 1910, Maj. H. B. Ferguson, of the Corps of Engineers, made a preliminary report—the first of its kind ever undertaken by the Government covering both navigation and water power. Major Ferguson pointed out the necessity for coordinating these two uses of the stream and asked for $25,000 to complete a joint navigation-power survey, but he never got the money and the survey was never completed.

Instead of having a well-considered coordinated plan, the record shows an absolute lack of policy in dealing with this stream. Isolated locks and dams separated by dangerous stretches of rapid water over which no commercial navigation possibly could be expected to flourish, have been proposed and abandoned from time to time. Thirty-two locks and dams have been proposed in all for navigation only. Of these 32 navigation dams only seven have been built and one of these seven was built without a lock. Meanwhile two power dams have been constructed, completely blocking the navigation from shore to shore, and while the power company has been required to show a provision for locks in its design, under the terms of the license, the construction of the locks is postponed until the development of navigation traffic warrants their construction. The idea of expecting a substantial navigation traffic to develop in a stream which is completely blocked at three points by permanent dams built from shore to shore without locks reminds me of the ancient nursery rhyme which runs like this:

> Oh! mother, may I go out to swim?
> Oh! yes, my darling daughter,
> You may hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
> But don't you go near the water.

The net result of this confused, delayed, and hopelessly discouraging navigation program has been that on December 29, 1920, the Chief of Engineers recommended abandoning entirely

the present navigation project. So we have this condition, that on a stream in which navigation might be had without cost to the Government, our lack of a comprehensive plan has resulted in no practical navigation improvement at all.

Turning now to the examples of the kind of power development which can be had when an entire stream is considered as a whole, we are obliged to look to nonnavigable streams, for I know of no instance in which a navigable stream has been worked out in this way.

A good example of a stream which is being so developed as to secure the complete utilization of its hydroelectric possibilities is a little branch of the Connecticut River in New England known as the Deerfield River. The Deerfield rises in the hills of southern Vermont, flows south through the Berkshires in northwestern Massachusetts, where it turns east and joins the Connecticut River near Turner Falls, Mass. Although it drains only 550 square miles, or only 1¼ per cent of the area drained by the Tennessee River, it is to have nine new hydroelectric power plants, which under the plans of the New England Power Co. will have an installed capacity of about 120,000 horsepower, or about the same amount of generating equipment as the primary power proposed at both dams Nos. 2 and 3 together at Muscle Shoals.

This is to be accomplished by regulating the flow of the Deerfield River by means of two storage reservoirs, one of which has been completed, together with five of the new hydroelectric plants. When the project is fully completed there will be 13 hydroelectric plants in a river that is only 75 miles long, and out of a total of approximately 1,950 feet of fall some 1,700 feet, or about 87 per cent, will be utilized.

An outstanding example of intensive and intelligent hydroelectric development in the South is to be found in an almost unknown stream called the Catawba River in North and South Carolina, a stream which in South Carolina is known as the Wateree River and is a branch of the Santee River which flows into the Atlantic Ocean a short distance above Charleston, S. C. This stream has been improved by the Southern Power Co. with 10 hydroelectric plants and 2 storage reservoirs. The dams, however, were not provided with locks, as this is not regarded as a navigable stream; so in spite of the fact that this stream is now an almost continuous succession of fresh-water lakes on which navigation would be very easy throughout the year, there can be no navigation at all. The total generating capacity of the plants on this small stream is 420,000 horsepower, and these developments operate more than 300 cotton mills with 5,500,000 spindles in addition to many other industries, and furnish light and power for several scores of cities and towns in the Carolinas.

In the West a splendid example of this policy as applied to power development is seen in the program of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which calls for the development of a continuous output of about 429,000 horsepower in an insignificant stream known as the Pit River in northern California. This river drains a basin of only about 6,000 square miles, or about 14 per cent of the area drained by the Tennessee River. There are to be five power stations in all, utilizing completely a fall of 2,070 feet in 60 miles distance. A storage reservoir will be provided to equalize the natural irregularities in the stream flow, but instead of building high dams the water is to be carried through tunnels across the various bends in the river and delivered to the powerhouse through large pipes.

Of course under such conditions no possibilities of navigation existed, but the Pit River is a tributary of the navigable Sacramento River, and the storage reservoir has its effect on the navigable capacity of the Sacramento River during times of low water, so that undoubtedly the Federal Government could exercise its authority in the case of the Pit River project if it so desired. It is not likely, however, that any improvement in the highly efficient plan of utilizing the waters of the Pit River could be desired.

These three examples of insignificant streams, yielding a total of nearly 1,000,000 horsepower under efficient development in which each stream in considered as a single unit from its source to its mouth and its flow regulated by means of storage reservoirs, so that the smallest possible amount of water is wasted and the greatest possible amount of fall in the stream is utilized, indicate clearly that with the adoption of such plans throughout the country we would find that our present estimates of the hydroelectric-power resources of the United States are much too small and that our plans for the navigation of our principal streams are capable of very substantial improvement.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, nature has so arranged the form and conditions of the earth to advantageously aid and assist the advancement of the individual, it matters not where he may be located, to the sustenance of life and the advancement of the human race.

This fact occurs throughout the world, and particularly so in the entire United States, where the opportunity for humanity to create power and install and maintain advantages to produce equitable transportation is unusually great.

Of the more than three million square miles which comprise the United States it was so formulated that most regions are always provided with the proper amount of moisture, and whenever there is a heavy rainfall, which, indeed, often occurs, brooks, creeks, and rivers carry away the overproduction, thus forming volumes of water which create valuable power.

The control of the wonderful power which nature has so generously provided for the use of mankind has created a function for this Government to perform through the Rivers and Harbors Committee. This committee has already achieved splendid success and a great field for accomplishment lies before it.

The more closely the improved faculties of mankind cooperate with and understand the powers of nature, the more advanced civilization will become and the more worthwhile life will be.

Time and the perseverance of water have provided a means of cheap transportation; rivers constantly carving out and carrying away the rocks and sediment have so deepened their channels as to permit various kinds of vessels to ply upon them, thus providing a very economic form of transportation.

Two great rivers—the Monongahela and the Ohio—form a wonderful water system, with possibilities of carrying more traffic than any other inland waterway. This system is not yet complete, but from the indications of the amount of appropriation which this bill provides, there will be great and profitable improvements and advantages brought in the near future, so that the products of the North and South and East and West will become exchangeable on a more equitable basis, and thus bring about better understanding between those sections.

Along these great waterways are located many steel mills, foundries, and other industries which furnish much freight to be carried by water, and there is also a vast amount of coal to be transported. Several years ago, before there was a dam built in the Ohio, there was a powerful towboat, called *Big Joe Williamson*, which plied up and down that river. This boat towed on one trip down the Ohio enough coal to load 45 trains of 50 cars per train; in other words, enough to load one train of 2,250 cars, carrying about 150,000 tons, or before mined, about 12 acres of coal. To transport that amount of coal today from the Fairmont section of West Virginia would cost at least one-half million dollars. No doubt that cargo towed down the Ohio by that great boat did not cost more than $50,000.

We should pay more attention to these waterways which furnish us free transportation. The water is neither owned or controlled by any individual or corporation, but is for the use of all of us.

We should always favor those divisions of Government work which keep these waterways in operation, and develop them so that lost power can be turned into useful energy that will save human energy, make homes comfortable, life enjoyable, and folks neighborly.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, the rivers and harbors bill now under consideration, beginning on page 8, line 3, provides for the authorization of improvements to Green Bay Harbor and Fox River, Wis. This proposed legislation is the result of the preliminary examination and survey authorized by Congress in the river and harbor act approved June 5, 1920.

THE FOX RIVER

Let me briefly give you the history of this waterway and a description of the river and harbor which this provision of the bill proposes to improve in order that you may have a better understanding of the merits of this proposition.

The Fox River rises in Columbia County, Wis., and flows in a northerly direction, emptying into Green Bay, an arm of Lake Michigan. Its length is about 176 miles. The Wolf River, which is physically the main river, but by designation is a tributary of the Fox River, rises in the central part of Forest County, Wis., and flows in a southerly direction about 220 miles, joining the Fox River 10 miles above Oshkosh. This large tributary of the Fox, known as the Wolf River, supplies an immense amount of water to the Fox. Lake Winnebago divides the Fox River into two sections known as the Upper Fox and the Lower Fox.

The Upper Fox is that portion of the river above Oshkosh. It varies in width at different places, and is from 50 to 300

feet wide, having also a fall at mean stage from Portage, Wis., to Lake Winnebago of 39.3 feet.

The Lower Fox is that portion of the river from Lake Winnebago to its mouth, Green Bay, which is a distance of about 32 miles and varying from 300 to 3,000 feet in width. It has a fall of about 166 feet and is divided into a series of eight rapids. The improvements proposed by this section of the rivers and harbors bill apply only to this part of the Fox River which is the source of considerable water-power development and is navigated by various boats serving the people and the business interests in the vicinity.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE NAVIGATION PROJECTS ON THE FOX RIVER

The first effort made by the United States to improve this river was by the congressional act of August 8, 1846, which provided for a grant of land to the State of Wisconsin for which the State in turn was to improve the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers and to provide at Portage a canal between them. This land grant was accepted by the State of Wisconsin on June 29, 1848. The State then placed the work of improvement under a State board of public works. Later the State by act of July 6, 1853, vested further improvements of the rivers in the Fox & Wisconsin Improvement Co., a private corporation under the laws of Wisconsin. On August 15, 1866, the State, under the act of October 3, 1856, sold the entire improvement work to the Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co., another private corporation. This company remained in charge of the waterway and its improvement until 1872.

The condition of the property at this time is revealed in the Annual Report of the Engineers of the War Department for 1873, on page 221, where it states that all structures on this river, with the exception of one stone lock, were temporary and in bad condition. It was at this time that the United States Government, by an act of Congress on July 7, 1870, and the rivers and harbors act of June 10, 1872, regained control of the improvement of this waterway described as the Great Lakes and Mississippi waterway by way of the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers by purchase from the Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co., for the amount of $145,000 of the property connected with the improvement of navigation, but not including the water power. The Government from now on had full charge of all of the improvement projects on this river for navigation purposes and had established and maintained between Lake Winnebago and De Pere 19 locks and 9 dams in connection with the waterway.

NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF THE FOX RIVER WATERWAY

The demands for the use of the navigation of the Lower Fox by the people in the Fox River Valley, both the consuming public and the industrial developments, have constantly been increasing. Col. W. V. Judson, district engineer of the northwestern division, reports on page 12 of Document No. 294 of the House of Representatives, Sixty-eighth Congress, that within the last five years the commerce of the Fox River has nearly doubled in tonnage and more than doubled in value. He states further that during the same period coal shipments on the Lower Fox have more than doubled in tonnage and have increased nearly four times in value. The opportunities afforded by the water-power development on the Fox River insure more extensive shipping and which, as the reports already indicate, are substantial every year.

I invite your attention to the data in Document 294 on page 12, showing the nature of the articles that are shipped on this waterway and the extent of the same in tonnage and value. To give you a further idea of the demand for the use of this waterway, which, if it is to adequately serve the Fox River Valley people, needs the proposed improvements, I call your attention to the enterprising cities along this river which benefit from the navigation. The important cities along this river are Fond du Lac, Oshkosh, Neenah, Menasha, Appleton, Kaukauna, De Pere, and at the mouth the large and enterprising city of Green Bay. Little Chute, Kimberly, and Combined Locks also thrive on this waterway. It is not necessary to enumerate the industries that flourish in these cities and which, I stated, depend a great deal upon shipping on this river. If you but refer to this same report of the engineers of the War Department, you will see for yourself that the capital invested and business carried on is considerable. In the one item of coal alone the industries along this water route consume over 250,000 tons annually.

What I have already said and the facts as revealed by the engineers' report I am sure clearly indicate the need of a dependable waterway in the Fox River Valley and consequently the immediate necessity of the improvements proposed.

IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED ON THE LOWER FOX

By adopting this provision of the bill the following improvements will be authorized to be made by the War Department: As recommended by the engineers' report, it provides for a channel 7 feet deep at low water and 100 feet wide, widened at bends over ledge sections at Kaukauna, Combined Locks, Little Chute, Drunkards Point, Appleton, and Grignon Rapids. The ledge area below De Pere Lock would be deepened to 9.6 feet to provide a navigable channel at low lake level during southerly gales, which, as reported by the engineer, greatly reduces the elevation of the water service in Green Bay Harbor.

In this connection Gen. H. Taylor, present Chief of Engineers of the War Department, in his report found on page 5 of House Document No. 294, says this—

> The greatest difficulty experienced by navigation is in the sections of the channel where a depth not in excess of 6 feet exists over ledge rock. During high water bowlders and ledge fragments are sometimes deposited on the ledge bottom, reducing the available depth and offering dangerous obstructions. A particularly difficult reach of this character lies just below the lock at De Pere—

Which is the section proposed to be deepened to the extent I mentioned. He goes on to say further:

> While little trouble is experienced in this reach from bowlders, the available depth over the ledge is reduced by from 1 to 4.6 feet by the general lowering of the water surfaces during southerly gales, and navigation is sometimes practically suspended for several days.

This, of course, is a very undesirable situation to have when industries depend upon articles shipped by the water route for the continuance of their enterprises. At Neenah it is recommended that that channel be widened to 100 feet and to provide also a concrete retaining wall at Kaukauna in order to prevent a possible breach at that point. It is apparent, of course, that by securing this retaining wall not only will it be an improvement to the shipping and water-power benefits derived from this river but it will be an economy to the Government by reason of the fact that it will save the property that is now jeopardized by a possible washout as reported by the Engineers of the War Department.

For a more detailed and complete view of the proposed improvements and the corresponding costs, I invite your attention to the following table taken from the report of the district engineer, F. S. Skinner, found on pages 27 and 28 of House Document 294:

Location	Character of work	Cubic yards in place	Unit cost	Cost
De Pere: Below lock	Removal of ledge rock, 600 feet long, 100 feet wide.	6,500	$6.50	$42,250
Kaukauna:				
Below fourth lock[1]	800 feet long, 100 feet wide	3,500	6.50	22,750
Below third lock[1]	700 feet long, 100 feet wide	1,700	6.50	11,050
Below second lock[1]	600 feet long, 100 feet wide	1,600	6.50	10,400
Below first lock[1]	400 feet long, 100 feet wide	3,200	6.50	20,800
Above first lock[1]	800 feet long, 100 feet wide	2,500	6.50	16,250
Total		12,500		81,250
In river below dam	Concrete retaining wall, 1,125 feet long, average 18 feet high.	3,750	15.00	56,250
Combined Locks: Below lock.	Remove shell and loose rock, 900 feet long, 100 feet wide.	1,900	2.00	3,800
Little Chute:				
Below second lock[1]	700 feet long, 100 feet wide	3,000	6.50	19,500
Above Guard Lock[1]	300 feet long, 100 feet wide	800	6.50	5,200
Total		3,800		24,700
Drunkards Point: Above Cedars Lock.	Removal of ledge rock, 1,000 feet long, 250 feet wide.	2,500	6.50	16,250
Appleton:				
Below fourth lock	Remove shell and loose rock, 300 feet long, 100 feet wide.	800	6.50	5,200
Below third lock[1]	200 feet long, 100 feet wide	700	6.50	4,550
Below second lock[1]	100 feet long, 100 feet wide	200	6.50	1,300
Below first lock[1]	350 feet long, 100 feet wide	500	6.50	3,250
Total		2,200		14,300
Grignon Rapids: Above Appleton First Lock.	Removal of ledge rock, ¾ mile long, 100 to 200 feet wide.	6,600	6.50	42,900
Neenah Channel: Above Neenah Dam.	Remove clay, hardpan, and stone, 1 mile long, 100 feet wide.	21,000	.60	12,600
Grand total				294,300

[1] Removal of ledge rock.

IMPROVEMENTS TO GREEN BAY HARBOR

The improvements mentioned in the foregoing remarks take care of the Lower Fox from De Pere to Lake Winnebago. The rest of the river from De Pere to Green Bay is referred to by the engineers of the War Department and the Rivers and Harbors Committee as Green Bay Harbor, and therefore the improvements contemplated at these points are described as improvements to Green Bay Harbor. I do not believe it is necessary to go to any great length to describe this portion of the river and harbor improvement proposed. It is sufficient to point out that the city of Green Bay is a great, enterprising center and is so situated as to afford it a wonderful opportunity for the development as an important lake port, which I may add, it is now so considered. However, in order to increase the possibilities of its use as a lake port and its shipping business with De Pere, a city only 5 miles up the Fox River from Green Bay, and the direct shipping business that is carried on with the city of De Pere by outsiders, necessitates the expenditures for the improvements proposed. By developing the project at this point according to the plans of the engineers of the War Department, and thus making it possible for direct contact between the shippers and the city of De Pere, by enabling their lake boats to reach De Pere without the necessity of transshipment or the unloading of part of their cargo, it is estimated that not less than $75,000 annually will be saved in this one instance alone. At the present time it is impossible for the lake steamers to go up the river to that point but with the improvement as proposed, which means a deepening of the existing channel of 15 feet to 18 feet and enlarging the turning basin at that point, the lake steamers will be able to reach De Pere with their full cargo.

The proposed improvements to Green Bay Harbor will involve an expenditure of $110,000. This, however, does not mean that the Government will have to spend this sum. The city of De Pere has agreed to pay $50,000 toward this improvement, and therefore the share to be borne by the United States will be only $60,000. One of the most conclusive examples of the interest and need of the people and the business interests in this community for this development is shown by the fact that they are willing to spend $50,000 themselves toward this improvement and furthermore have agreed that in order to protect the Government in its undertaking from any possible chance of their not being able to raise the $50,000 allotment that no work should be begun by the Government on this project until the people of De Pere have raised this sum.

THESE PROJECTS IN HARMONY WITH NATIONAL POLICY FOR IMPROVING RIVERS AND HARBORS

In conclusion, let me say that this project involving the improvement to Green Bay Harbor and Fox River is not merely a proposal conceived by interested parties, but it is the result of examination and survey by the engineers of the War Department and it has the indorsement of the engineers of the War Department, as shown by the letter of Maj. Gen. Lansing H. Beach, formerly Chief of Engineers of the War Department, found at the beginning of House Document No. 294, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session; the statements of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, concurring with the district and division engineers, found on page 4 of this document; the indorsement as shown in the letter of Maj. Gen. H. Taylor, now Chief of Engineers of the War Department, found on page 4 of this document; and in a number of other reports that are printed in this same document, all of which concur with other recommendations for this improvement; and last but not least, based on the findings of the engineers of the War Department and a careful consideration of the reports submitted in this connection, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors properly included this proposal in the bill, recommending that it be passed.

Having conclusively demonstrated to you the necessity and importance of this relief to the people interested in the shipping on this water route and those that benefit from this waterway, and that it has had the indorsement of all the official bodies to whom the project has been referred, I believe that I can expect that Congress will approve this provision of the rivers and harbors bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 16, 1925, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

796. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment of the United States for the fiscal year 1926 in the sum of $5,000 for the Botanic Gardens (H. Doc. No. 560), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11066. A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend d'Oreille River, Bonner County, Idaho, at the Newport-Priest River Road crossing, Idaho; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BURTNESS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3642. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at Kettle Falls, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3428. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River to connect the city of Portsmouth, Ohio, and the village of Fullerton, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PARKS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 11168. A bill granting the consent of Congress to S. M. McAdams, of Iva, Anderson County, S. C., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 11214. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended by the act of December 30, 1910; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TILLMAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5197. A bill to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1179. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia rendered useless or unnecessary by reason of the opening, extension, widening, or straightening, in accordance with the highway plan of other streets, roads, or highways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1786. An act to amend sections 5, 6, and 7 of the act of Congress making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10590. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to provide funds to be used in the purchase of a suitable tract of land to be used for cemetery purposes for the use and benefit of members of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 1196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Washington: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10770. A bill granting certain lands to the State of Washington for public park and recreational grounds, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOMINICK: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3509. An act to change the time for the holding of terms of court in the eastern district of South Carolina; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11638. A bill to amend the tariff act of 1922 and other acts, and to change the official title of the Board of United States General Appraisers and members thereof to that of the United States Customs Court, presiding judge, and judges thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 9700. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to enlarge the site and erect buildings thereon for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States in Tokyo, Japan;

with amendments (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 8267. A bill for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. S. Con. Res. 25. A concurrent resolution relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10869. A bill to authorize Hoffman Philip, minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary of the United States to Uruguay, to accept certain gifts from the French and British Governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. J. Res. 262. A joint resolution to authorize the United States Shipping Board to adjust the claim of the Near East Relief; without amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 11418. A bill authorizing the Department of State to deliver to the Hon. Henry D. Clayton, district judge of the United States for the middle and northern districts of Alabama, and permitting him to accept, the decoration and diploma presented by the Government of France; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1948. A bill for the relief of Samuel Friedman, as trustee for the heirs and devisees of B. Friedman and Henry Mills, and as trustee for the heirs and devisees of Emanuel Loveman, deceased; with amendments (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2416. A bill for the relief of F. Joseph Chatterton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Hannah Parker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10749) granting a pension to Maude Grinstead; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11601) granting a pension to Margaret A. Lawrence; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 11667) to create a bureau of civil air navigation in the Department of Commerce, encourage and regulate the navigation of civil aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWES: A bill (H. R. 11668) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Missouri, Illinois, and Kentucky to construct, maintain, and operate bridges over the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers at or near Cairo, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREW: A bill (H. R. 11669) to amend section 315 of the tariff act of 1922 and extend to articles on the free list the power of the President over import duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 322) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolution (H. Res. 406) to print the article entitled "Japanese exclusion" as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. CULLEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York favoring an appropriation by Congress for the deepening of the Hudson River Channel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York favoring authorization and appropriations for deepening the Hudson River to the capital district; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 11670) granting a pension to Edward A. Junck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11671) granting a pension to James L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11672) granting an increase of pension to James F. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 11673) granting an increase of pension to Jane Langerak; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 11674) granting a pension to Sarah E. Jarrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 11675) granting an increase of pension to Marilla Couse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 11676) granting a pension to Samuel R. Proud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11677) granting a pension to Julia A. Barrow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 11678) granting an increase of pension to Emma Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11679) granting an increase of pension to William Sally; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11680) granting an increase of pension to Patrick D. Hagerty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11681) granting a pension to Edward J. Pitts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11682) for the relief of the persons or companies who advanced money or materials for the construction and maintenance of an air-mail hangar at Salt Lake City, Utah, for the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11683) for the relief of T. Arthur Moore; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 11684) granting a pension to Angie Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 11685) granting an increase of pension to Emogene E. Perrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 11686) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 11687) granting a pension to Elizabeth B. Cornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11688) granting a pension to Ursula Lamphier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11689) granting a pension to Anna Pruden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11690) granting a pension to Frances Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11691) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Vail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11692) granting an increase of pension to Martha H. Nunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 11693) granting an increase of pension to Marion A. Hey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS: A bill (H. R. 11694) for the relief of John H. Emmord, Emma W. Bay, and Harry C. Holloway, copartners, trading as John W. Bay & Co., and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11695) granting a pension to Carrie B. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11696) granting a pension to Dora Alice Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 11697) for the relief of Daniel Godsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 11698) for the relief of Lizzie Collier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 11609) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11700) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Deemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution (H. Res. 405) to pay to Walter C. Neilson $1,500 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions by detail from the Bureau of Pensions; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3456. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, asking for a more definite proportionate contribution by the Federal Government and the District of Columbia in appropriations for the maintenance, upkeep, and development of the Federal territory; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3457. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of T. C. Thatcher, vice president of Oklahoma City Mill & Elevator Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., relative to the interpretation of the milling in bond and the tariff treaty between the United States and Cuba on wheat produced in Canada and milled in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3458. Also, petition of Lieut. Bernard A. Kellner, favoring adequate appropriations for making the national defense act of June 4, 1920, a practical reality; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3459. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Boston Real Estate Exchange, Boston, Mass., protesting against the creation of a rent commission for the District of Columbia, as proposed by United States Senate bill 3764 and House bill 11078; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3460. Also, petition of General Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains, recommending favorable action on Senate bill 2532 and House bill 7038, which provide for the same status as to pay, allowances, advancement for Army chaplains as for Navy chaplains; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3461. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of Highland Park Women's Clubs, urging the participation of the United States in the World Court on the terms of Warren G. Harding and Secretary Charles Hughes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3462. Also, petition of officers of organizations of Rochester, Mich., urging the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to report a resolution providing for participation of the United States in the World Court on the Harding-Hughes terms, in order that it may be voted upon by the Senate as a whole; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2463. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Shingle House, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3464. By Mr. KINDRED: Petition of Community Councils of the City of New York, advocating the immediate enactment of the rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3465. Also, petition of Thomas W. Shelton, chairman of the Committee on Uniform Judicial Procedure, American Bar Association, urging immediate consideration by Congress of Senate bill 2061 or House bill 11071; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3466. By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of Lars Stai, of Mount Shasta, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 8938, allowing travel pay from the Philippines to volunteer soldiers of the Spanish-American War and disabled veterans of the World War, state department, Los Angeles, Calif., urging passage of House bill 6484 and Senate bill 33; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3467. Also, petition of Lincoln Post No. 1, Department of California and Nevada, G. A. R., San Francisco, Calif., urging the repeal of the Stone Mountain Memorial 50-cent pieces; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3468. Also, petitions of El Dorado Oil Works, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing postal legislation recommended by the President and Postmaster General; and the Haslett Warehouse Co., San Francisco, Calif., indorsing postal legislation recommended by the President and Postmaster General; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3469. Also, petition of Executive Committee of Massachusetts Bar Association, indorsing legislation to increase the salaries of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3470. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of Mr. Ross Dustin and others, of Bend, Oreg., protesting against the Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3471. Also, petition of G. H. Martin and others, protesting against the Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

FRIDAY, *January 16, 1925*

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 15, 1925)

The Senate met in open executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the treaty with Cuba.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Edge	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.
Ball	Fernald	Keyes	Sheppard
Bayard	Ferris	King	Shipstead
Bingham	Fess	Ladd	Shortridge
Borah	Fletcher	McKellar	Simmons
Brookhart	George	McKinley	Smoot
Broussard	Gerry	McLean	Spencer
Bursum	Glass	McNary	Sterling
Butler	Gooding	Means	Swanson
Cameron	Greene	Metcalf	Underwood
Capper	Hale	Moses	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Harreld	Neely	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Harris	Norris	Warren
Cummins	Harrison	Oddie	Watson
Curtis	Heflin	Overman	Willis
Dale	Howell	Pepper	
Dial	Johnson, Calif.	Ralston	
Dill	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senate, as in legislative session, will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, to move that the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes, be set down as a special order for consideration at the conclusion of the routine morning business on Thursday, January 22.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may we have the request restated?

Mr. MOSES. I have requested unanimous consent as in legislative session to move that the bill to which I have referred be set down as a special order to be taken up for consideration at the conclusion of routine morning business on Thursday, January 22.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and leave is granted by unanimous consent to the Senator from New Hampshire to make the motion.

Mr. MOSES. I make the motion.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I know exactly what the motion is?

Mr. MOSES. My motion is to make Senate bill 3674, which is the postal salaries and rates bill, a special order to be taken up for consideration at the conclusion of routine morning business Thursday, January 22. I understand that it requires a two-thirds vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. I object.

Mr. MOSES. I had already obtained unanimous consent to make the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina can not now object. The Senator from New Hampshire has been granted unanimous consent to make the motion.