

that Congress shall not do what it determined to do by denying the appropriation necessary to carry it out. That is the situation. Congress has determined absolutely to build this improvement and passed a law to that effect. Now comes along the Committee on Appropriations and say, "We will deny the appropriation to carry out the policy," in effect repealing by their action what Congress has formerly determined should be the law and the course to pursue.

Mr. WARREN. The House did not include that item, and the Senate committee found it with 27 or 28 others of similar nature and felt that they all ought to go over until next year. I am not going to oppose a vote being taken on it if it can be taken at once.

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to have the Senate understand the amendment. I relied on that last night and it did not work very well. I want the Senate to understand the situation. The report says:

The Lighthouse Service storehouse, wooden smithy, and wharf are on property belonging to the Treasury Department, which is situated in the midst of the United States naval station. The wooden storehouse and wharf, which are highly inflammable, are located between the Navy coal sheds and Piers A and B, one of each on each side, and are therefore in an unusually dirty location. The coal dust is practically always in motion, and when the coal conveyors are in operation it blows about in clouds. It finds its way into the depot keeper's quarters and into the storehouse, where the thousands of dollars' worth of property is stored, which it is impossible to keep clean. These coal sheds have been erected since the storehouse was built. Furthermore, there are frequently several Navy torpedo-boat destroyers lying along side at the Navy piers on each side of the depot wharf, which, in addition to causing a great deal of dirt, are a menace to the lighthouse tenders on account of collision. A new site and wharf are now urgently needed for the efficient and economical work of the district. The Navy Department has repeatedly urged the removal of this depot from its present location in the midst of the navy yard.

Then follows the recommendation of the department. I wish the committee would recognize the wisdom of allowing this item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLETCHER. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 153, after line 24, insert: Marine biological station, Key West, Fla.: For the completion of the marine biological station at Key West, Fla., including the construction of buildings, purchase and installation of equipment, and improvement and protection of grounds, \$110,000.

Mr. WARREN. That is neither provided for by law nor estimated for.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is provided by law. The amendment carries out the provisions of existing law. The existing law provides for this station and the amendment is offered in pursuance of and for the purpose of carrying out existing law. Appropriation has been made heretofore.

Mr. SMOOT. It was estimated for, was it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was not estimated for this year. It has been previously estimated for. It is not in the estimate, but it is to carry out existing law, and that comes clearly within the rule. I insist that here is a situation where, in 1914, Congress provided for the station and put it on the condition that the location should be donated. The people got together and donated the site. They dug canals, built sea walls, spent \$20,000 of their own money, and donated the location to the Government. The Government then appropriated \$25,000 in 1916 to begin the work, and there the thing stopped.

Is it possible that the Committee on Appropriations will not allow this work to go on? They deny the appropriation when the law provides it and when everything has been done that would require it to be done. The people themselves have donated the site and gone into their pockets and built the sea walls.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to, so we can rush along and finish the bill to-night and take up the emergency tariff bill and pass it at a very early day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 24, insert after the committee amendment the following:

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is hereby authorized, by and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to sell or exchange in full or part payment for other sites in the same localities the premises now occupied by and in connection with the marine hospitals at St. Louis, Mo., and at Memphis, Tenn., or either of them, as in his judgment the public service may require.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the unfinished business been laid before the Senate?

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand it was temporarily laid aside and that it retains its place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true. It will not be displaced by a recess.

Mr. McCUMBER. That is the reason why I did not ask that it be laid before the Senate. I renew my motion that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, February 10, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 9, 1921.

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

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, Thy mercy is without measure, and the gates of Thy love are wide open. Pity us if we forget Thee. Write Thy law in all of our hearts, that it may become a simple rule of conduct.

Comfort the bereaved ones who are to-day in the vale of shadows of their sacred dead, and bear them through the troubled waters of their grief until the mysteries of the night are dissolved into the promises of the morning. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

Anthony	Davis, Minn.	Jacoway	Oliver
Ashbrook	Dempsey	James, Mich.	Overstreet
Ayres	Dent	Jones, Pa.	Padgett
Babka	Donovan	Kennedy, Iowa	Patterson
Baer	Doelling	Kincheloe	Phelan
Bankhead	Doremus	Kitchin	Porter
Barkley	Eagan	Layton	Radcliffe
Bell	Edmonds	Lee, Ga.	Rainey, Ala.
Benson	Ellsworth	Leibach	Rainey, Henry T.
Bland, Mo.	Emerson	Lufkin	Rainey, John W.
Bowling	Evans, Nev.	McCulloch	Ramsey
Brumbaugh	Fairfield	McDuffie	Randall, Calif.
Buchanan	Ferris	McGlennon	Reed, W. Va.
Burke	Focht	McKenzie	Riordan
Caldwell	Fordney	McKiniry	Rouse
Candler	Gallivan	McLane	Rowan
Caraway	Gandy	Maher	Sabath
Carew	Gard	Mann, S. C.	Sanders, Ind.
Casey	Goldfogle	Mead	Sanders, La.
Chindblom	Goodall	Minahan, N. J.	Sanders, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Moon	Sanford
Classon	Gould	Mooney	Scully
Coady	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Va.	Small
Connally	Hamill	Morin	Smith, N. Y.
Costello	Harrison	Mudd	Snell
Crago	Hoey	Nelson, Wis.	Steagall
Crowther	Holland	Nicholls	Steele
Currie, Mich.	Houghton	Nolan	Stevenson
Dale	Howard	O'Connell	Stiness
Davey	Hull, Tenn.	O'Connor	Sullivan

Tillman	Vestal	Whaley	Young, Tex.
Towner	Vinson	Wilson, Ill.	
Vare	Ward	Wise	
Venable	Watkins	Yates	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

#### ELECTORAL VOTE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House communications from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, authentic copies of the certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President elected at the election held on the 2d day of November, 1920, as transmitted to him by the governors of said States.

#### GENERAL DEFICIENCIES.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15962, the general deficiency appropriation bill. Pending that I move that general debate be limited to two hours and a half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that general debate upon the general deficiency bill be limited to two hours and a half.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the general deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I think it is generally agreed that freight rates must come down. The public is becoming thoroughly alive to that fact, and even the railroad owners themselves as well as their employees are beginning to realize it. The question, however, that is bothering is how it may be done. Before rates can be reduced operating expenses must come down, and in order to reduce the operating expenses, the wages of railroad employees must be reduced and the cost of coal and steel to the railroads must come down. I think it will be generally admitted that the largest items of the operating expenses of the railroads consists of wages and the cost of coal and steel. It is unfair that these three items should remain out of proportion to the general readjusted prices of the country. The country is going through a difficult period and we can not have prosperity with a lopsided readjustment. I believe that any fair-minded man will admit that the rates which prevailed at the time the railroads were turned back to their owners in March, 1920, were too low for a period of such high prices and were insufficient to pay the operating expenses of the railroads plus a fair return to the capital invested. So it was inevitable that there should be an increase in freight and passenger rates. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the rates which were fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission were unreasonable at the time they were fixed, but conditions have changed very radically since then.

The fault of the present situation does not lie with the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Railroad Labor Board; nor does it lie with the railroads or their employees. That looks like a rather broad statement to make and will not be accepted by some, because naturally we like to find some one to make the goat. The situation has been brought about by changed conditions, which it would have been impossible for anyone to anticipate, and these changed conditions must be dealt with, and they can not be dealt with by a further increase in the rates to the public. The freight and passenger traffic already has all the burden, and more than it can bear. The regulatory commissions of the Government, the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Railroad Labor Board, have responded to the needs of capital and labor during the period of inflation and mounting costs.

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

Mr. BLACK. In just a moment. It is the public's turn now. The pendulum has swung back the other way, and it has swung back with a vengeance so great that thousands of farmers and business men have been pushed to the verge of bankruptcy, and unless these regulatory commissions can regulate in the interest

of the public at the time that it is necessary for them to do so, then regulation is a failure, because a regulatory system that will only regulate in favor of capital and labor and not in the interest of the general public would be a failure and would have to be discarded. I am making no such accusation against the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Railroad Labor Board. I have no reason to believe they will fail to function in the public interest, now that the time is approaching when necessity demands that they do so.

When wheat was selling for more than \$2 per bushel and corn for \$1.75, and cattle and hogs in proportion, and cotton at 30 and 35 cents per pound, and cotton seed at \$60 per ton, and hay at \$25 per ton, these rates were not excessive. They were reasonable and fair enough. But cotton is no longer 30 and 35 cents per pound, but is dragging at one-third that price. Corn is no longer \$1.75 per bushel, but is selling in the principal markets at very much less than one-half that figure. Also wheat, cattle, hogs, wool, hay, and practically all raw products have undergone a radical decline. The freight rates, which were reasonable and in proportion during the high-price period, are no longer in proportion now. There must now be another readjustment, and this time it must be to a lower level.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does not the gentleman, in view of the fact of the large increases in freight rates, think that the percentage of tax in the revenue bill on freight and passenger rates ought to be reduced or ought to be repealed?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I do. Now, it is quite clear in order for rates to be reduced, operating expenses must come down. The returns to the Interstate Commerce Commission since the new rates went into effect on September 1, 1920, show that the roads have earned under those rates less than 4 per cent per annum on their valuation of \$18,900,000,000, as fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, or less than an annual rate of \$750,000,000 per annum, which is at least \$200,000,000 less than in 1917, the year before they were taken over by the Government. Now, I know that it has been said by some labor leaders, and it has been stated frequently on the floor of the House by certain Members, that the Cummins-Esch bill amounted to a gigantic subsidy to the railroads. The figures of the Interstate Commerce Commission do not bear out that statement. The figures of the commission show that the net earnings to the roads in 1917, immediately before we took them over, were considerably over \$200,000,000 more than they now are under the rate of increase granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, whereas the aggregate amount of wages paid railroad employees is nearly \$2,000,000,000 more than it was in 1917, when the roads were taken over by the Government. Part of this increase in wages was granted by the Government during Federal control and part of it by the Railroad Labor Board, which was set up under the Cummins-Esch law. Now, that does not bear out the statement that the Cummins-Esch bill amounted to a gigantic subsidy to the railroads. The fact that the net earnings of the companies are less and the earnings of the employees very much more seems to completely negative such a statement. On February 4 I requested the Bureau of Railway Economics to give me figures as to the aggregate amount paid out for railway wages in 1917 and in 1920, and here are the figures: In 1917 the aggregate amount of wages paid to the employees of railways in class 1 was \$1,739,482,142. The figures for 1920 are not yet complete, but they show by multiplying the first quarter for 1920, which is available and which was \$795,618,330, by the four quarters of the year that the aggregate expenditure for railway wages in 1920 will be approximately \$3,600,000,000. I say that those figures are arrived at by taking the first quarter which is available, \$795,618,330, and multiplying it by 4 and adding to that the \$400,000,000 which resulted from the wage increase in May, 1920. The May increase, on an annual basis, was about \$625,000,000, but only two-thirds of that amount was applicable to 1920, as the increase was in effect only for eight months, from May 1 to December 31. On this same basis unless distinct economies are put into effect in 1921 by a reduction of employees or changes in working regulations or reduction in basic wages, the aggregate amount of wages in this year of 1921 would not be less than \$3,800,000,000, as against \$1,739,482,142 in 1917.

Now, it must be apparent to all that a pay roll of such staggering proportions can not be maintained under these new and changed conditions. Regardless of the fact that most of us like to see high prices for farm products and high wages for all laboring men, it is conditions which we must face and deal with and it is evident that the business and agriculture of the country can not support such a heavy load at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Many of the railroads claim that in order to drop the expense of many empty trains that they have been

operating that it is necessary to lay off at least 30 per cent or more of their employees, and the employees come and say that they shall not lay off one of them. What are we doing about it?

Mr. BLACK. Well, I do not wish to be diverted now to a discussion of that question. I have no information about that matter and I am trying to discuss matters which I have studied and investigated.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will yield.

Mr. LAZARO. In the District of Columbia here we have a commission regulating passenger rates on the two street railway systems. It developed that one was prosperous and the other one was poor, and every time the poor one asks for a raise, which was granted because they had to get it in order to operate successfully, the other one got the benefit of it. I would like to ask the gentleman if that applies to the railroad system of the country?

Mr. BLACK. Well, if the gentleman will remember the Cummins-Esch bill provides that when a railroad gets beyond a 6 per cent earning capacity that a certain percentage of it is recaptured in the public interest and placed into a loan fund to be administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission and to be loaned on satisfactory security to the railroads which are less advantageously situated, and some of the large railroad owners were very much opposed to that proposition, and the gentleman will probably recall that some representatives of these larger roads filed briefs with the House Committee on Interstate Commerce against this provision. But it went into the bill all right and I think is a good provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask for five additional minutes?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I will yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Now, not only must the wages of railroad employees be reduced in order that freight rates may be reduced, but the price of coal and steel to the railroads is entirely too high. I have no doubt that there are some coal operators and steel manufacturers who take the position that it is no affair of the public what the railroads pay for coal and steel, but it is.

As to the price of steel rails, the Bureau of Railway Economics said in its letter to me of February 4, 1921:

We have no complete statistics on the price of steel rails to the railways in 1917 and 1920. However, we think the price paid in 1917 was slightly above the standard market price of \$28 per ton. Perhaps in the neighborhood of \$30. While in 1920 the price varied from \$47 up to \$57 per ton.

We are very much interested in these prices. When it is considered that the courts of the country have held that public utilities are entitled to earn a reasonable dividend on their investment after the payment of necessary operating expenses, then it does become a very serious concern to the public that those operating expenses shall be reasonable and just. If there is no way to hold down operating expenses, then there is no way to hold down rates. But of course there is a way, so long as it is properly exercised.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield for just a short question?

Mr. BLACK. I do.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman think that fixing a dividend for the carriers tended to take from them a great incentive to reduce wages?

Mr. BLACK. The Cummins-Esch bill does not guarantee any dividends to any carrier beyond the six-month period, which has already expired. I am glad the gentleman called my attention to that feature, for while it diverts me from what I was saying I want to discuss the matter briefly. The statement has often been made and erroneously made that the Cummins-Esch bill now guarantees a dividend to the railroads. It does not do that. I think I can very quickly prove that it does not. Now, for example, the net earnings of the railroads for the United States for December last were about \$23,000,000—bear that in mind, you gentlemen who have criticized the Cummins-Esch bill, and have said that it guaranteed a dividend to the railroads—the net earnings of the roads in December were about \$23,000,000, which will be less than 2 per cent per annum on their aggregate value as fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and if there was a guaranty, then somebody would owe and pay the difference.

Now, will anybody contend that the Government of the United States is either legally or morally bound to pay the difference between the 2 per cent and the 6 per cent, which was prescribed as a rule of rate-making? As a matter of fact, the Esch-Cummins bill only prescribes a rule of rate making, and says to the commission, "You shall fix rates in the groups that you designate, which will yield in the aggregate 5½ per cent and

an additional one-half per cent under certain conditions to railroads when they are efficiently, honestly, and economically administered." That is what the bill provides on that subject. Only that and nothing more.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has stated the situation exactly, as we all understand it. Some of us thought that a guaranty—

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman contend it is a guaranty?

Mr. CARTER. I think that question would take a long explanation, and I do not want to take up the gentleman's time. At least the gentleman in charge of the bill at the time on the floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], admitted to the House that it was a guaranty.

Mr. BLACK. I believe he did do so, but in my judgment it was a very erroneous statement of the effect of the rule of rate making in the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Now, the question I asked was with relation to wages to employees, about which the gentleman was talking. The wages have been increased, according to the gentleman's own statement—

Mr. BLACK. About \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. CARTER. About \$2,000,000,000 under the Esch-Cummins bill?

Mr. BLACK. No; there was a considerable part of it under Government operation. The wage increases by the Railroad Labor Board under the Cummins-Esch bill, which were granted last summer, retroactive to May 1, 1920, amount in the aggregate to about \$625,000,000 per annum. The rest of the \$2,000,000,000 was under Government operation.

Mr. CARTER. So that there must be something in the statement that the railroads have not that incentive to reduce wages that they would have when they would not have a fixed dividend income.

Mr. BLACK. They had no power to reduce wages under Government operation, and probably have none now unless such wage reductions are made by the Railroad Labor Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. I am sorry I can not have the time to discuss coal and steel further, but I will not ask for another extension of time, as I understand the time of the committee is all taken.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, when Congress convened on the 6th day of December last a stupendous task confronted it. In less than three months it was necessary for the Committee on Appropriations and Congress to consider and act upon estimates for appropriations for the next fiscal year aggregating over \$4,701,000,000. The House has now arrived at a place in the legislative program of this session where we can fairly estimate the expenditures for next year if the amounts agreed upon by the House shall not be greatly exceeded when the appropriation bills are finally enacted by Congress.

At the outset the Committee on Appropriations realized that it must inaugurate a broad general policy regarding appropriations for the next fiscal year if Congress was to reduce appropriations so that there might be a substantial reduction in taxation. The policy adopted provided for a minimum of new construction and to reduce estimates wherever a reduction could be made without the serious impairment of a necessary Government service. There are those who believe that the Government should embark upon new undertakings and new activities that will necessarily involve very large expenditures. There are many who believe that the practice of the Government of granting State aid for worthy projects ought to be very largely extended. The Committee on Appropriations has consistently urged Congress to refrain from embarking upon new services at this time and has opposed every effort to broaden or extend the Federal-aid provisions, for it has been forced to realize that the Government can meet its expenditures in but two practical ways; first, by levying taxes, and, second, by borrowing money. The taxes must come from the very people who pay taxes in their respective States. We certainly will not borrow money to engage in new enterprises; and the National Government ought not to tax the people of a State to carry on the very work which the State is authorized to do, and for which the local State and county governments have ample authority to lay local taxes.

At the beginning of this Congress the Committee on Appropriations commenced its work with very definite convictions. It realized that there could be no substantial reduction in taxation until there was a substantial reduction in appropriations. Using this premise as a starting point, it has during the past two years labored diligently to bring about a substantial reduction in expenditures in order that Congress might meet the demand for a reduction in taxation. This Congress, if it completes its work of appropriations, will have made appropriations for two fiscal years in all the departments of the Government, and for three fiscal years in most of the departments, eight of

the great supply bills for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, having failed to pass when Congress adjourned on the 4th of March, 1919.

In making the appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1920, Congress reduced the executive estimates by \$1,685,867,893.54, and for the year ending June 30, 1921, it reduced the executive estimates by \$1,312,417,650.39. After deducting all duplicate estimates in the two sessions, the total reduction made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, aggregated more than \$2,710,000,000.

The total executive estimates submitted to Congress in December with requests for appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, aggregated more than \$4,701,000,000. We have now reached the point in our work on these appropriation bills where the results of the policy of economy adopted by Congress can be clearly seen. All of the appropriation bills have been reported to the House with the exception of the fortifications bill, and all of the bills have been acted upon by the House with the exception of the naval appropriation bill and the fortifications bill. How well the House has performed its work on the appropriation bills at this session of Congress is reflected in the following comparative statement:

*Statement giving the amounts estimated and the amounts recommended in the regular annual appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1922, as reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations, and the increase or decrease in the bill as compared with the estimates.*

Bill.	Amount.	Estimates.	Increase (+) or decrease (-).
Agriculture.....	\$33,517,459.00	\$53,029,384.00	— \$19,511,925.00
Army.....	1 331,222,612.62	699,275,502.93	— 368,052,890.31
Diplomatic and consular.....	8,543,650.79	11,983,848.94	— 3,440,198.15
District of Columbia.....	19,842,012.99	25,039,044.99	— 5,197,032.00
Indian.....	9,305,880.00	11,989,703.67	— 2,683,823.67
Legislative, executive, and judicial.....	112,705,748.75	136,452,634.97	— 23,746,886.22
Navy.....	395,504,444.23	679,515,731.47	— 284,011,287.24
Pension.....	265,500,000.00	265,500,000.00	
Post Office.....	573,964,721.00	585,406,902.00	— 11,442,181.00
River and harbor.....	15,250,000.00	57,114,915.00	— 41,864,915.00
Sundry civil.....	383,209,092.41	804,525,484.85	— 421,255,792.45
Fortification (bill not yet reported; estimated).....	14,000,000.00	35,676,533.66	— 21,676,533.66
Total.....	2,162,626,221.79	3,365,502,086.49	— 1,202,883,464.70
Permanent annual and indefinite appropriations.....	2 1,335,776,360.87	1,335,776,360.87	
Total.....	3,498,402,582.66	4,701,286,047.36	— 1,202,883,464.70

<sup>1</sup> Includes appropriation for the Military Academy, formerly carried in a separate bill.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$35,000,000 estimated for payment of increased compensation to certain employees (\$240 bonus).

The statement assumes that the fortifications bill will not exceed \$14,000,000, and I believe that figure will be found to be in excess rather than under the amount which that bill will carry. It is thus seen that while the total requests for money for next year aggregated \$4,701,286,047.36, the total amounts reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations for all the services, including permanent and indefinite appropriations, and including \$35,000,000 for bonus to Government employees not estimated for by the departments, is \$3,498,402,582.66, or a reduction in the estimates of \$1,202,883,464.70. If these bills shall pass before Congress shall adjourn without substantial increases, this Congress will have reduced the executive estimates by an aggregate of almost \$4,000,000,000 for three fiscal years.

I hope these bills will pass before this Congress adjourns. [Applause.] These bills ought to pass before the adjournment on March 4, so that the Ways and Means Committee of the House can immediately know the task that is before it. That committee is now studying the question of revenue. It realizes that there must be some reduction in taxation, and that certain taxes which have become burdensome to all our people must be modified and other taxes repealed. That committee will sit during the recess of Congress, and we ought to pass the appropriation bills in the time that remains of this session, so that that committee can take up its work with intelligence. It will then know how much revenue must be raised, and it will be able to cut its goods according to its cloth. It has seemed to me that if we act with moderation and economy, if we keep the appropriations somewhere around \$3,500,000,000 for the next fiscal year, including the appropriations for the Postal Service, the work for the Ways and Means Committee and for the next Congress, so far as revenue laws are concerned, will be comparatively easy.

In this connection it is both interesting and instructive to consider where the money comes from with which to pay these tremendous expenses. Last year our receipts, broadly speaking, came from the following sources:

Customs (tariff duties).....	\$323,536,559.25
Income and excess profits taxes.....	3,956,936,003.60
Miscellaneous taxes.....	1,442,213,241.46
Miscellaneous receipts.....	981,728,633.32
Postal revenues.....	437,150,212.83
Total receipts, not including public debt.....	7,141,564,649.96

In the main, the miscellaneous taxes above referred to, aggregating \$1,442,213,241.46, were derived from the following sources:

Estates.....	\$103,635,563.24
Transportation.....	253,244,640.48
Beverages.....	197,332,105.84
Tobaccos, cigars, etc.....	295,809,855.44
Admissions, dues, etc.....	81,918,656.74
Manufacturers' excise taxes.....	268,469,978.44
Capital stock corporation tax.....	93,020,420.50
Stamps.....	84,847,827.49
Oil by pipe lines.....	8,420,405.03
Telegraph, telephone, radio revenues.....	29,631,837.20

The miscellaneous receipts, aggregating \$981,728,633.32, are made up of a great many items, including profits on coinage, tax on circulation of national banks, interest on public debts, premium on war-risk insurance, interest on farm-loan bonds, Panama Canal tolls, Indian trust funds, and sale of Government property, including surplus military and naval supplies.

The picture of our national finances would not be complete if it did not show in a more general way the cost of the functions of government which are paid for out of the appropriations contained in the table to which I have just referred.

The following is a classification of the principal objects of disbursement, exclusive of the public debt, for the fiscal year 1920, from the general fund of the Treasury, and disbursements for the Postal Service from the postal revenues:

European food relief.....	\$93,236,117.80
Loans to foreign Governments.....	421,337,028.09
Wheat-guaranty fund.....	350,000,000.00
War Finance Corporation.....	150,000,000.00
Bureau of War Risk Insurance.....	174,888,559.30
Bureau of Pensions.....	214,621,763.43
Federal Board for Vocational Education, vocational rehabilitation of soldiers, sailors, etc.....	34,984,423.90
Federal control of telegraph and telephone systems.....	12,018,557.68
Federal control of carriers and expenses under the transportation act, 1920.....	1,038,614,961.18
Shipping Board.....	469,094,549.35
Expenses of loans.....	22,122,776.85
Interest on the public debt.....	1,024,024,440.02
Military Establishment and War Department, civil (exclusive of rivers and harbors).....	1,053,694,541.33
Naval Establishment and Navy Department.....	632,690,267.94

The total of the above items, due principally to expenses incident to past wars and to present national defense, is

Postal Service (including \$418,722,295.05 payable from the postal revenues and \$35,698,400 payable from the Treasury) and Post Office Department (\$2,680,470.81 payable from the Treasury).....	457,101,165.86
All other disbursements of the Government, including the Legislative Establishment and the Departments of State, Treasury, Justice, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Interior, the independent offices, the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous offices.....	2 512,038,442.40

Grand total for disbursements..... 6,560,467,535.13

Since the signing of the armistice large sums have been disbursed in the payments for war supplies and materials, and in the carrying out as well as in the cancellation of contracts made during the war. The task imposed upon the War and Navy Departments, the Shipping Board, and Emergency Fleet Corporation, and the Treasury Department especially, was very great. But this war hang over, so far as accounts payable are concerned, is largely behind us. Looking at the matter in a broad way, it has seemed to me that if we do not by additional legislation take on new obligations in the way of financing activities heretofore financed by individuals or corporations, and if we do not take on additional Government functions involving large expenditures, we should be able to keep the appropriations within approximately \$3,500,000,000. An analysis of the receipts under the war revenue act will, I believe, show that by the repeal of the excess-profits tax there will come into the Treasury under the income-tax provision alone \$1,500,000,000 a year. My own opinion is that it will exceed rather than fall below that sum. Unquestionably the excess-profits tax is in a large measure passed on to the consumer, and is one of the elements that have tended to keep living costs excessively high. That tax can be repealed, and it ought to be repealed. It must be repealed if living costs are to be reduced in accordance with the demands of the consuming public.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?  
Mr. GOOD. I will yield for a question.

<sup>1</sup> Net disbursements.

<sup>2</sup> This sum includes many minor objects of disbursement due directly to war purposes which are not readily susceptible of classification under that general head.

Mr. DOWELL. This is a deficiency bill. Will the gentleman explain to the House if it is possible in the regular appropriation bills to make appropriations that will not be exceeded by the departments, and therefore make deficiency bills unnecessary?

Mr. GOOD. Of course, deficiency bills should be avoided. They arise in three practical ways: First, by Congress enacting legislation subsequent to the enactment of an appropriation; second, by the happening of an unforeseen circumstance; and, third, by lax administration and violation of the antideficiency laws. We always have had deficiency bills; we always will have them. I hope we will never be called upon to pass another so large as this one.

It has been stated in the papers that our customs receipts or tariff duties can be raised so that we may expect \$500,000,000 a year from that source alone. I doubt very much if our tariff laws can be so modified that they will yield so large a sum. But I do believe that these laws can be revised so that we may expect as much as \$400,000,000 per year.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman about the repeal of the excess-profits tax. Where would the gentleman get taxes that would take the place of these excess-profits taxes?

Mr. GOOD. We will not need the revenue brought in by excess-profits taxes if we will cut down appropriations. There is where we can effect a saving. We can avoid the payment of that tax or a substitute tax by a system of economy and national financing of temporary loans, such as our certificates of indebtedness, war savings stamps, and the Victory loans. There will mature within the next three years certificates of indebtedness, war savings stamps, and Liberty bonds of approximately \$7,000,000,000. Shall we continue to lay this heavy tax upon American industry so as to pay this indebtedness within the next three years, or shall we refinance these obligations by loans rather than by taxes? I believe our taxes have become such a load upon industry that they are harmful when viewed from the standpoint of national production, and that these maturing obligations can best be met by borrowing the money with which to pay them.

Mr. OLDFIELD. I very much fear that the gentleman's party will place a sales tax to take the place of the excess-profits tax.

Mr. GOOD. If the gentleman's party is so foolish as to place a sales tax on the backs of the American people, it will in his opinion go down to a humiliating defeat, because the people of the United States will not, in his opinion, stand that kind of a tax. [Applause.] A sales tax should be the last resort. During the next few years we will go through an era of great unemployment and social unrest. The man who does not realize that fails to read the signs of the times.

How will the laboring man feel, while out of employment and with a small or with scarcely no income, if he is compelled to pay a tax on everything that he eats and everything that he wears? Not realizing that the excess-profits tax has been passed on to the consumer and that in the past he has been compelled indirectly to pay it, he will become bitter in his resentment at a Congress that repealed a tax required out of excess of earnings only to substitute a direct-consumption tax, which he must pay. Our cost of the great World War must necessarily be paid by the man who has the money or property with which to pay taxes. That cost must be paid, not by a tax exacted from a man because he is hungry or cold, but from a man who has the money with which to pay the tax, and who can pay it with a minimum of hardship. Congress must keep clearly in mind the fact that all taxation must be fair and just, and that in levying new taxes great care should be exercised not to unduly antagonize the man who earns his living by the sweat of his brow. To unduly antagonize labor at this time, when there is so much unrest and when the army of unemployed is increasing so rapidly, might result in disaster.

To recur to what I was discussing, our money with which to pay the cost of government for the next year should, it seems to me, come from the following sources:

Customs.....	\$400,000,000
Income and corporation taxes.....	1,500,000,000
Miscellaneous taxes.....	1,250,000,000
Miscellaneous receipts (not including interest on foreign loans).....	500,000,000
Postal revenue.....	500,000,000
<b>Total estimated revenue.....</b>	<b>4,150,000,000</b>
Total bills as reported, including \$14,000,000 for fortifications.....	3,498,402,582

It will be seen that this leaves a balance of the estimated revenue, over the reported appropriations, of \$651,000,000.

It has seemed to me that we ought to repeal the tax on transportation, which last year yielded more than \$252,000,000 in taxes on freight and passenger fares. That service is already taxed to the breaking point and these taxes should be repealed. It will not be difficult to find new miscellaneous sources of taxation that would not be burdensome to take their place.

Last year there was taken from bonded warehouses almost 40,000,000 gallons of spirits. These spirits paid a tax of only \$2.20 a gallon. They were withdrawn for medicinal purposes, but were used for beverage purposes. We ought to restore the tax of \$6.40 a gallon, and by so doing could add to our revenue from this source alone from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000, depending upon the amount of the withdrawals.

We have also a comparatively light tax on tobaccos, cigars, and cigarettes compared with similar tax levied in other countries. Last year we collected approximately \$295,000,000 from this source. If we levied the same tax on this class of commodity that is levied by Great Britain, and assuming that that tax would not materially interfere with the consumption, it would bring into the Treasury more than \$500,000,000 a year.

So that by repealing taxes on transportation we may find other subjects of taxation, by putting an additional tax on luxuries, that will more than take its place, so far as the revenue derived is concerned.

Again, we have in the United States more than 8,000,000 passenger-carrying automobiles. Practically every one is a luxury, and if we placed a tax upon passenger-carrying vehicles and made the amount of the tax dependent upon the horsepower, a reasonable tax, we could easily collect \$200,000,000 from that source. By pending legislation it is proposed to appropriate \$100,000,000 for so-called Federal aid for road building throughout the United States. No one is more vitally interested in good roads than the man who drives an automobile. By levying a wheel tax that would yield \$200,000,000 a year we could continue Federal aid for good roads at the rate of \$100,000,000 a year and still leave available for other Government functions \$100,000,000 derived from that source.

It is estimated that next year the postal receipts will bring in \$500,000,000 and that the miscellaneous receipts will yield \$500,000,000 more. During the past two years the Government has sold a great deal of property, real estate, buildings, and equipment of all kinds, and we have more to sell. We have also sold and will, I hope, continue to sell many of the merchant ships that we acquired during the war. Certainly the miscellaneous receipts will not fall far, if any, below \$500,000,000 a year. From these sources alone, therefore, we can foresee an income of not less than \$4,150,000,000 a year, which is \$650,000,000 in excess of the appropriations as carried by the bills as they were reported to the House. And these bills in the main have not been increased on the floor of the House. I hope they will not be materially increased in the Senate.

The changes in the bills thus far considered by the House from the bills introduced and referred to the House for action have been as follows:

*Comparative statement giving the amounts recommended in the regular annual appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1922, as reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations, and the amount carried in the bills when passed by the House, showing the increase or decrease in the bill compared with amount recommended.*

Bill.	Reported to House.	Passed House.	Increase (+) or decrease (-).
Agriculture.....	\$33,517,459.00	\$33,668,009.00	+ \$150,550.00
Army.....	1,331,222,612.62	331,208,112.62	- 1,000,014,500.00
Diplomatic and consular.....	8,543,650.79	8,409,492.79	- 134,158.00
District of Columbia.....	19,842,012.99	19,807,012.99	- 35,000.00
Indian.....	9,305,880.00	8,576,380.00	- 729,500.00
Legislative, executive, and judicial.....	112,705,748.75	109,781,488.75	- 2,924,260.00
Navy.....	395,504,444.23	(?)	
Pension.....	265,500,000.00	265,500,000.00	
Post Office.....	573,964,721.00	572,714,721.00	- 1,250,000.00
River and harbor.....	15,250,000.00	15,250,000.00	
Sundry civil.....	383,269,692.41	382,483,692.41	- 786,000.00
Fortification (bill not yet reported)			

<sup>1</sup> Includes appropriation for the Military Academy, formerly carried in a separate bill.

<sup>2</sup> Bill now pending in the House.

It appears, therefore, at this time, if we can pass the appropriation bills as we ought to pass them, the next Congress will be able to take up the work of revenue legislation with intelligence. It will know immediately when Congress adjourns how much money we will have to raise to pay the expenses of the Government, and I believe the Committee on Ways and Means of the House can, in the next Congress, be trusted to bring in a

bill that will raise that revenue and at the same time repeal these objectionable and burdensome taxes that have contributed so much to make living costs excessively high.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield for a question.

Mr. TOWNER. Might not some of the \$600,000,000 be added to the revenue of the United States as interest on our foreign loans when we receive interest from the foreign governments?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; that could be done; but as and when interest is received from that source the amount might well be used for the retirement of bonds that were sold in the United States to raise the money needed to make these loans. In my remarks I have left out of consideration altogether the matter of collecting interest from foreign creditors. It is difficult to say at this time how the governments that were allied with us in the war and to whom we have loaned large sums of money will be able to finance their indebtedness. It is difficult to say with any degree of certainty whether they will be able to pay the interest on their obligations or not in the near future.

But from the sources I have indicated, with but \$1,500,000,000 of income taxes, as compared with \$4,000,000,000 collected last year, it seems to me that we can from these other sources derive sufficient funds with which to pay the cost of government. This means a reduction of 70 per cent in the income and excess-profits taxes, and that reduction ought to bring substantial relief not only to the taxpayer but to the producer as well.

One of the things that we most need in America to-day is increased production. Practically every business concern, be it great or small, is hampered to-day because of a lack of capital. When we require that so large a portion of the earnings of industry shall be paid in taxes, we leave but little available for the growth and expansion of business. If by the repeal of the excess-profits tax we can permit American industry to keep a greater portion of their earnings to take care of their increased capital demands, we shall in a broad and constructive way do much for the upbuilding of a bigger and better industrial America. [Applause.]

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has stated that the postal receipts are about \$500,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. No; I have given the amount of the postal receipts for last year as \$437,150,212.33, but it is estimated that for the next fiscal year the postal receipts will yield approximately \$500,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that that is not equal to the disbursements?

Mr. GOOD. No; there will likely be a deficit of from \$60,000,000 to \$75,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. Closer on to \$100,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. I would not be surprised if the deficit would amount to the sum indicated.

Mr. STEENERSON. And the gentleman is aware of the fact that ordinarily the Committee on Ways and Means does not frame any laws to provide revenues for that service.

Mr. GOOD. Well, in a broad way, they are supposed to report a revenue measure that will yield enough to take care of all ordinary demands, including any deficit in the Postal Service.

Mr. STEENERSON. The rates are usually imposed upon the recommendations of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and it also depends largely on the action of Congress. Last year Congress increased the pay of employees in the Postal Service, and by that increase I am advised we have added to the postal expenditures for this year something like \$80,000,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. That was absolutely necessary.

Mr. GOOD. I do not think it was all necessary. Many of the increases were justified. But the committee has found this situation: Carpenters, plumbers, and mechanics employed by the Treasury Department are working in post-office buildings side by side with similar mechanics employed by the Post Office Department. In the latter case the employees receive as much as 40 or 50 per cent more than the wages paid to similar employees of the Treasury Department. We certainly do need a standardized wage in all of these services, where men are doing similar work, and my observation has been that some of the increases made in the Post Office appropriation bill can not be justified.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman ought to be aware that the complaints from these people in the employ of the Treasury Department are of long standing, and in the opinion of the Post Office Committee the employees did not render as good

service if they were reduced to the pittance that is paid some of these custodians of the Treasury Department who have charge of these buildings.

Mr. GOOD. I now desire to discuss briefly the items contained in this bill. Frankly, I do not believe I ever had charge of a bill that was as objectionable as the bill we are now considering. It contains items providing for expenditures in so many instances where I think the expenditure might have been avoided. The total estimates considered by the committee in the preparation of this bill aggregated more than \$478,000,000. The bill carries \$203,293,476.72, and is \$275,433,309.60 less than the estimates considered by the committee. The amounts carried in the bill, in a broad way, fall into seven general classes, as follows:

Internal Revenue	\$9,000,000.00
Military Establishment	48,000,000.00
Naval Establishment	61,500,000.00
Postal Service	57,000,000.00
Audited claims	16,000,000.00
Judgments	1,000,000.00
Miscellaneous, aggregating	10,000,000.00

The miscellaneous items include:

Interstate Commerce Commission	\$1,532,400.00
Public Health Service	1,514,280.00
Coast Guard	1,405,000.00
National Soldiers' Homes	610,000.00
Pension Office, examining surgeons	400,000.00
Department of Justice	1,325,936.96
Agriculture:	
Forest fires	725,000.00
Gypsy moth	150,000.00
Pink boll weevil	75,000.00
Lighthouse Service	351,362.85
Small miscellaneous	1,948,000.00

A brief examination of each of these classes will show the necessity for appropriations. In the first place, the Internal Revenue Department found that \$21,000,000, carried in this year's appropriation for conducting the income and excess-profits tax divisions, was not sufficient. The department found that it was necessary to do more work connected with the 1917 returns than they had anticipated, and that unless these assessments were made before the 1st of March, 1921, the Government could not make the assessments but would be compelled to bring suit to collect the taxes. The burden of proof would thus shift from the taxpayer to the Government and the incidental cost of making the collections would be very materially increased. They are now collecting from the 1917 and 1918 returns approximately \$35,000,000 per month.

Shortly after the 1st of July the Secretary of the Treasury found that he would not be able to place on the assessment rolls all of the assessments that ought to be made for the year 1917 before the 1st of March, unless he very largely augmented his force. He therefore waived the requirements of law as he was authorized to do, so far as an allotment was concerned, and employed an increased force, thus anticipating a deficiency. The Secretary asked for a deficiency of \$9,000,000. We have cut that estimate to \$8,000,000. That cut was made on the theory that inasmuch as the appropriation for next year is but \$30,000,000, if this year's appropriation was increased by as much as \$9,000,000 he would have a larger force during the latter part of this year than he can employ out of his appropriation for next year. In stating the appropriation for next year I am assuming that the Senate will agree to the provisions of the House bill. If it does not, then it will, I assume, make changes in our appropriations contained in this bill to correspond with changes it makes in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill in this respect, for the force employed practically during the month of June, 1921, ought to be maintained for the month of July, 1921. I do not know whether we have given the Secretary of the Treasury all the money he needs for this service or not; but I believe we have. I hope we have, for no one, I am sure, will say that we should not give the Treasury Department a sufficient fund to collect these taxes.

I do not know whether the entire force in the Internal Revenue Department is efficient or not. No one can tell. I believe it is headed by a very capable and efficient commissioner. It has been necessary during the last two years to build up a great force. To do this work efficiently requires trained auditors, and one of the things that has very greatly hampered the work is that large concerns, in dealing with the Treasury Department, discover auditors in the income-tax division, for example, doing efficient work, and they offer them more money to enter private employment, and of course they leave the Government service, and the Government is compelled to train new men to take their place. Because of this interference it has been necessary all along continuously to take on new recruits from time to time, and when it is necessary for a department to continually break in new men to take the places of trained and experienced men,

the cost incident to these changes is considerable, and the efficiency is not always the best.

Then the department asked \$1,600,000 for the enforcement of prohibition. They have available for this purpose, and for the enforcement of the narcotic act, \$5,500,000 for this year, and we are giving them \$1,000,000 more. Members of the Committee on Appropriations have been wrongfully accused for their failure at all times to appropriate all that has been asked for the enforcement of national prohibition. Personally, I care nothing about the charge or insinuation that the committee is wet because it fails to report all that is requested. A very large majority of the committee voted for the constitutional amendment and for the Volstead Act, but simply because we voted for it did not mean that we are willing to turn the Treasury over to those who are intrusted with the enforcement of the act irrespective of the needs of the service. When we came to this item we looked into it with the same scrutiny and care that we investigated every other item; and we finally concluded that by giving them \$1,000,000 we would be giving them a force with which they ought to be able to adequately administer and enforce this law, so far as the enforcement during this year can be carried on by Federal authorities. An examination of the hearings will show that there is in this bureau a force, with salaries, as follows:

11 supervising field agents, at \$4,727-----	\$51,999
44 directors, at \$3,932-----	173,000
206 clerks in offices of directors, at \$1,287-----	385,100
215 inspectors, at \$2,054-----	441,010
143 clerks in office of supervising field agents, at \$1,306-----	186,158
1,067 agents and inspectors, at \$1,728-----	1,843,796
450 guards at warehouses, at \$1,501-----	675,450
2,071 bonus employees—bonus paid to them-----	490,040
Travel expenses, annual-----	1,407,928
<b>Total-----</b>	<b>5,655,081</b>
Travel expenses for 5 months-----	586,218

While I have included the bonus as \$490,040 in this statement, it must be remembered that the bonus is not included in the appropriation of \$5,500,000, but is in addition to that amount. So that for this fiscal year, with the amount carried in the bill, we will have appropriated for the enforcement of the national prohibition act and the narcotics act, including the amount paid for bonuses, \$6,990,400. I resent with all the force at my command the insinuation or charge made by paid lobbyists that the Committee on Appropriations is not in sympathy with the enforcement of the prohibition act.

I do not believe that Mr. Williams's administration of the prohibition law is on a par with his splendid service with regard to income taxes and the other work of his department. And in saying that I do not want to be understood as saying that he is not doing his very best to enforce the law. I realize that he can not give personal attention to all of the details of the rapidly increasing activities of the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The enforcement of the prohibition act was thrown upon his office at a time when he was already overcrowded with work, and the enforcement of that act was, I imagine, very largely left to other administrative officials. That I think was necessary. I do not believe that those who have been intrusted by him with the enforcement of this law have spent the appropriation with that same degree of care that has characterized the expenditures for the collection of internal-revenue taxes. I realize that it was a new law and everything connected with its administration and enforcement was new and that an entire new force had been rapidly called together to administer it. I have discovered some things to which I have called the commissioner's attention, and which he has promised to investigate, that ought not to exist.

For example, I discovered that in a town of approximately 50,000 people there was no officer stationed to enforce the prohibition law. But at a small place, within 15 or 20 miles of that town, where there never had been a saloon, a prohibition officer was stationed to enforce the law. This officer had never been in a small town and it was not contemplated that he would go there. But by designating the small town as his place of duty he would while engaged at work in the large town where he remained all the time be able to draw a per diem of not less than \$4 per day or actual expense not in excess of \$5 per day. Here, it seemed to me, was not only a case of maladministration, but was a case where an officer who was intrusted to enforce the law started out with the idea that in order to increase his pay he must violate the law.

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

Mr. GOOD. I yield just for a question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Has the gentleman any information outside of the one instance where that has been done?

Mr. GOOD. Having found it in one case, and having found where they are doing it in one congressional district, I assume that that is not the exception.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. And still it is absolutely denied in the hearings.

Mr. GOOD. No; it is not. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Williams, a man of very high character and splendid attainments, said he did not know about it but would inquire into it. He agreed with the committee that if that condition existed, it was an abuse that ought not to exist, and that he would see to it that it was corrected. And I have no doubt but that he will.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Let me tell the gentleman this: I went to see Mr. Kramer in reference to it—

Mr. GOOD. Why did not he come before our committee?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. And he absolutely denied that it is true.

Mr. GOOD. That shows that he does not know about the business with which he has been intrusted.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think you do not know what your business is, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. GOOD. That may be true, but that is beside the question. A lady of very high standing in my own town, who for a great many years has given her time to the question of prohibition, called upon me while I was at home during a short vacation to tell me about some of these things. I made a personal investigation. I found there was no agent stationed at Cedar Rapids, a town of 45,000 people. About 22 miles east, at Lisbon, there was stationed a prohibition officer or agent. I was reliably informed that he had never lived at that place, that most of his time was being spent at Cedar Rapids, and while there he was drawing his per diem at not less than \$4 per day. I was also advised that another prohibition officer or agent was stationed at Vinton, a town about 40 miles northwest of Cedar Rapids, and that this agent did not live at Vinton but spent his time in larger cities, and while away from his official designated place of duty drew his per diem. If either of these agents had been stationed in the large city in which they performed their work, they would not have been entitled to any expense while at work at the place officially designated as their place of duty. Just think of it; here is a great force costing over \$6,000,000 a year appointed to enforce a specific law; and yet when these men start out they are practically told "we will give you for your services as agent and inspector \$1,728 a year; but we will place you at some little town where you will not live, and where you will never go; but by placing you there you can draw from \$4 to \$5 a day additional compensation." Right at the inception of the employment they tell a man who is paid to enforce the law that he must violate the law in order to get additional funds out of the Treasury of the United States. Now, the gentleman says that these are the exceptions; and it may be so, but would it not seem strange that the only exceptions in the United States should be found in the one district in the United States where a little investigation was made?

We looked into these matters as much as we could in the hearings. At the time we did it we knew our course would be criticized. We knew it would draw fire from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] and others who get their directions not from constituents, but from dictators here in Washington, who propose to tell Congress just how much shall be appropriated for a given purpose. I do not know what others think about it, but I do not believe that this Congress or any Congress can afford to take the dictation of any man or any set of men with regard to appropriations out of the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.] I think we ought to go into this question of the enforcement of the prohibition act just as we go into every question, and if there is waste and inefficient methods employed in the enforcement of prohibition, we ought to criticize it just as freely as we criticize other expenditures. Personally I think we have given them all that is necessary this year for the enforcement of prohibition, so far as that enforcement can reasonably be carried on for the first year by the National Government. To properly enforce that law everyone knows that there must be the closest cooperation of State and local authorities. I personally know that by building up so large an organization in so short a time a great many men are connected with it who ought not to be connected with it. A great many men, some of whom are in the bureaus here in Washington, do not believe in the enforcement of the law; some are in the field who are not only winking at its violation but actively aiding in the violation of the law. I do think by cutting down this appropriation we will serve notice not only on Mr. Kramer but the 11 district supervisors and the 44 State supervisors, some of whom are not qualified to administer the law, that their failure to enforce the law is under investigation. Weed out the undesirables in this service and the department will have more money than it can properly expend in the enforcement of this law.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. You carry \$6,000,000 for the enforcement of prohibition?

Mr. GOOD. The amount carried in this bill brings the total for enforcement of prohibition up to \$6,500,000, and in addition there will be paid in bonuses about \$490,000.

Mr. JUUL. Is there any special item carried in the bill for the suppression of highway robbery? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. No; not in this bill.

Now, take the Military Establishment; we carried \$48,000,000, all told. That is made up of several items, and the appropriation is made necessary largely because of the increase in the number of enlisted men. The Secretary of War requested \$40,000,000 for the pay of the Army. That estimate was made on the theory that there would be in the service for the year an average of 227,650 men. On the 31st of January last the Army had an enlisted strength of 237,149 men. The War Department was then enlisting at a rate of 1,000 per day, and the separations from the service amounted to about 7,000 a month, leaving a net increase in the service of about 23,000 men per month. It is now estimated that there are approximately 240,000 men in the military service of the United States. It was stated before the committee that if the resolution, which has since been adopted, should become a law by the 1st of February, that the War Department would be able to reduce the size of the Army so that we would have during the year an average of 208,797 enlisted men. It is thus seen that the passage of the resolution reducing the size of the Army to 175,000 enlisted men will have the effect of reducing the average size of the Army for the year about 20,000 enlisted men.

It was the opinion of the committee that we could therefore reduce the estimate of the Secretary of War from \$40,000,000 to \$24,000,000 for the pay of the Army. It necessarily follows that by reducing the number of the enlisted men by 20,000 that there could be a corresponding reduction in the request for an appropriation for subsistence and supplies. The estimate for this was \$32,273,987, while the bill carries \$22,000,000 for that purpose. A part of this reduction was also due to recent reductions made in the rations from 54 cents to 42 cents per ration.

The largest reduction in the estimates was made in the Navy Department. This reduction was made possible through the discovery that in the general account of advances for the Navy Department for the fiscal years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920, for which requests were made for deficiency appropriations, there were corresponding balances, and if the Navy Department was authorized to use balances remaining for certain objects, to extinguish deficiencies or deficits in appropriations for other objects, they would not need any money at all. It was purely a bookkeeping matter. Everything for which the deficiency estimate was made had been purchased and paid for, but the payment had been made out of the general account of advances, and they were able to make it because there were surpluses in certain appropriations. You must understand that under the law the Navy Department, and recently the War Department, handle their appropriations in a different manner from all other appropriations. Ordinarily when an appropriation is made for a given service that service is given a credit of the amount of the appropriation on the books of the Treasury Department.

Not so with the Navy Department. When the appropriation bill becomes a law, the total amount of the bill is credited to the department in one item and is called general account of advances. When checks are drawn on this appropriation, whether it be for contingent expenses or for transportation and recruiting or for the Bureau of Yards and Docks or Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, for training stations, or for any service, that check is paid out of the general account of advances, and the Treasury Department never knows whether any given appropriation is overdrawn or not. It continues to pay the checks so long as anything remains in the appropriation and credited to the general account of advances. The Committee on Naval Affairs has reported out a bill which, if enacted into law, will permit the Secretary of the Navy to balance his books. Certainly this is a businesslike way to adjust the matter, and the committee therefore was able to reduce the estimates by \$114,339,131 for the Naval Establishment because of the proposed legislation authorizing such transfers.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That bill is not likely to pass at this session of Congress.

Mr. GOOD. No.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it necessary to have the legislation in order to relieve these officers who have made the payments contrary to law, so that in the end a deficit is shown?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; either that or to make appropriations to cover those deficits. We did not feel warranted in doing that. It will be necessary some time. I do not think there is any hurry about it. The accounts are there. The services were secured. Everybody got his money, and the only difficulty is that they have gotten into a little trouble as to the accounts. They had money enough, but they have not expended it along the lines directed by Congress.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When this bill passes the House and goes to the Senate, I suppose that if the Senate should add an amendment, according to the provisions of the bill reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, it might possibly be agreed to by the House.

Mr. GOOD. I imagine that is so. Now, there is a large item in the bill for a deficiency in the Postal Department. The total estimates for the Postal Service were \$57,500,000. The principal item that goes to make up this total was \$35,650,000 for inland transportation by railroads, and the deficiency is due to the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission of December 23, 1919, increasing the compensation of railroads for carrying mails. The bill also carries \$7,000,000 for temporary and auxiliary clerk hire. That is made necessary because of the inability of the Postal Service to obtain regular employees to do the work and used temporary employees. The deficiencies in the Post Office Department can in no wise be attributed to any cut by Congress in the requests for appropriations by the department for this year. The total appropriations carried for the fiscal year 1921 to the Post Office appropriation act for similar purposes to those for which deficiencies are provided for in this bill aggregate \$92,687,320, while the estimates submitted by the Post Office Department last year for said appropriations aggregated but \$88,423,500. In other words, in the appropriation act Congress made no reduction in the estimates for the services in the Post Office Department for which deficiencies are now asked, but, on the other hand, Congress appropriated more money than the Postmaster General asked for those services.

The surplus in the Postal Service about which so much has been said and written is rapidly disappearing, and when all of the expenditures are in that surplus will be turned into a deficit. In determining whether or not there is a deficit in the postal operations, we should not consider as a part of the postal receipts the war revenue derived from the Postal Service. That revenue was not intended for the Postal Service, but was expressly provided to pay a part of the expense to carry on the war. Looking, therefore, at the finances of the Postal Service for the fiscal years 1918, 1919, and 1920, the situation is as follows:

Audited surplus, 1918	\$64,126,774.08
Less war revenue	44,500,000.00
Net audited surplus for 1918	19,626,774.08
Audited surplus, 1919	73,734,851.96
Less war revenue	71,302,000.00
Net audited surplus for 1919	2,342,851.96
Audited deficit, 1920	17,270,482.72
1920 items in this bill	2,555,454.31
Total deficit, 1920	19,825,937.03
Audited surplus, 1918	19,626,774.08
Audited surplus, 1919	2,342,851.96
Surplus, 1918 and 1919	21,969,626.04
Less 1920 deficit	19,825,937.03
Net surplus, 1918, 1919, and 1920	2,143,689.01
Estimates submitted in Senate Document No. 373 to pay Railroad Administration for carrying mails during period of Federal control, being from Jan. 1, 1918, to Feb. 29, 1920, covering part of the fiscal year 1918, all of the fiscal year 1919, and part of the fiscal year 1920	65,575,832.03
Deduct net surplus for 1918, 1919, 1920	2,143,689.01
Deficit for the three fiscal years	63,432,143.02
Post Office Department, fiscal year 1917	\$9,836,211.90
Audited claims in this bill on account of railroad transportation for 1917	9,377,321.93
Reduces surplus, 1917, to	458,889.97
This sum will be wiped out by additional claims for 1917 which will be certified to Congress later, and a deficit of more than a million dollars for 1917 will result.	
Fiscal year 1921.	
Appropriations for fiscal year 1921 for Postal Service, including estimated amount of \$41,855,510 to be paid from indefinite appropriation to carry out provisions of reclassification act	\$504,434,700.00
Deficiency appropriations for 1921 in this bill	55,003,700.00
Total for 1921	559,438,400.00



The revenues for the service for the fiscal year 1920 amounted to \$437,150,212.33. The rate of increase in receipts for the first six months of fiscal year 1921 averaged 19.81 per cent. If this ratio continues during the remainder of the year the receipts for 1921 will aggregate

	\$523,649,657.39
Total appropriations for 1921 already made or pending	559,438,400.00
Estimated revenues	523,649,657.39
Estimated deficit	35,788,742.61

This deficit will likely be nearer \$50,000,000.

Therefore, the approximate known deficits from the foregoing are as follows:

1917	\$1,000,000.00
1918, 1919, 1920	63,432,143.02
1921	35,788,742.61
Total	100,220,885.63

I desire briefly to call attention to one of the big estimates for which no provision is made.

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman yield before entering upon that?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. There is a general impression that these deficits or deficiencies are created without sanction of law, at least some of them.

Mr. GOOD. The amounts carried in the bill as deficiencies for the Navy Department, the Post Office Department, and many other services are legal deficiencies. Some of them were caused by the enactment of laws after the appropriation bills were enacted, requiring additional expenditures. Many of them, however, are created in violation of law.

Mr. FESS. Well, is not there some way by which we can avoid that?

Mr. GOOD. Some of the deficiencies of the War Department were authorized by law. The War Department is authorized, as is the Navy Department, to create deficiencies for certain purposes, such as clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, or transportation. But, generally speaking, all appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations, expressly authorized by law, are required to be allotted at the beginning of each fiscal year by monthly or other allotment, so as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiencies during the latter part of the year. In many of the departments that law is being observed, but in some cases it is not observed. The matter, however, is purely administrative, as the gentleman knows. It is not in the province of Congress to administer the law. When we find that an official has taken the law in his own hands and spends more money than Congress appropriated, we must then decide whether we will grant enough money to continue needed activities for the remainder of the year, or refuse to grant the money and stop the activity. Where the service is a necessary one the committee have reported an appropriation, although they have felt that the law ought to be strictly enforced. It ought to be brought home to every disbursing officer and every officer of the Government who has anything to do with administering appropriations that the antideficiency law should be strictly observed.

Mr. FESS. That is the source of my question. I thought we had some regulation, and whether it is being observed or not, is it our fault; and if it is our fault, how are we going to correct it?

Mr. GOOD. Failure to enforce the law by an administrative official is not the fault of Congress. It makes it very embarrassing for Congress when we must determine whether the Government shall suffer through the failure of some official to strictly enforce the law. To refuse to give the money for a service when the person who had administration of the fund appropriated spent it all during the first nine months might mean that a very needful service would be discontinued.

In this connection, permit me to say that it might be contended that because we cut estimates for this year by \$1,312,000,000 there would naturally be a great deficit. Outside of the War Department, where the estimates were for an Army of 576,000 men, and Congress only appropriated for something less than 175,000 men, and outside of the Navy Department, where Congress increased the pay of officers in the Navy and Marine Corps, which required about \$30,000,000 to pay the increase provided for after the estimate was made—outside of these two departments the total amount carried in the bill to supply deficiencies is only \$2,800,000. In other words, the deficiencies did not occur in those items where Congress cut the estimates, but they were incurred in other services. In those items where we cut the estimates, the deficiencies carried in this bill are but \$2,800,000.

Mr. FESS. So it is not true that these are a mere matter of bookkeeping?

Mr. GOOD. Not at all. Take the Navy Department. The gentleman will recall that we appropriated \$10,000,000 for fuel and that is just what the Secretary of the Navy asked for. In the first six months the department spent \$18,267,412, or more than \$8,000,000 in excess of the amount estimated for the whole year. And we are carrying in the bill to make good that deficit \$8,267,000 for the first six months, and for coal for the Navy for the second six months \$20,000,000, which will give the Navy Department for fuel for the year \$30,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000, as originally estimated by the department.

The bill also carries for the Military Establishment over \$48,000,000, practically all of which was made necessary because the Secretary of War increased the enlisted strength of the Army over 175,000 men.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will permit, under the item he has just given, where an appropriation of \$10,000,000 was made and they spent \$18,000,000, is not that irregular and unlawful?

Mr. GOOD. That is one of the items where the law provides that the Navy Department may make purchases in excess of the appropriations and is a legal deficiency.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. The fact, as I understand from what the gentleman says, is that as to the essential services that we appropriated for there is only about \$2,800,000 of deficit?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; assuming also that Congress had refused to pass the increased pay bill, which took about \$65,000,000 or \$70,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. I refer to matters within the estimates. That is a matter entirely outside of the estimates. When the estimates were made that increase of pay was not contemplated, and was not contained in their estimates.

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. MONDELL. So as to the matters contained within the estimates relating to the essential services of the Government, the deficiency is \$2,800,000?

Mr. GOOD. Except the War Department.

Mr. MONDELL. Except where the War Department went defiantly beyond the will of Congress in recruiting?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but the War Department, the gentleman will recall, did make large estimates for this year. The estimate of that department was for an Army of 576,000 men, and Congress did cut that estimate. And if we eliminate the War Department, we can truthfully say that while the amount carried in this bill is large the deficiencies are not, because Congress reduced the estimates. The bill carries over \$203,000,000, of which \$48,092,960 is for the Military Establishment, leaving more than \$155,000,000 for other services, and of that only \$2,800,000 is to supply deficiencies in items where Congress reduced the estimates of the executive departments.

Mr. McKINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. McKINLEY. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement that the country will read, and I want to ask this: Now, as I understand, the post-office appropriations and the post-office receipts will about balance?

Mr. GOOD. No; the post-office receipts for this year, for the first six months, increased about 19 per cent over last year. But the indications are that this rate of increase will not be kept up. If they fall off, as now seems probable, there will be a deficit in the Postal Service, not of \$35,000,000 but probably of \$80,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. Calling it \$60,000,000, as I understand, the appropriations, including the \$60,000,000, are \$1,900,000,000, and to that is to be added about \$1,200,000,000 interest and sinking fund, making a little over \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. For next year; yes. I have tried to show that for next year the total appropriations ought not to exceed \$3,500,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. And that includes the Post Office Department?

Mr. GOOD. That includes the Post Office Department.

Mr. McKINLEY. Leaving that out, it is about \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. About \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. The gentleman has stated that the estimates are about \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. The estimates are \$4,761,000,000, including the Postal Service. It is pretty hard to say what the expenditures are going to be for this year; they will be much larger than they will be for next year. We are not yet through with paying war obligations. Since we reported this bill estimates for still more deficiencies have come in. I can not say at this time

what the expenditures will be for this year. The figures I have used have to do with the appropriations for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McKINLEY. For the succeeding year of 1922, for which you are making these appropriations—

Mr. GOOD. Yes. The total amount carried in all of the House bills, including the Postal Service, and estimating the fortifications bill at \$14,000,000, is \$3,498,000,000.

Mr. McKINLEY. And that includes interest and sinking fund?

Mr. GOOD. It includes everything of that kind.

Mr. McKINLEY. And it brings it up to about \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. It brings it up to \$3,000,000,000, leaving out the Postal Service.

Mr. McKINLEY. But you have stated it will be about \$4,000,000,000, as I understood?

Mr. GOOD. I have said the estimates were about \$4,701,000,000, and I have said the total amount carried in the House bills aggregates \$2,162,000,000, and the permanent and indefinite appropriations, including \$35,000,000 for bonus, will bring the total amount carried in the House bills up to \$3,498,000,000.

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

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. There are \$800,000 reported in this bill as deficiency for the air mail service in the Post Office Department?

Mr. GOOD. About that amount was included in the estimates for inland transportation.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman go into the question of whether there was any authority existing in the Postmaster General to create that deficiency?

Mr. GOOD. We did not. We took the gentleman's bill this year, in which there was reported an item of \$1,200,000, which went out on a point of order, and assumed that it was necessary, and, therefore, carried the item in the transportation of mails, just as it was carried last year.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to say that while there was \$1,200,000 carried in the bill for the authorized mail routes, \$800,000 of a deficiency requested by the department was for an unauthorized route.

Mr. GOOD. That, as I understand, is a question of administration. If they could use the air service as cheaply as transportation by rail, then they were authorized to spend the money in that way.

Mr. MADDEN. The routes that were created, on which this deficiency was based, were never authorized either by appropriation or by law.

Mr. STEENERSON. I want the gentleman to finish. What was the estimate?

Mr. GOOD. I do not have the exact amount before me. My recollection is that we gave exactly what was estimated for. The gentleman can get the exact figures in the report.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman was going to state that a moment ago.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there is one item in the bill that I wish to discuss briefly, and that is the estimate of \$95,000,000 for the emergency shipping fund. We have not carried anything in the bill, and we have refused to carry an appropriation for obvious reasons. In the first place, the War Department, it is claimed by the Shipping Board, owes it \$208,000,000 on which there have been advances aggregating \$53,000,000, leaving it with an account payable against the War Department of \$153,000,000.

The War Department has the appropriation and is willing to pay any amount which they are legally required to pay, but the Shipping Board has been unable to furnish the vouchers and to make the showing so that the War Department can make payment on many of their claims. The Shipping Board estimated that it would require \$95,000,000 to carry on its operations to the end of the year. Since these estimates were made it has received from the War Department \$13,000,000. It has some other credits that it will unquestionably collect before the end of the year, so that if it shall be able to obtain as much as \$40,000,000 additional from the War Department, it is the opinion of the committee that it will be unnecessary to make further appropriations for this fiscal year.

I can well understand the embarrassment of the Shipping Board. The members of the board have not been confirmed, and they naturally hesitate to formulate broad policies which must be adopted if we are to have a real merchant marine. They are, therefore, simply marking time, and this is necessarily so. I hesitate to criticize the Shipping Board, because I realize that when criticism is made of a body that it reflects upon the members of the board personally. I have felt that the affairs of the Shipping Board are in a very bad way and that the Emergency Fleet Corporation, which I suppose is the biggest corporation in

the world, has in the main been very poorly managed. But in saying this I do not mean to reflect upon the ability of the men who from time to time have been associated in this great undertaking. At times some of the most eminent business and professional men of the country have been connected with this organization.

The difficulty is there have been too many changes in the organization. No one has been allowed to stay in the organization long enough to master it; no sooner would a person show a high degree of efficiency than he was either removed or permitted to resign, and with every change in the personnel there has been a change in policy. All of this is greatly to be regretted, for it has led to confusion and inefficiency all along the line. My own opinion is that we will in the future experience difficulty in securing the right kind of men to manage this huge corporation, with the small salaries which Congress has provided, and it may be necessary to change the law in this respect. For if this service is to succeed we must be able to retain the men after they have become familiar with their duties.

Because of these changes, and because of the magnitude of the transactions, and not because of lack of ability or of hard work, the Shipping Board has not been able to function in a healthy and efficient way. For example, it is unable to present to the War Department the evidence of the War Department's indebtedness to the Shipping Board so that the claims can be paid. The chartering of its boats is on a principle calculated to entail great loss by the Government because of operations. For example, here is a shipping concern with, say, 10 vessels of its own, and it has been able to charter 5 boats from the Shipping Board.

To-day practically all vessels are running at a loss. So the concern owning 10 vessels of its own ties up its own vessels and discharges most of its men and cuts down its loss to the minimum; but the 5 vessels that are chartered from the Shipping Board are found in operation, and the Government pays the loss. This may be an extreme case, but it illustrates a principle that is wrong and the need for more businesslike administration of this great enterprise.

There are, as I recall, 73 boats being constructed for the Emergency Fleet Corporation. They are in various stages of completion, all the way from 15 to 98 per cent completed. To stop work upon them might make the Government answerable in damages, which would greatly increase the cost. It might entail great financial losses upon contractors. It was the opinion of the committee that these boats should be completed, and that in some way the money should be made available to complete the program. It was also the opinion of the committee that the Shipping Board should immediately take prompt action to cut off the loss in the Division of Operations, and in granting new charters the contracts should be so safeguarded that the loss to the Government will in any emergency be reduced to the minimum.

So far as securing funds the committee felt that there is but one thing for the Shipping Board to do, and that is for it to present its vouchers to the War Department and others that are owing the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and make its collections, and when it has done this it could then come to Congress, if necessary, for additional new money.

But it is unthinkable for this organization, with these large credits outstanding, to continue its operations on the theory that no matter how inefficiently it may function that Congress will supply the money. The first step for the Shipping Board to take is to settle with the other departments of the Government that are owing it money, and when this settlement has been made there will be ample time for Congress to supply any deficiency in the appropriations.

It has been suggested that the Shipping Board spend several millions of dollars, and the War Department spend several millions more, in auditing the claims of the Shipping Board against the War Department. Obviously this ought not to take place. It seems to me that the War Department should settle with the Shipping Board just as it settled with the Railroad Administration without an expensive audit. It is all Government money. Here are two branches of the Government—the Shipping Board and the War Department. One owes the other some money. The War Department, in this instance, has an appropriation available for this purpose of more than \$60,000,000, and these two departments of the Government should get together and agree upon a settlement and adjust their claims, and then Congress can in the future make appropriations with a full knowledge of the outstanding credits of the Shipping Board. Until that settlement is made Congress, it seems to me, will be rather loathe to make deficiency appropriations for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, there is another reason why the committee refused to make further appropriations at this time for the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. It was discovered that some time ago the Shipping Board passed a resolution preventing shipbuilders who had contracts for building ships for the Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation from decreasing wages to any of the employees in the yards. It will be recalled that after we started the program of building these ships, because of the increased cost of living and the increase in wages everywhere, it was necessary to increase the pay of the employees, and their wages were very rapidly as well as generously increased. In many cases they were doubled. These increases were based upon the high cost of living. It seemed strange, indeed, to the committee that those who had contracts for building ships on a cost plus a fee basis should be told by the Shipping Board that the contractor could not reduce his wages at all. I understand that this resolution of the Shipping Board remained effective until a few weeks ago, when the board passed a resolution rescinding the former order. It seems to me it ought to have gone further and required the shipbuilders to decrease wages in view of the fact that the cost of living has been very much decreased in the last few months. But nowhere has the board taken an affirmative position that would bring about some reduction in the cost of these vessels to the Government. The cost of living has been going down and down, and yet these men who are employed by the various contractors building these 73 ships are paid the same wages that they were paid when the cost of living was at the peak.

The committee was gratified over the broad, patriotic view taken by the men who are engaged in building these ships in one of the yards. I hold in my hand a petition signed by more than 10,000 laborers employed in the yards of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation at Camden, N. J., where we have been building 16 of the large passenger-cargo ships. Four or five of these ships have already been completed and the others are nearing completion. These laborers realized that their employers could not get new contracts on the present wage schedule. These laborers also realized that the work on the 11 or 12 Government ships still in the yards would all be completed within three or four months, and when completed, if the corporation did not get new contracts, they would be out of work. They looked at the matter in a practical way, and reasoned that they would rather take a decreased wage now, and thereby enable their employers to secure new contracts for new work, and thus enable them to have continued employment, than to be thrown out of work entirely. And so they came to Congress with this petition, as I feel they had a right to do, asking that the money be made available to complete these ships, and they state in their petition that they are perfectly willing to take a reduction in wages. When the representatives of these men came before the committee they were asked how much of a reduction the laborers in these yards were willing to take, and they stated that they were talking of a 20 per cent reduction. It is almost unthinkable that the men employed in building these ships have sensed the business and industrial outlook before the Shipping Board sensed it, or, at least, before they took action looking toward a resumption of normal activities.

And this is what is necessary all over the country. In every industry and calling wages were increased because of war and war conditions, to meet the increased cost of food and of clothing. Now that the prices of these commodities have gone down, the price of labor must follow. I have here a report just issued from the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor, dated January 21, 1921. That report shows the percentage of people employed in the different lines of production, as compared with January 1, 1920. It shows that the percentage employed in metal production is 69 per cent, in building trades 47.6 per cent, in textile products and clothing 64 per cent, in the leather group 65 per cent, in the automobile group 30 per cent, in lumber and housing group 67 per cent, and in the clay, glass, and cement group 80 per cent, as compared with January 1, 1920. This report would indicate that more than 25 per cent of the people employed in these industries on January 1, 1920, are out of employment to-day. The percentage of unemployed will increase until we strike something like a reasonable basis.

Here are some advertisements sent out by the Northern Pine Lumber Manufacturers' Association. These advertisements are of the size of an ordinary newspaper, and they are requesting builders in the United States not to buy lumber or to engage in building enterprises until the costs are more reasonable. At first blush it is strange, indeed, that lumber manufacturers whose business depends upon sales take the initiative and advertise

all over the United States for people not to buy their products until prices of their products come down. But they are actuated by the same motives that the laborers in the New York Shipbuilding Corporation are actuated by when they say to Congress that they are perfectly willing to take a reduction in their wages in order that they may have continued employment.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. HASTINGS. What reason do the lumbermen give for sending out that kind of an advertisement?

Mr. GOOD. Obviously they are looking at the question just as the laborers in the New York Shipbuilding Corporation yards looked at it. They realize that a substantial going business can not be built upon present abnormal prices and that the cost of production must be decreased before business can start in a healthy way. Production costs are too high all along the line. They are coming down, and just in the proportion that they are reduced will the cost of living to the American people be reduced. I suppose lumber manufacturers realize, as they must realize, that building operations will not start in a big way until they can be carried forward on a basis that is reasonable, so far as costs are concerned. And hence they are willing to hasten the day when they can start their business on a sound basis. To start it on a false basis will mean loss and finally disaster. Why is it that there is a lack of employment in America to-day, as shown by the United States Employment Service, of more than 25 per cent as compared with January, 1920? It is because people will not buy at these abnormally high prices. Prices are high because the cost of production is high, and the cost of production is high because labor, which is the principal item in production, is excessively high.

The Committee on Appropriations realized this situation two years ago, and we formulated a policy then that the Government of the United States should not engage in a building program at that time and that our appropriations, so far as public works were concerned, with very few exceptions, should be limited to maintenance items. That was not true with regard to the shipbuilding program, because the contracts had already been let for the ships, while we were at war. What Congress should do first of all, what the administration should have done and should yet do, is to encourage men in a patriotic way to see that it is to their advantage to accept lower wages, because in the end it will mean continuous employment and will mean that the cost of the things they will be compelled to buy out of their wages will be correspondingly reduced.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman speaks of the advertisement of the lumber manufacturers advising the purchasers not to buy lumber until the price was reduced. I would like to inquire whether they have reduced the price of lumber themselves, whether they have not that matter in their own hands?

Mr. GOOD. I have not looked into that question, but I understand that the price of lumber, on the whole, has been reduced by more than 25 per cent. But the price is still prohibitive. The gentleman must know that a tree in the forest is of no great value. It is not until it has been laid low, hauled to the mill, sawed into lumber, placed on the cars and sent to the lumberyards that it becomes of much value. Every one of these operations requires labor, and I suppose that a large part of the price we are compelled to pay for lumber is to reimburse the manufacturer for what he has been compelled to pay in wages in order to produce the lumber. Possibly his profits are too high. If so, in the same spirit the laborer is asked to reduce his wage should we ask the manufacturer and the dealer to reduce his profits. This is absolutely necessary.

I have already consumed more time than I had intended and the discussion has taken a much larger range than I anticipated. When the bill is read under the five-minute rule I shall be very glad to explain any of the items contained in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, 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. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 1 o'clock p. m. Before acting upon that request the Chair would suggest to gentlemen that on the counting of the electoral vote the law provides that the seats on the right of the Chair shall be left vacant for the Senate. The Chair is informed by the Doorkeeper that it will require four rows, so that gentlemen will please occupy other seats and leave the first four rows for the use of the Senate. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 1 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Would you take four rows over here instead of taking three rows clear across?

The SPEAKER. By the law providing for the counting of the electoral vote it has been enacted that the seats on the right of the Chair shall be occupied by the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that, Mr. Speaker, on account of the fact that this side of the aisle is preferable to the Senate? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know why it was done. Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1 o'clock p. m.

The recess having expired, the House resumed its session.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTE.

At 1 o'clock p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, preceded by their Sergeant at Arms, and headed by the Vice President and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The VICE PRESIDENT took his seat as the presiding officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the two Houses of Congress, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and the laws of the United States, are now in joint convention for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedents, unless demand shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been had that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes of the States.

Twelve years ago, upon an occasion similar to this, the then Vice President of the United States, my warm personal friend, Charles Warren Fairbanks, of Indiana, suppressed any manifestation of approval or disapproval upon the part of the galleries or the members of the joint convention, announcing at that time what seemed to me to be a proper statement, that this is a solemn and important occasion in the affairs of the people of America, and it should be discharged with dignity and in silence.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk. The tellers will count and make a list of the votes of the State of Alabama.

Mr. LODGE (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that James M. Cox, of Ohio, received 12 votes for President and Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, 12 votes for Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with, and the Chair will open in alphabetical order the certificates showing the electoral votes of each State, and the tellers will count and make announcement of the results in the several States.

There was no objection.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in their alphabetical order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the President of the Senate.

The tellers delivered to the Vice President the following statement of the result:

The undersigned, HENRY CABOT LODGE and OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, tellers on the part of the Senate, and FLORIAN LAMPERT and WILLIAM W. RUCKER, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921:

Electoral votes of each State.	States.	For President.		For Vice President.	
		Warren G. Harding, of Ohio.	James M. Cox, of Ohio.	Calvin Coolidge, of Massachusetts.	Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York.
12	Alabama.....		12		12
3	Arizona.....	3		3	
9	Arkansas.....		9		9
13	California.....			13	
6	Colorado.....	6		6	
7	Connecticut.....	7		7	
3	Delaware.....	3		3	
6	Florida.....		6		6
14	Georgia.....		14		14
4	Idaho.....	4		4	
29	Illinois.....	29		29	
15	Indiana.....	15		15	
13	Iowa.....	13		13	
10	Kansas.....	10		10	
13	Kentucky.....		13		13
10	Louisiana.....		10		10
6	Maine.....	6		6	
8	Maryland.....	8		8	
18	Massachusetts.....	18		18	
15	Michigan.....	15		15	
12	Minnesota.....	12		12	
10	Mississippi.....		10		10
18	Missouri.....	18		18	
4	Montana.....	4		4	
8	Nebraska.....	8		8	
3	Nevada.....	3		3	
4	New Hampshire.....	4		4	
14	New Jersey.....	14		14	
3	New Mexico.....	3		3	
45	New York.....	45		45	
12	North Carolina.....		12		12
5	North Dakota.....	5		5	
24	Ohio.....	24		24	
10	Oklahoma.....	10		10	
5	Oregon.....	5		5	
38	Pennsylvania.....	38		38	
5	Rhode Island.....	5		5	
9	South Carolina.....		9		9
5	South Dakota.....	5		5	
12	Tennessee.....	12		12	
20	Texas.....		20		20
4	Utah.....	4		4	
4	Vermont.....	4		4	
12	Virginia.....		12		12
7	Washington.....	7		7	
8	West Virginia.....	8		8	
13	Wisconsin.....	13		13	
3	Wyoming.....	3		3	
531		404	127	404	127

HENRY CABOT LODGE,  
OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,  
Tellers on the part of the Senate.  
FLORIAN LAMPERT,  
WILLIAM W. RUCKER,  
Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Gentlemen of the convention, the report of the state of the vote as delivered to the President of the Senate is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Warren G. Harding, of the State of Ohio, has received for President of the United States 404 votes;

James M. Cox, of the State of Ohio, has received 127 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of the electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Calvin Coolidge, of the State of Massachusetts, has received for Vice President of the United States 404 votes;

Franklin D. Roosevelt, of the State of New York, has received 127 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 4th day of March,

1921, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Gentlemen of the convention, the purposes for which this joint convention was called having been accomplished, as presiding officer I dissolve this joint convention, and the Senate will return to its Chamber.

The Senate (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) retired from the Hall, and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Speaker resumed the chair and called the House to order.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. Good, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the first deficiency bill, H. R. 15962, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I expect to occupy only a very limited time in the discussion of this bill. I think the Appropriations Committee and the subcommittee that had under consideration this bill have made a genuine, patriotic effort to cut down the expenses of the Government. I believe that is so regardless of politics of the whole House, as well as of the Appropriations Committee, but I notice from time to time an effort is made to take rather too much credit by one of the political parties for the cut that is made in these bills. A criticism is indulged in at times because it was necessary to appropriate a large amount of money for the Army in this deficiency appropriation bill. A criticism is made of the Secretary of War because he enlisted the force of the Army above 175,000 men. If criticism is just anywhere, it should fall upon the shoulders of the Congress of the United States and not on the Secretary of War. Last year we enacted an Army reorganization law which provided for an Army of 280,000 men. At the time the bill was under consideration an effort was made to limit the Army to 185,000 men. That was voted down by this House. It was, therefore, not illogical for the Secretary of War to assume that if the Congress did not want to limit the Army to 185,000 men, it wanted him to enlist the number placed in the bill, namely, 280,000 men.

I have observed at other times, not so much in the discussion of this bill as in other bills, a keen, incisive criticism because it became necessary to appropriate money for the pay of the Army in a deficiency bill. If you will go back and look at the record, you will find that practically every year for the last 20 years it has been necessary to bring in a deficiency appropriation for the pay of the Army. In the year 1900—20 years ago—when the Government was in the control of a Republican Congress and a Republican President, it was necessary to appropriate in the deficiency bill \$4,000,000 for the pay of the Army. In 1901 \$3,000,000 were appropriated in a deficiency bill for the pay of the Army. In 1902 it was \$1,500,000, in 1904, \$1,500,000, and in 1905, \$1,500,000. In 1907 it was nearly two million, and so on down the line practically every year. If I have permission, I shall put the list of deficiency appropriations in the RECORD, made for the payment of the Army.

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

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Statistical records of that kind are not extraneous extensions of remarks, but I am not going to object to putting such things into the RECORD, as I said to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Very well. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may file this brief record with my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am not in sympathy nor in accord with the enlistment of an Army up to 280,000 men. I think 150,000 men in time of peace are sufficient, but Congress said that we should have an Army of 280,000 men, and when an effort was made to reduce that Army to 185,000 men you voted it down. Therefore, I say, the Secretary of War was justified in assuming that Congress meant what it said when it wrote 280,000 men into law and when he enlisted more than 175,000 men.

I am going to speak for a moment on one other subject which is unpopular, a subject which is an unpopular activity of the Government. I speak of the Shipping Board. I want to say in advance that I hold no brief for the Shipping Board. I hold no brief for any gentleman on the Shipping Board or anyone connected with it, but it has been made the butt of the Congress and of the people for months and months. It has been said that the Shipping Board is an extravagant concern. Perhaps it is. The Shipping Board organized under the law the greatest concern

ever organized in the same length of time. They spent \$3,000,000,000, and some of it I expect was wasted; that is, it was wasted to the extent that we got very little from it, but from the activities of the Shipping Board you have now the only asset that you have gotten from the war. You have 1,380 vessels built by the Shipping Board that will some day be valuable for carrying the trade of this country, provided the Congress and the people do not build around this country a tariff wall that will not let us have any trade. You have 1,380 vessels built by the people's money and that is some sort of an asset. You gentlemen who are always criticizing the Shipping Board should tell me what assets you have out of the money you spent for poisoned gas; tell me what assets you have out of the money that you spent for powder; tell me what assets you have out of the money that you spent for building artillery, or powder factories, or railroads and docks in France, or the billion dollars you spent for aeroplanes; tell me what assets you have out of the money used for building big military camps, or soldiers' uniforms, or railroad transportation. You have none at all, and I am not criticizing that fact; the money was spent as a military necessity. The money spent by the Shipping Board, like the money spent for the war generally, was a part of the war necessities and should be charged off as a war loss. It was nothing more or less than a war loss. We had to win the war, and we spent the money. We had to build these ships and we built a lot of ships, which we can not now use because conditions have changed. We have three or four hundred wooden ships that are practically of no value now; neither are our powder factories or our poison-gas factories. The Shipping Board is criticized because they built wooden ships. The enemy was sinking ships at the time they were building faster than we could build them, and in the judgment of the men in control it was necessary to build some sort of ships. Therefore they built wooden ships as well as steel ships, because they were building all of the steel ships they could.

I am quite in accord with what Gen. Dawes said the other day, that we would have paid horse prices for sheep to haul our artillery in France, if necessary, if the sheep could have hauled the guns to the front. So we spent money for wooden ships and now they are valueless, but if all of the steel ships had been sunk the wooden ones would have been called into commission, and they would have been of value in winning the war. We spent the money as a war necessity; let us charge it off as a war loss and turn our faces to the future.

As I stated, I hold no brief for the Shipping Board, and while I voted to bring this bill in without an appropriation for the Shipping Board, I am not willing that the people who entered into contracts with this Government to build a lot of ships shall go without their money. It was agreed in the committee that in all probability the necessary money to pay these people could be gotten from the War Department. The War Department has a lot of money appropriated by Congress. It is money that the Shipping Board claims is due it. If it is due, the Army should pay it over, and it does not make any difference whether there is an audit of the accounts or not. It is transferring the money from one Government pocket to another. The Shipping Board or some representative of the Government should have the necessary money with which to pay the men who are building these ships. The contracts for them were made in good faith with the Government. Believing that the Shipping Board or some functionary of the Government could get the money necessary to pay contractors who are building these ships from the War Department, I have for my part agreed that this bill might be brought out without an appropriation for the Shipping Board. I dare say if the Army does not provide sufficient funds with which to pay these contractors that a deficiency will be brought in and passed during this Congress to provide money to pay the contractors who are building these ships. Under these conditions I voted to bring in the bill and I support the bill. I believe the bill is as meritorious as any bill reasonably could be brought from the Committee on Appropriations, and I hope it will receive the support of gentlemen upon both sides of the aisle.

List of deficiency appropriations made for pay of the Army beginning with the fiscal year 1900.

Feb. 9, 1900, deficiency, pay of the Army	\$14,988,832.61
Mar. 3, 1901, deficiency, pay of the Army	3,000,000.00
July 1, 1902, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,500,000.00
Apr. 27, 1904, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,500,000.00
Mar. 3, 1905, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,400,000.00
Mar. 2, 1907, deficiency, pay of the Army	3,000.00
Mar. 4, 1907, deficiency, pay of the Army	574,951.14
May 30, 1908, deficiency, pay of the Army	240,000.00
May 30, 1908, deficiency, pay of the Army	500,000.00
May 30, 1908, deficiency, pay of the Army	1,250,000.00
Mar. 4, 1909, deficiency, pay of the Army	4,000,316.66
Mar. 4, 1911, deficiency, pay of the Army	453.33
Mar. 4, 1911, deficiency, pay of the Army	250,000.00

Mar. 4, 1913, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	\$7,368.00
Mar. 4, 1911, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,200.00
Aug. 26, 1912, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,800,000.00
Mar. 4, 1913, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	22,320.80
Mar. 4, 1913, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	2,897,121.20
May 25, 1914, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,828,663.33
Feb. 28, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,199,772.62
Mar. 31, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,577,017.42
Sept. 8, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	950,000.00
July 1, 1916, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	1,648,000.00
Apr. 17, 1917, deficiency, pay of the Army-----	647,833.33

Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to occupy any time in this debate, but some remarks were made by the chairman of the committee which I think furnish an occasion for saying something. I believe all of you who have taken any interest in the enforcement of prohibition are aware that there has been a persistent effort to misrepresent and discredit in every possible fashion the national prohibition act and the enforcement of prohibition. I had hoped that, so far as this committee was concerned and the House generally was concerned, that they would in a sympathetic fashion try to support and enforce the law, but I am sorry to say that I have some reason to suspect that at least some of the Members are not very enthusiastic. We succeeded a few days ago in getting in this House the approval of a majority, almost a majority of 2 to 1, to an increase by \$600,000 the appropriation for next year. I find on this deficiency bill a cut of \$600,000. Rather suspicious that the amount of this cut is just the same sum that we added to the next year's budget. I find the chairman now bitter against the prohibition force because of the methods he claims they are using in enforcing the law, and what is his criticism? One or two men down near his home town have been found to be located not at the place where they operate. Well, how long I do not know. Did they stay there a week or a month? He does not claim to know. There is no information on that subject. I went and got the hearings and read them over very carefully, and there is nothing in the hearings to justify the claim; nothing there to show that that is the policy. On the contrary, the commissioner in charge of this matter, when examined by the chairman, said and said emphatically that it was against the policy of the department, and that they had a system of checks to prevent that very thing. I went to Prohibition Commissioner Kramer to satisfy myself whether that sort of a policy was in force. Mr. Kramer told me it is not and that it is against the rules; that they have men whose business it is to keep check on that very thing to see it is not practiced. That apparently is the only thing that is charged against the prohibition force. Now, I do not claim that the prohibition force has been perfect. It could not be. It was built up in a hurry; it had to be; and with the small salaries that are paid it may be possible—yes, probable—that you have some people who are not strictly honest. That is true in every service. The idea of trying to break down prohibition by refusing to appropriate the necessary funds for its enforcement will not deceive anyone, and can not be justified by calling attention to an isolated violation on the part of some officer in the service. The pretense that this refusal to furnish sufficient money can be based on such an excuse is ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I have not got it.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. It seems to me on a subject of this kind I ought to have some time to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I think the country will be greatly pleased to read the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations this forenoon to the effect that there may not be the necessity of some new form of taxation. I have been giving the question of the cost of living, and quite naturally, therefore, the cost of government, considerable study. I have been going into all the channels of information available, because it appeared to me that our biggest problem in readjustment is the tremendous cost of government that has been entailed on us by the war. I do not mention it as a subject of criticism; I mention it as the unavoidable result of war conditions. The question was, how are we going to get to a lower level of the cost of living, which, of course, is another expression for the cost of government? This much is absolutely certain: There is no hope to reduce taxes until we reduce the cost of government. That is axiomatic, and I am of the opinion that there is little

hope to reduce the cost of living until we have a basis by which we can reduce the burden of taxes. The question now is whether we can reduce the cost of government to the extent that we need not increase our taxation burden, and whether we would have the freedom to reduce our present taxation system and get away from the war system of taxation. It has been hoped by the country at large that that can be done. Our taxing system, which is justifiable in time of war, is not justifiable in time of peace.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. Is it not a fact that our taxes now are only two-thirds of what they were during the time of war?

Mr. FESS. Well, taxation is the same, but the amount of taxes will be greatly reduced because of the reduction of business in the country, but the rate of taxation that was adopted in war time is still in vogue.

Mr. DUNBAR. Is not the rate of taxation less than it was during the time of war?

Mr. FESS. We have made no changes in the surtax, we have made no changes in the excess-profits tax except what was written in the law itself.

Mr. DUNBAR. Has not there been a change in the normal tax?

Mr. FESS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. DUNBAR. Did not we have a budget that required the raising of \$6,000,000,000?

Mr. FESS. But that is a reduction of the cost of government; it is not a reduction in rate. There has been no change in taxation, and that is what I am talking about. The people would be willing to bear the burdens of war tax in time of war, but they are fretful in bearing war-time burdens in time of peace. We have the same system of taxation now in 1920 that we had in 1918 when the war was at its height.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield right there? I do not think he wants to be inaccurate.

Mr. FESS. No; I do not want to be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not the gentleman in error? Is it not a fact that in what is the revenue act of 1918, which did not become effective until 1919—we call it 1918, because it passed the House in the fall of 1918, but did not become effective until after the war—the rates of taxation were materially reduced over the previous revenue act, and that that was reflected in the payment of all our income taxes? We paid much less for that year.

Mr. FESS. Nevertheless we still have the excess-profits tax, and we still have the very high range of surtax.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the gentleman, I hope this coming Congress will materially reduce the coming taxes, but I thought he wanted to be correct in his statement that there has been no change since the war, because there has been.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to say to my friend from Indiana [Mr. DUNBAR], that the thing I am calling attention to is as to whether we can revise our present system of taxation, which I know my friend will admit is quite unscientific and ought to be revised without having to supersede it by some other form of taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. FESS. The suggestion made by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee was the most surprising in one way and will be the most satisfying in another of any statement that could be made by a responsible chairman of a committee, namely, that we have the trust of reducing the cost of Government to the extent that we may be able to revise our unscientific method of taxation and yet not be called upon to supersede it by some new form of taxation. If that can be done, it is the most encouraging statement that I have heard expressed from the floor of the House on taxation since the close of the war.

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

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I fully agree with what the gentleman is saying about taxation. I want to ask him as one of our leaders in this Congress, if he does not feel that this Congress and the succeeding Congress should studiously avoid creating any new activities by legislation that would incur additional burdens to those we now have to bear?

Mr. FESS. I certainly agree with my friend from Illinois on that.

The Secretary of the Treasury rather startled the country when he first made his statement that it will take some time, indefinite yet, before we can reduce the cost of government below \$4,000,000,000. That was a statement that startled

the country, for that is four times the cost of government in 1916, and it is fully six times the cost of government in 1912. The estimates came in for \$4,700,000,000 in this Congress, and the chairman has demonstrated satisfactorily, to my mind, that we are able to cut that pretty nearly one and one-half billions and get through without in any way interfering with or injuring the necessary work of the Government. Now, if we can join our efforts and cut the cost of government all along like that, I do see the way by which we will not need to supersede our present form with any other form of taxation other than probably the revision of the tariff, which all will concede ought to increase the impost duties somewhat. But at the same time we will be able to reduce the present system to the extent that we can get rid of the present unscientific method.

I want to compliment the spirit of the committee in their effort to strike at the root of the thing. We talk about the cost of living as one objection and the high burdens of taxation as another objection.

There is positively no way that I see in which we can relieve it except in the cost of government, and that is the business of Congress now at hand.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. If we are to reduce the cost of government, should we not quit granting aid to the States to assist them in engaging in educational and benevolent work that brings duplication of bureaus here in Washington and which encourages them to look to the United States Treasury for assistance along those lines which are matters that are really State functions?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend that one way to reduce the cost of government is to quit making appropriations at all for anything that is new. That would be one way.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think the States ought to take care of those things that are really State functions?

Mr. FESS. Provided the function is so vast that the State can not do it and the Government must aid it, I would question the wisdom of discontinuance. I know what my friend is driving at, but he can not point to any Member of Congress that is standing with the committee more four-square to prevent introducing new things than the man he is striking at now. [Applause.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Thank you. I am not striking at my friend from Ohio, but I am striking against the growing habit of granting State aid on every benevolent proposition which can better be handled by the States with a great saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks by putting in the Record some statements in regard to appropriations and deficiencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to revise his remarks by printing certain figures. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. They are tables in reference to this bill?

Mr. GOOD. They have reference to things about which I was talking—

Mr. McCLINTIC. In connection with the bill?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I have no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, during the history of this body many able men have presided over the Committee on Appropriations, and yet the service of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], the chairman of the committee during the past two years, justifies me in stating that that committee has never had a chairman who was more faithful to the public welfare and never has had one who more intelligently discharged his duties. [Applause.] And yet the Committee on Appropriations can not govern the total amount of appropriations.

The gentleman who has just preceded me, Mr. FESS, referred to the total amount of appropriations, and it caused me to think that if his committee and the other committees of this House will refrain from bringing in legislation authorizing greater expenditures on the part of the Government, we would have more hope of holding down the total appropriations to such an extent as to permit a reduction of taxes. The fact is that with this bill carrying \$203,000,000 the appropriations for the current year pass the \$5,000,000,000 mark. Direct appropriations carried in the regular supply bills amounted to \$4,859,890,327.30. This bill, recommending \$203,293,476.72, makes a total of direct appropriations of \$5,063,183,804.02.

And yet that does not tell the whole story. I have to specify and say "direct appropriations" in order to make a distinc-

tion, for during this Congress we have departed from the custom heretofore prevailing and have resorted to indirect appropriations, appropriating by authorizing the expenditure of unexpended balances, by the sale of assets, and in other methods. I have figured the amount of money that has been made available for expenditure by the departments in these indirect methods and it totals \$543,500,000 over and above the direct appropriations, so that the total amount made available to date by this Congress for governmental purposes reaches the figure of \$5,606,683,804.02, or more than five times as much as ever was appropriated by any Congress in time of peace in the history of this country.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not just now.

These figures are so stupendous that we can not realize their true meaning. They mean, however, that to meet the expenditures authorized by this Congress for this current year we must levy an average tax of \$50 upon every man, woman, and child in America.

My good friend from Ohio [Mr. FESS] was quoted the other day as stating that this Congress would save \$1,000,000,000 by reducing estimates, and my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has frequently stated the case in that way. But reducing the estimates does not reduce the taxes. I want the Congress to stop bothering about reducing the estimates and commence to reduce appropriations and thereby reduce taxes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], the chairman of the committee, said we have reduced the estimates here about \$270,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hicks). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that in the discussion of a deficiency bill covering the expenditure of \$203,000,000 we ought to have more than 33 Congressmen on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make a point of order that there is no quorum present?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I think I will withdraw it, since I have called attention to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee has referred to the Naval Committee reporting legislation to take care of the estimates for the Navy Department. He has induced the Naval Committee to report a bill making funds available for expenditure and thereby avoiding an appropriation. I must say that I know of no man in the House who has the shrewdness of the chairman of the committee in that regard. He has not only rendered great service to the country, but he has rendered greater service to the Republican Party than any other man that I know in this House, because he has, by resorting to this indirect method, enabled my good friend from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to go before the country and boast of these reductions of estimates.

The difficulty is that it takes a long time to explain the many methods by which they have camouflaged appropriations, and that is how he is able to get away with it. When he found it was necessary to take care of the deficiencies of the Navy Department, instead of appropriating the money he simply has the Committee on Naval Affairs report out this legislation. You take those paragraphs, and you find that in the first one he says:

That the unexpended balances of annual appropriations for the fiscal years 1919 and 1920 shall be transferred, after two years from the expiration of the fiscal year for which made, to a fund to be established on the books of the Treasury Department, to which shall be charged expenditures for the fiscal year 1920 and prior years, under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted.

This simply means that out of funds which were appropriated during the war and which were unexpended and which ordinarily would go into the Treasury June 30 they will now pay this \$114,000,000 asked for by the Navy Department. The Navy Department asked for a deficiency of \$14,000,000. The gentleman from Iowa saw a way to avoid making that appropriation and yet make the money available, and therefore he had the Committee on Naval Affairs report this legislation, which takes care of \$114,000,000. The second paragraph takes care of \$300,000,000, and in the third paragraph we take care of \$40,000,000, making a total of \$454,000,000 taken care of by this legislative device. The amount will not appear in the appropriations, but the money will be made available and will be spent, and the taxpayers, who pay the bill, will never know what the Government is costing them.

The gentleman from Iowa said he was taking care of the Shipping Board. The Shipping Board wanted \$90,000,000. He says the War Department owes them \$150,000,000. He says that inasmuch as the Shipping Board really needs only \$90,000,000 to July 1 we should have appropriated the \$90,000,000 and

provided that they shall turn into the Treasury the \$150,000,000 due from the War Department. But that would make the total of appropriations larger, so the chairman of the committee simply refrains from making that appropriation, and lets them use the whole \$150,000,000, if they can get it, from the War Department. So that if they collect the \$150,000,000 they will spend it, instead of \$90,000,000, and the country will be out just \$60,000,000 on the deal. But it looks like "economy."

Now, let me call your attention to the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] as to saving a billion dollars. If you will save a billion dollars, why do you not reduce the taxes a billion dollars? If you are going to save it, why not let the people know it, by reducing the amount of money they are going to pay into the Treasury? You and I know, gentlemen, that this reduction of estimates has been going on for 20 years. There have been only two years in the last 20 years when the estimates did not exceed the appropriations. It will always be so until we shall establish an efficient budget system, because here in this Congress is the only place where an attempt is made to determine the relative importance of the demands of the different departments. We determine not only whether they are meritorious, but also whether they are urgent.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. FESS. What I am concerned about is this: Is there, in the judgment of the gentleman, any chance for us to reduce the cost of Government to the extent that we shall not need to proceed outside of the present system of taxation?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman can be just as certain as that he is standing there that it can not be done. You can not reduce taxes when you only reduce estimates; and my purpose in speaking here now is to call the attention of the House to the fact that it is necessary to concentrate your attention upon reducing the appropriations for the next fiscal year below those of the current year, instead of being satisfied with merely reducing estimates. [Applause.] If we do not reduce the appropriations to a most substantial extent below appropriations for the current year, when I tell you that you have made available for expenditure this year more than five and a half billion dollars, how can you reduce taxes? It can not be done.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman say that that amount will be required in another year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It will not be required if you reduce the appropriations for the next year below those of the current year; but if you satisfy yourselves merely by reducing the sum total of the extravagant estimates, it can not be done; and unless there is some reduction hereafter, far exceeding what has been done to date, there will be no reduction of taxes. And, moreover, bills are being reported from legislative committees requiring the expenditure of large amounts. The Committee on Appropriations has no discretion in the matter. When these expenditures are authorized we will have to appropriate; and unless there is a change between this and March 4 there will be very little reduction, if any, in the total amount of money made available for expenditures during the next fiscal year.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The Ways and Means Committee in having their hearings to get the facts upon which to make a basis of taxation, so that they may revise the system, have a right, have they not, to take the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the amount of money we must raise?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman from Ohio knows that any judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury must be based upon his estimate of what the Congress is going to do; and unless he has some inside information that is not available to us, he is in a hopeless fix when he tries to estimate what this Congress is going to do about appropriating money. There is no way in which he can ascertain it. If your committee reports a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$200,000,000, it will have to be met by a bill reported from the Appropriations Committee, and, manifestly, if the Secretary of the Treasury has not taken that \$200,000,000 into consideration in any estimate that he has made, he is \$200,000,000 short in his estimate, and the Ways and Means Committee will have to find the money.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is Wednesday, and this House has already passed this week items of legislation providing for about \$450,000,000 of new appropriations that have not yet been made. Does the gentleman think that with that course followed we are likely to reduce appropriations or reduce taxes very much?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of course, the gentleman's question answers itself, and it is as clear as anything on earth

can be that unless the brake is put on immediately the expenditures during the next fiscal year will be little, if any, below the expenditures for the current year. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] has 21 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has one minute remaining.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LONGWORTH). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the pending bill, but it is my purpose to call the attention of the Congress and the country to the condition of an important piece of legislation that has had the consideration of the country for many, many years. It is what is familiarly known as the packers' legislation. The packers' bill has been passed by the Senate. That bill was reported to the Committee on Agriculture of the House. That committee of the House has reported back a packers' bill, and that bill is now on the calendar for consideration. We have been debating spending the people's money, and I state that now we have an opportunity for this Congress to debate a fundamental proposition that will help the producers of this Nation, upon whom the Nation must depend for the money that we spend. Are you going to have that legislation? You can have it this week if those responsible for power here now will exercise that power. I want the country to know that that exercise of power will determine whether or not the country is to have the relief that has been demanded in the enactment of the packers' law. There are two sources of power now in this House. One is what is known as the steering committee, a concern that has no legal status. Nobody knows where it sits or what its members say. It is concealed from the public. But if reports be true, that steering committee is the supreme power in this House, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the head of that committee, who comes from the city of Chicago, the home of the packers, is exercising a dominant power on that committee, and if it is left to him the country has no hope of getting this relief.

Then the leader of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]—it is up to him to act. The country is demanding of him that he act. Committees of Congress have duly considered this bill for months and months. Reports have been made, and the bill has passed the other body. It is here on this floor. It is the duty of the leader of the responsible majority, which must act if we are to have this legislation in the interest of the producers and consumers of this Nation. It is his duty so to handle the parliamentary situation that this bill can be brought to a vote. The country is going to hold him responsible for the power that he now has. Committees of agriculturists, of stockmen, of consumers, have waited on the gentleman from Wyoming, leader of the majority, and they have written to him an open letter, which refers to a conference that representatives of organizations signing the letter had with the gentleman from Wyoming, in which he stated in substance that he is opposed to the packer control legislation, but he believes that if the Gronna bill as it passed the Senate came to a vote in the House it would be passed and go to the President, and also that as a Republican he is anxious to have a Republican President sign the packer control bill when passed by Congress. If he believes that there is a great majority in this House that is ready to pass the Gronna bill, this House is the representative body which is supposed to reflect the sentiment of the people of this Nation. If the leader of the Republican majority thinks that, then it is his duty to report this bill and have it brought up for consideration.

There is one other source of power, and that is the Committee on Rules, of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is chairman. If he and his colleagues on that committee stand foursquare for the protection of the stockmen of this country as well as of the consumers, why not grant us a rule making this bill in order? I pledge you that if you grant that rule we will have legislation within 24 hours. How are you going to exercise that power? Answer to the country! [Applause.]

Mr. EVANS of Montana. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I want to discuss for just a few minutes the same question that has been discussed by my friend from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], and that is packer legislation. I agree with the gentleman from Texas in all that he has said, but I want to approach the subject from a little different viewpoint. This is an important piece of legislation. It has been before the Congress in one form or another for a number of years. At the beginning of this session many bills were introduced both in the House and in



the Senate dealing with this subject. Extensive hearings have been held before committees of both the Senate and the House. Just a short time ago the Senate passed the Gronna bill. It came over here to the House and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. That committee took up the bill and considered it carefully for something like a week or 10 days and reported it back to the House with an amendment in the form of a substitute. I remember well the long days of hearings we had in the Agricultural Committee last winter, and I know that there are on the Committee on Agriculture both Republicans and Democrats who are anxious to see this legislation enacted. I know that there are Republicans and Democrats in this House who want it. To-day I want to urge upon all who want this kind of legislation to unite their efforts and let us get the Rules Committee to bring in a rule. This bill is here. It has passed the Senate and all we have to do is to take it up in the House, consider it, and pass it. There is only one way to secure this legislation, and that is to take up the Senate bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture, vote down the substitute, pass the Senate bill just as it passed the Senate, and send it to the President of the United States for his signature. Then you will get the legislation that the people of the country want. If you do not do that, if you pursue any other policy, you will not get any legislation. If you adopt the substitute, you simply send the bill to conference and in the 20 days remaining the bill will die. When the new Congress convenes after the 4th day of March you must begin anew in both bodies, introduce other bills, hold additional hearings, and all of the long, laborious work done by the committees of both House and Senate will be thrown away. My purpose this afternoon is to urge that all Members of this House on both sides who are anxious and desirous of securing this legislation get together and bring force to bear on the Rules Committee that they may bring in a rule. What happened on yesterday? We had a rule reported to bring in a bill which was defeated by only one vote under suspension of the rules the day before. One gentleman, a member of the Rules Committee, stated that the vote the day before when the House voted almost two-thirds for the bill was a sufficient reason for the Rules Committee bringing in the rule. I believe a large majority of the House wants this legislation. Impress this fact upon the Rules Committee, and a rule will be forthcoming.

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

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time, one minute, to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS of Montana. And, Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the financial statement which the gentleman from Iowa made to the House at the beginning of to-day's session, and particularly his statement that unless appropriations and expenditures of the Government were reduced to less than \$4,000,000,000 that there would be no possibility of reducing taxes which are now upon the statute books from which the people are demanding relief, and that the party responsible for making the appropriations would be held responsible by the people of the country.

There is no reason, in my judgment, why, with the proper exercise of economy and the determination on the part of the Members of Congress, that they will for the time being abandon certain pet projects which are not absolutely necessary to be carried on at this time—I say there is no reason, in my judgment, why the appropriations can not be reduced to a point much less than \$4,000,000,000. It has been more than two years since the signing of the armistice. People are not only expecting but are demanding that the appropriations be reduced and that they be relieved of some of the excessive taxes imposed on them during the war. I think I can promise the Republican majority, who are responsible for the legislation and for the appropriations that are made in this Congress, and also in the next Congress, that in every effort they make toward economy and toward the reduction of expenses they will have the cooperation of the Democratic minority.

I want to say this to the Members upon the Republican side of the Chamber, that if they will follow the advice and leadership of their present able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], there is no question but what these appropriations will be held down to a point that the people may reasonably expect, because I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations with the gentleman from Iowa for the past 10 years, and I say to you that there is no Member of this House who, in my judgment, has shown a greater desire to practice economy, who has shown more courage, more ability, in committee and on the floor of the

House, in his efforts to bring about economy on the part of Congress than has the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. [Applause.]

As was stated a while ago, it is not only a question of reducing appropriations, but Congress must make up its mind to cease creating new activities which call for new appropriations.

I was very much gratified a while ago when in response to a question by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Dr. FESS, a leader of his party on this floor and in the country, made the statement that, so far as he was concerned, he was opposed to the creation of new activities unless they were absolutely necessary. I recall—and I say this with all due respect to the gentleman from Ohio, because I have a warm personal regard for him—that the gentleman has been one of those Members in this House who in times past has been very persistent in his efforts to pass certain legislation, important, useful, and valuable, but possibly not absolutely necessary at the time, which would impose on Congress the necessity of making large appropriations. There are now bills on the calendar from the gentleman's committee which, if passed, will further greatly increase the expenditures of the Government in the sum of hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

About a year ago Congress made appropriations for this fiscal year. The election was approaching and there were very strenuous efforts made by the majority side, particularly by the majority leader, to show that the administration was unduly extravagant and that the Republican majority in Congress was exceptionally economical, and to prove that statement he and others referred to the estimates submitted by the executive departments, denouncing them as extravagant, and compared them with the actual appropriations made.

I charged then that some of the appropriations were being reduced with the knowledge that it would be necessary after the election and at this short session of Congress to come back and get sufficient money with which to carry on the necessary activities of the Government. I charged then that we would find ourselves in the position at this short session of having brought before us a larger deficiency bill than was ever proposed before in Congress in peace times. We are confronted to-day with the first deficiency bill for this session, carrying more than \$200,000,000, a greater amount than has ever been carried in any deficiency bill ever proposed in peace times.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] vouchsafed in his remarks this morning that there were pending before the committee other large estimates for deficiencies, and he intimated that later on during this session, before we adjourn three weeks hence, he would be under the necessity of proposing another large deficiency appropriation bill. This bill carries, as I said, \$203,000,000. Excluding the appropriations for the Army and the Navy, it carries something like \$94,000,000 of deficiencies. It may be true, as the gentleman from Iowa says, that these deficiencies do not occur by reason of reductions made in estimates by Congress at the last session. If that be true, then it is a complete answer to the charge made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and also by the gentleman from Iowa that the executive departments were unduly extravagant in submitting their estimates. It would show that the administration, in its desire to hold down expenses, submitted estimates which were really not sufficient in amount for the ensuing fiscal year.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not a fact that if the Secretary of War had refused to increase the Army and held it down to the amount appropriated for at the last session of Congress there would not have been a deficiency, so far as the Military Establishment is concerned?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is probably true. I was speaking particularly of the estimates outside of those submitted for the Army. I agree with the gentleman. I am opposed to an Army exceeding 150,000 men, and if I had had my way the Secretary of War would not have enlisted above 150,000 men; but I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact—and the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs—that his own committee reported to this House and Congress passed a bill authorizing an Army of 280,000 men, in round numbers. The Secretary of War was authorized to enlist that size of Army by express authorization of this House. It is true that later on in the same session and within a few weeks Congress undertook to limit it by making an appropriation—

Mr. MCKENZIE. But is it not true that that authorization in the reorganization bill said that in peace times the enlisted force of the Army should not exceed 280,000 men? It does not say that it shall be 280,000 men.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand; but it made the authorization.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois can not complain, because he and every member of his party yesterday twice voted not to reduce either the Army or the number of officers in the personnel. They had a chance to do it yesterday, and they voted to keep it up as high as possible in both votes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. On that same question that same bill directed the different branches and departments of the Army to be composed of so and so and directed that they should be so enlisted, making up a total of 280,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I regret that I have not the opportunity to discuss some features of the bill which I intended to discuss, but have not been able to do so in the time allotted me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Valuation of property of carriers: To enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out the objects of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof," by providing for a valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject thereto, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$1,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Iowa how much money has already been appropriated for the valuation of these railroads and how much longer this appropriation will be carried and what the real benefit to be obtained from the same is?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amount already appropriated, not including the amount carried in the bill, is \$21,050,462. It is supposed that the field work will have been completed with the end of this fiscal year, and that the work of assembling the field notes and completing the valuation will have been completed by the end of this calendar year. Just when the work will be finally completed will depend on what Congress does. The work must continue under the law. Here is what Judge Prouty says with regard to the completion of the work:

The transportation act, as I apply it in my own mind, will require the commission to determine, probably as of December 31, 1921, the value of each individual interstate railroad in this country; and this same transportation act requires the commission to use in the making of that valuation the information collected under the valuation act. It was clearly in the mind of Congress that the figures of the Bureau of Valuation would be available to the commission for the most part by the time it became necessary to use them.

Mr. SNELL. Is it a fact that this valuation changes faster than the people are able to make the valuation under the present system?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not. Of course, the valuation has changed more rapidly than they could proceed during the war.

Mr. SNELL. I mean as a general proposition, leaving out the war entirely.

Mr. GOOD. That has upset their work to a very large extent, of course. If the valuation of the roads is based only on the cost, you would have one figure, and if it was based on the replacement cost you would have at this time an altogether much larger figure.

Mr. SNELL. And they are doing both.

Mr. GOOD. They are making a valuation, so that both the cost to the railroad companies and the reproduction costs will be known.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. Under the valuation act of 1913 the valuation board of the Interstate Commerce Commission must make a valuation, first, of the original cost; second, of the cost of reproduction; and third, of the cost of reproduction, new, less depreciation, but in view of the decision of the Supreme Court handed down last summer in the Kansas City Southern case, the commission under mandamus proceedings must now make a valuation of the acquisition of lands in addition to the present value, and that decision of the Supreme Court will entail additional expenditure of \$300,000, which could not have been anticipated by Judge Prouty or by Chairman Clark when they appeared before the Committee on Appropriations a year ago in making the estimates.

Mr. GOOD. Answering the gentleman's question a little further, Judge Prouty says:

Now, if I am permitted to proceed as we are now going, I expect to be able to furnish the commission by the end of the present calendar year with these figures as to every railroad, with possibly a few exceptions, of 500 miles or more in extent; but if this deficiency appropriation and our annual appropriation is materially reduced the accomplishment will be nothing as good as that.

Mr. SNELL. Is it expected that these appropriations will have to be continued indefinitely, if you are going to keep up this work, to make them of value?

Mr. GOOD. I should not think it would require anything like the appropriations required before, because a survey has been made, but some appropriation will have to be made if the work is to be kept current.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. In the physical valuation act the commission in doing this valuation work will have to keep current the cost of all additions and betterments and extensions since July 1, 1914, which is the date of the valuation, so that it will not be a very large force to keep current the items of cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman think it is absolutely necessary to continue these appropriations for the good of the commission, of the people, and of the railroads?

Mr. ESCH. There never was a time when this valuation was more necessary in view of the facts contained in the transportation act, namely, that after two years, which will be the 1st of March, 1922, the valuation upon which the Interstate Commerce Commission is to fix rates which will produce the 6 per cent becomes effective, so, according to Judge Prouty's statement, he hopes to make the valuation during the current calendar year.

Mr. SNELL. What have they been doing toward fixing the rate up to the present time?

Mr. ESCH. They made the valuation last March, or rather in April, I think it was, of \$18,900,000,000, based largely upon estimates—tentative valuations which have been filed with them by the valuation board. They also took into consideration the other elements of value referred to in the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. SNELL. Are those more accurate than the ones they obtained from the railroads themselves?

Mr. ESCH. Yes; those were checked up.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman considers it is absolutely necessary to continue this appropriation?

Mr. ESCH. I do. Unless this valuation is made it will be difficult for the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the basis for rates.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to get some information about this of the gentleman from Iowa. How long has this physical valuation been going on?

Mr. GOOD. The first appropriation was \$100,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913.

Mr. CARTER. How many men are employed in the physical valuation of the railroads at this time?

Mr. GOOD. I can not state that exactly. We had a complete table in the sundry civil bill hearings—I do not have it before me—giving the entire personnel of the field force and the office force.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The complete list of names and the salaries will appear in the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. GOOD. The same thing was given in the sundry civil hearings.

Mr. CARTER. It may have been stated over there, but the gentleman stated it so low that we could not hear it over here. What time does the gentleman estimate it will take to finish this work now?

Mr. GOOD. Judge Prouty says it will be completed by the end of this calendar year.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, during the discussion of this bill the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] gave some very interesting information relative to the air mail service. In my opinion, if the mail service conducted by air service of the Post Office Department is successful, it will only be a question of time—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not make the point of order against the gentleman, although the gentleman is discussing a matter out of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Does the gentleman make the point?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I am more courteous than the gentleman.

Mr. McCLINTIC. If the gentleman will permit, a post-office item is contained in this bill, and I hope he will not make the point of order.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I am not making the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I thank the gentleman. As I started to say, in my opinion, if the air mail service is successful, it will only be a question of time until it is enlarged similar to the way the Parcel Post System was enlarged, and will ultimately result in a passenger-carrying mail service. A few days ago there was discussed on this floor a very interesting subject, which dealt with a gas which when fully developed will be used, in my opinion, in the passenger carrying service. The gentlemen from Texas [Mr. LANHAM and Mr. PARRISH] gave some very interesting information relative to the utilization of a by-product of natural gas called helium. All of us know that the natural elements above are such that a person operating an airplane is liable to be suddenly confronted with air pockets, wind currents, and changes of temperature. In my opinion, we will never be able successfully to combat the air and its changes until we have developed a machine with a sufficient amount of natural buoyancy which will meet these sudden conditions when necessary. Mr. Chairman, in the question propounded by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN] to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] in regard to helium gas he answered, if my memory is correct, that he was not in favor of allowing private industries to develop this gas, and I want to say to you and to the committee that unless private industries are allowed to develop this natural gas the whole country is liable to suffer. In other words, nothing should be done to retard or hinder those who wish to develop air passenger service.

I am thoroughly of the opinion that if Germany during the recent war had been able to find some gas that was noninflammable and noncombustible that their Zeppelins could not have been brought to the ground when participating in a raid and that country might have won the war. If you will remember, when those Zeppelins were in use that they did more to bring terror to the cities which were bombed than anything ever invented in modern warfare. I am of the opinion that if this Congress withholds or passes any legislation which will prevent private industry from developing helium gas, which is to-day being wasted, that the development of aero passenger service in the future will be seriously retarded. I am hoping that when this subject comes up for consideration at a later date the statements I have made relative to aero passenger service and the development of helium gas will be taken into consideration, so that in the future we may have the benefit of the best brains that can be put forth by private industries to hasten the completion of the discovery of such aero passenger-carrying ships which will be able to meet or combat the natural elements in the air. Helium gas is the only known gas suitable to be used in balloons and passenger-carrying ships that is noninflammable and noncombustible, and its development should not be retarded by legislation.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I do it to discuss briefly the item under consideration. I was a member of the subcommittee that appropriated the first money for the physical valuation of railroads. At that time I took the position which I think is sound; that is, instead of putting out the small number of surveying parties, the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to have been given enough money to have made that physical valuation in as short a time as possible. I think this is a very important piece of work, of course made necessary, as you all know, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, what I fear about this is that the first valuations made, commencing some years back, will give rise to litigation in the event the Interstate Commerce Commission shall fix the rates based upon a valuation that they made years ago.

There are two difficulties in the way. One is that railroad mileage may have been increased many times since the valuation was made, and another is that the railroad mileage and equipment may depreciate many times and not be worth half what it was. Therefore, I am afraid that this very valuable service will not be as accurate and as beneficial to us as it would have been if we had made the valuation more quickly.

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

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. SNELL. That is one of the points I wanted to bring out. What value at the present time is the valuation of a railroad that was made eight years ago?

Mr. SISSON. That, of course, is problematical. I can not tell, nor do I believe anyone can tell, what the courts would do

with that question if it was in the courts. It would depend entirely on the testimony as to the change of valuation at the time.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], in whose opinion I have great confidence, if in his opinion the valuation made some 8 or 10 years ago will be a safe basis for the commission to fix rates upon now?

Mr. ESCH. As I understand, the valuation was required to be made of a given date. That was July 1, 1914. The great amount of work done by the valuation board since that time consists of sending engineers over every mile of railroad in the United States and over every mile of telegraph line. They have made a list of the ties and the rails, the cubic feet of fill and—

Mr. SISSON. I am thoroughly familiar with that, because that was all gone over when the appropriation was granted.

Mr. ESCH. Now, we have that detail. Then the thing to do is to attach to those elements of valuation the unit of cost, and that they will do when the field work is finished.

Mr. SISSON. That is all true, but I am at a loss to know. I have great confidence in Judge Prouty, but he was not absolutely certain in his testimony a year or two ago as to what valuation the court, or how much value the court, would attach to the valuation made some years ago. In other words, Judge Prouty also believed with the committee—I do not know that the whole commission agreed with him—that the work ought to have been done with more speed and that more surveying parties ought to have been put out for the purpose of making the survey very much quicker.

Mr. ESCH. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SISSON. But the committee differed with us about it. Now, I think this is one of the most important items that we can now consider. What I fear is that it may lead to this sort of litigation: If the rates fixed by the commission should be favorable to the public, it would mean, of course, that the railroads would attack those rates. Now, if they make rates favorable to the railroads, I do not know just who is going to intervene in the interest of the public, because the commission is presumed to represent the public. Therefore the accuracy of the valuation ought to be such that not only the railroads but the public might know that it is a reasonably fair one. A railroad that permits its rolling stock and its tracks to go down may be very much less valuable than a railroad that is continually improving its rolling stock and tracks. I have been at a loss to know how, in the absence of proof on the part of the Government, we would ever be able to meet successfully in any contest or litigation the proof the railroads had advanced as to change of valuation unless they should make a resurvey of the whole matter and of the money lost. I hope, however, that the survey will be—and I think it will be—of great value. And I think the sooner we conclude it the better.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all authorized expenditures under the provisions of the act of February 17, 1911, "to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," and amendment of March 4, 1915, extending "the same powers and duties with respect to all parts and appurtenances of the locomotive and tender," including such stenographic and clerical help to the chief inspector and his two assistants as the Interstate Commerce Commission may deem necessary, and for per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, \$10,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Under this head of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the first paragraph we have appropriated \$500,000 "for all other authorized expenditures necessary in the execution of laws to regulate commerce," and so on, not itemized in any particular. That would embrace almost anything, and I merely mention that to call attention to the loose and intemperate way we still have of appropriating money. And I might add that for these different matters embraced under this head for the present fiscal year we have already appropriated \$1,600,000, and this deficiency of \$500,000 is additional to that sum. In the next paragraph, which is for the "investigation of railroad accidents," we appropriate another deficiency of \$22,400. This sum is in addition to the \$313,600 already carried in the sundry civil bill for this particular paragraph. Then, in the next paragraph, "valuation of railroad properties," we appropriate \$1,000,000 deficiency, and this in addition to the \$1,750,000 already appropriated, practically all of which has been spent during the present fiscal year.

Mr. GOOD. For valuation.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. Now, the present paragraph is for "locomotive inspection," \$10,000, as a deficiency. And the chairman of the committee knows that we have already appropriated, and it has been spent, most of it, \$290,000 under this head for the present fiscal year for such inspection. Now, I

want to show you who it benefits mostly. The people of the United States only indirectly are benefited, but I will show you who it benefits directly.

There is very little testimony given on these items. The hearings on all of them will not cover over two or three pages. But I want to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Clark, on page 24 of the hearings, with respect to this second paragraph under this head, and for which, as I said, we have already spent \$313,600 and are now appropriating as a deficiency \$22,400 more.

The chairman of the committee was trying to find out how Mr. Clark was spending this money, and asked him the reason for all this. He said:

We have an engineer physicist, who is a very competent man, and he is doing valuable and helpful work—

Valuable and helpful work to the people directly? No. Here is the way in which it was valuable and helpful:

Helpful to the manufacturers of those things and helpful to the railroads.

So Mr. Clark said.

Most of this money that we are spending under these two heads is helpful mostly to the railroads we learn from the testimony of Mr. Clark. I am wondering when we are going to stop it.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that that is helpful, of course, to the railroads and to the manufacturers who are manufacturing safety appliances. But the old safety-appliance law was not enacted for the benefit of the railroads, but it was enacted to lessen the number of injuries to the public.

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield further; I have but five minutes—

Mr. GOOD. That is too much—

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman has used an hour and a half to-day. It reminds me of a statement I heard not long ago which came directly from an engineer, to show how the people have to pay for these regulatory matters and for certain rules that both the railroads and the employees have for the operation of trains, from which the country suffers daily. The engineer stopped at a little station and found out that there was a bolt loose and lost, that had been lost out of some part of the engine. He had such a bolt in his engine cab box that cost about 8 cents that he could have put in there in three minutes and put it in good, and his engine would have been in first-class shape; but under the rules of his organization he could not touch the bolt, and he could not touch the engine—

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. He had to stop that engine and that train full of passengers at that little station, and wire in to the next division, some thirty-odd miles, and have them send an engine and a caboose with two mechanics in it, out there to put a little 8-cent bolt into the engine. The train was delayed four hours and a half, and that one little bolt cost the railroad company an immense amount of money, which the people have to pay in the increased tariffs.

For the inspection of these boilers and the inspection of these tenders and the investigation of these railroad accidents the people are paying these tremendous sums when the railroads themselves ought to do most of it. That is the point I am trying to make. The railroad company, after all, is responsible to individuals for every accident. There are big lines, big systems, that have operated for years and have not had an accident or loss of life for years, and that was true before we ever thought of spending these sums of half a million dollars a year in such investigations. I say this is, most of it, unnecessary. We started that a good while ago. We ought now to retrench on it and stop it. It is not a true deficiency, and we ought to stop spending the money.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I drew and, to use a common expression, "put through" this House what is known as the boiler inspection bill. I did it after a very thorough examination of the subject, even going so far as to crawl into the fire box, with the steam still on in the boiler, where it was pretty hot, to learn how the whole thing was done.

It is to the interest of the railroad company to have boilers that do not explode, but they frequently took the chance, and

boilers did explode. I dare say there has been no one thing done by the Government which has been of more value to the people than the laws in reference not merely to boiler inspection on the railroads, but providing for the inspection of other parts of engines and for the various safety appliances required on the railroads.

All of these propositions were fought by the railroad people. They were all, it is true, largely asked for by railroad labor, but they were passed in the interest of the public, and the expense which the public pays is paid for the benefit of the public; and if they could derive as much benefit in a thousand and one other directions as they do in this direction, how happy I would be!

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 1918, \$23,603.41.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Will the chairman of the committee kindly state whether or not this sum, \$23,603.41, is all for items for which there was due authorization of law?

Mr. GOOD. I think there is due authorization of law for all these items. Of course, it is a deficiency. They have expended this money.

Mr. BLANTON. I realize that it is a deficiency, but was it a deficiency that was based upon authority of law? Did they spend the money with due authority of law?

Mr. GOOD. They could not make the payments that would pass the auditor unless there was authority of law for it. I think unquestionably there was authority of law for all the expenditures.

Mr. BLANTON. Did our usually careful chairman look into the matter?

Mr. GOOD. Yes. This has come before us in two ways. Last year it came before us as audited claims. There was a whole bunch of audited claims. They should not have come as audited claims. They were a deficiency. We refused to allow them as audited claims, and they come back now as deficiency appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. These are not tango items, are they?

Mr. GOOD. I hope not.

Mr. BLANTON. There were some items in the last bill of that kind.

Mr. GOOD. I say that the House, and no Member of the House, had anything to do with these expenditures. They are claims that have come in. They seemed to be regular expenditures. Some of them are in amounts that have been tied up for some time, small claims; and the Government is compelled, as I think the gentleman will understand—

Mr. BLANTON. We had a deficiency bill here less than six or eight months ago. Why should \$23,000 go over from 1918 in a deficiency, and \$55,000 in 1919, and not be covered in the last deficiency bill? We have passed several deficiency bills since these amounts were incurred.

Mr. GOOD. We provided for several deficiency expenditures that took place during the war. They are for postage and telegraphing and cable messages, and things of that kind.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no high society in it?

Mr. GOOD. I can not say as to that. If there is any "high society in it," the Members of the House were not connected with the expenditure; I know that.

Mr. BLANTON. But they are connected with taking the money out of the Treasury to pay for it.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman can well understand that if the Government refused to pay bills that were contracted abroad it would not very long have any credit, even though the gentleman and other Members of the House might question the correctness of making the expenditure. The State Department having entered into the contract and having contracted the indebtedness, Congress can do nothing except pay the bill, even though the State Department may have been unwise in contracting the indebtedness. I do not know whether it was wise or not; but the Government can only maintain its credit at home and abroad by paying its contracts.

Mr. BLANTON. There is one bill that has lately been filed for money already expended. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. GOOD. What is that?

Mr. BLANTON. The million and some odd thousands of dollars, filed for expenses abroad, much of it being social expenses. Does the gentleman approve of that claim?

Mr. GOOD. I do not know the claim the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman does not know about it, I will not remind him of it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is it not a fact that when we make up a deficiency appropriation, these deficiency items can not be paid unless they are authorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. That is true.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This does not authorize new expenditures, as I understand it.

Mr. GOOD. Not at all. It is simply to pay bills that have already been contracted.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Under law.

Mr. GOOD. Under law. The auditor has passed these bills, and he could not pass them if they were not authorized by law.

Mr. BEGG. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] withdraw his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I wish to get a little information from the chairman of the committee [Mr. Good], if I may have it. It is on the question of deficiencies in general in the departments. I take it up under this department because I know more about it than I do about any other. When we make a specific appropriation for any item like contingent expenses or salaries of consuls or consular agents, or anything of that kind, what right has the department under the law to spend more than is appropriated, unless it is the moral right to meet an emergency? I should like to have the gentleman's statement on that.

Mr. GOOD. It has no right, except that under the provisions of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes if the expenditure is under an appropriation inadequate for the purchase of clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, or transportation in the War Department or the Navy Department, then and in those cases only have the officials the right to create a deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. Then if I understand the gentleman—and I think I do—any expenditure beyond the appropriations, unless we all concede that an emergency arises, by the Department of State or any other department is an absolute violation of law?

Mr. GOOD. There are some modifications of that. The antideficiency law provides that at the beginning of the year there shall be an allotment made by the officer who has the appropriation in charge, and that that allotment shall be by months or quarters, so that there shall be no deficiency in the last quarter. But that is subject to this qualification. I guess I had better read the whole provision—

Mr. BEGG. It is not necessary.

Mr. GOOD. In case the officer finds that in order to efficiently administer a given law he will need more money than the appropriation, then he can waive his allotment, but that waiver must be in writing and submitted to Congress with the reasons therefor, and after that is done then he can create a deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that, but that is never done, is it?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; very frequently. It is done in a great many cases.

Mr. BEGG. I have never known it to be done.

Mr. GOOD. It is done in very many instances, and has been done as to many of the estimates for deficiencies in this bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the gentleman from Iowa will pardon me, of course when Congress directs an officer of the Government to do something and he does it and there is no appropriation, that is a legal deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that absolutely.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Or if we provide for the salary for an office and do not appropriate the money to pay the salary, there is a legal deficiency.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman did not state that.

Mr. BEGG. I understand that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But where we appropriate for specific purposes, where there is no direction, they can not spend more than that sum without a further appropriation.

Mr. BEGG. Under the item for contingent expenses or emergencies in the State Department we appropriate \$600,000. The gentleman does not hold that that gives them permission to go on and spend \$650,000, does he?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Certainly not.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In the case in question—

Mr. BEGG. There is no specific case. I am just trying to determine the facts, to see if this body has any check on any department that cares to go ahead and expend beyond the appropriation.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know the gentleman will be interested in a statement as to how this particular deficiency arose. Accounts are presented after an appropriation

has lapsed, and that is this case according to the hearings. When the accounts were received it was not ascertained what appropriation they belonged to and it was too late to charge them to the exact appropriation to which they did belong.

Mr. BEGG. I was not questioning this specific item. In the last Congress and this two deficiency bills have been brought up. There unquestionably have been emergencies in some and in others there is no emergency, but they go on and spend without any limitation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Government officials can not spend money because there is an emergency; they are not authorized to do that.

Mr. BEGG. I know that they give that as an excuse.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not the way deficiencies are created; there must be more than an emergency. Congress acts in the case of an emergency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, a question. Whatever became of the provision put in the law several years ago making it a criminal offense for the head of a department to exceed the appropriation?

Mr. GOOD. That is the act of February 27, 1906; that is the one I referred to a moment ago, the antideficiency law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did anybody ever enforce it?

Mr. GOOD. There have been a great many violations of it. I suppose during the war it was impossible to strictly enforce it. Take the items under discussion; they were created during the war, but they were in excess of the appropriations for those years. To answer the gentleman's question, I do not know of any criminal prosecution or any punishment ever having been inflicted on anyone for creating a deficiency in violation of law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The war is over, and does not the gentleman think we had better go back and enforce the law henceforth and forever?

Mr. GOOD. I certainly do. If the gentleman from Missouri will look over the hearings, he will find that every person that came before us had his attention called to the antideficiency law, and he was asked why it had not been enforced. The committee has been quite diligent in that respect, not only in this Congress but previous Congresses. I remember when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] conducted the hearings on the deficiency practically every item that came before him he made the inquiry as to the failure to observe the antideficiency law. We have done it right along. But practically it is an administrative function. Congress can not dismiss a man. Here is a jail sentence provided for as a penalty, as follows:

Any person violating any provision of the act shall be summarily removed and made to pay a fine of \$100 or imprisonment of not less than one month.

I do not know where a single administrative official has ever inflicted a penalty under this provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Iowa in all probability will have great influence with the incoming administration, and can it not be enforced somehow and in some way?

Mr. GOOD. I think a rather lax method has grown up in all departments with regard to enforcing the antideficiency act.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. When the attention of these officials was called to the fact that they had violated the law, did they claim that they had not violated the law or did they admit that they had?

Mr. GOOD. Sometimes it was an admission and sometimes they were able to show some reason why it had been done.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For additional amount necessary to complete the purchase of 129,000,000 sheets of distinctive paper for United States currency, national-bank currency, and Federal reserve bank currency, including transportation of paper, traveling, mill, and other necessary expenses, \$110,536.87.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What I desire to call the attention of the committee to does not properly come under this item nor the one preceding; but this morning we talked about the possibility of the interest being paid upon foreign loans. I have been noting in the financial dispatches and discussions of financial questions reference to the fact that the foreign loans have never been put in the form of a bond, but simply in the form of a certificate or due bill, and the question was raised whether until these loans were funded there will be any interest to run, indicating that there may be a claim that the interest does not begin until we put the debt in the form of a bond. Has the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had any information on that point?

Mr. GOOD. The statement was made at one time before the committee a year or so ago that the obligations were in the

form of demand notes. My understanding is that they draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

I think it was Secretary Glass who made the statement while he was Secretary of the Treasury that some arrangement had been made whereby the foreign countries would not be called upon to pay the interest for the period of three years. I think that that has been allowed to stand in that way; there was a tentative agreement between this Government and other Governments whose demand obligations we had that our Government would not demand interest until about three years after the signing of the armistice.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman understand that when they do demand it it will be three years' interest, or does interest begin at the end of the three years?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, it was not a waiver of the interest, as I understand it, but only a postponement of the time of payment. The Secretary would not have such authority. If the gentleman is interested in that I refer him to quite a long and full discussion of the matter in the hearings before the committee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill of this year.

Mr. FESS. I hope the gentleman's view is correct, although it has been mentioned in financial circles that there is no interest due until after the debt is put in the form of a funded debt.

Mr. GOOD. If that was the case there would have been no necessity for an agreement on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury that the payment of interest should be postponed for three years.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I admit the statement. In connection with this I read a statement put out by a New York bank that has some very interesting items in it:

Significant in considering Great Britain's outlook are the figures recently issued by the Savings Banks' Association of the State of New York which show that the British Empire profited more in a monetary way as a result of the war than any other nation, her estimated wealth now being approximately \$230,000,000,000, as compared with \$130,000,000,000 when the war started. This gain of \$100,000,000,000 is attributed to the wealth added by the Mesopotamia oil fields, the African territory taken from Germany, and the elimination of Germany as a trade competitor, and will serve as an important asset in the recovery and extension of foreign trade.

There has been much interest recently developed in our rights in the Mesopotamia oil fields, as the gentleman will recall. I am wondering whether this statement is true, that \$100,000,000,000 represents the additional wealth of one of the Allies, one of our associates in the Great War, and whether there is any real legitimate reason why this interest should not be paid now on the debt that is owing us.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking a question, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think it is time for the Government to stop all of this talk that is going on throughout the country to the effect that the United States Government is not going to demand payment for all of these loans due by our allies, and let the people of this country understand, and let the people of all of the foreign countries understand, that the United States Government is going to require them to pay every dollar of loans that we made them during the war? Does not the gentleman think it is time to put a stop to all of this misunderstanding throughout the country?

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman I am afraid is asking me to criticize what the Secretary of the Treasury has done, and I do not want to do that, because I might be accused of being a partisan if I should criticize even the postponement of the payment.

Mr. BLANTON. The time is going to be here in a few days when the gentleman will have to speak for his own Secretary of the Treasury; as to what his own Secretary is going to do.

Mr. GOOD. I hope the time has arrived when we may call upon the countries owing us to pay the interest on their obligations.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa permit me to suggest that possibly there are many elements in connection with that matter?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. For instance, I should think that the honorable Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union would want to know about the effect upon our home markets, judging from a speech which he made not long ago. The question has many elements, and I agree with the gentleman from Iowa that for numerous reasons, not confined to those here given, it ought not to be answered at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. I noticed the other day that one of these countries that owes us quite a lot of money, and that is always

hollering hard times, spent over \$100,000 for a state dance the other night, and if they can waste money in that way they ought to be able to pay the interest on the money that this country let them have in their extremity.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of file holders and file cases for use of the accounting offices of the Treasury Department, \$3,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question in respect to the policy of such items as are contained in this paragraph:

For the purchase of file holders and file cases for use of the accounting offices of the Treasury Department, \$3,000.

What is the necessity for expenditure of \$3,000 for that item?

Mr. GOOD. That is largely for files for checks. The expenditures have been so great and the number of checks drawn upon the Government so large, that the amount appropriated for this purpose has not been sufficient. More than that, the cost has been very much greater. Formerly we appropriated \$6,000 a year, \$4,000 in 1915 and 1916, and then \$5,000. This year we have \$12,000 available. The department does not have containers to put these checks in. Many of these are war-risk checks, and the gentleman can see that it takes almost as many checks for new service as we ordinarily would have for all other purposes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understand that, but the other departments—the War Department and several commissions and bureaus—had unlimited files and file cases that should have been transferred to the Treasury Department for that purpose. Why was that not done?

Mr. GOOD. These are a box the size of a check and my impression is that they are of pasteboard. The checks are placed in them and filed away. It takes a great many of them, and the file cases used by the War Department in many instances are still being used. They have files in them, and until those files are relieved of all matter that will not be preserved those cases would not be available.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have been informed that there are in storage houses in certain places in New York thousands and hundreds of thousands of these file cases, desks, and all kinds of office furniture. What is the policy of the Government with regard to that surplus furniture?

Mr. GOOD. Under the law all surplus file cases and furniture are turned over to the General Supply Committee, and when an appropriation is made the department that gets the appropriation must go to the General Supply Committee, and if there is a case or a desk or anything of that kind that is desired, which is in stock, that department pays for it out of that appropriation to the General Supply Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understand that this \$3,000 will follow that same course?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; but there are no cases of this kind in stock. These are simply pasteboard boxes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hospital construction, Public Health Service: For the completion of hospital buildings in Cook County, Ill., \$400,000.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, at the end of line 8 there was an amendment asked for by the Public Health Service and also by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds which I have omitted to offer. I ask unanimous consent to return to that for the purpose of offering the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to return to line 8 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 14, after line 8, insert as a new paragraph the following: "The limitation of \$210,000 for technical services, etc., contained in section 10 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines,' approved March 3, 1919, is increased by the sum of \$11,400."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me what is the purpose of that?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. Is that an increase in the limitation?

Mr. GOOD. It increases the limit of cost. The committee refused to give the item because it was legislation. We referred the matter to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. At Dawson Springs, Corpus Christi, and Cook County, Ill., where the inspectors and assistant inspectors are doing work the department does not have enough within the limitation to pay for the inspectors. They say they will have to discharge their inspectors and the work will have to go on without inspectors unless this increase in the limit is permitted. It does not carry

an appropriation, but increases the limit of expenditure for inspection by \$11,400. The matter was presented to the committee and the department asked for it, but the committee felt that it was not a deficiency in that sense and yet the committee did feel that perhaps a great deal more money would be saved by keeping the inspectors doing inspection work rather than take them off their jobs. I understand the Building and Grounds Committee want it inserted in the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will yield, this is really a limitation on a statutory act.

Mr. GOOD. It increases the limitation by \$11,400.

Mr. GARRETT. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OPERATING EXPENSES.

Operating force: For such personal services as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary in connection with the care, maintenance, and repair of all public buildings under the control of the Treasury Department, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$12,000.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Iowa. I have read the hearings on this particular item, and, as I understand, it gives, on page 225 of the hearings, a list of the towns where it is intended to put in additional watchmen. Is that the understanding?

Mr. GOOD. We give none of them. It was for an increase in the number of watchmen and in other places, and also an increase of salaries—

Mr. WINGO. I understand that is right. It is to increase the salaries and to increase the number of watchmen in the cities.

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The reason I ask about it is this: In the city of Fort Smith the custodian there, who is the postmaster, received instructions to close the building unless he had a labor watchman which he has not now. Well, you can not close the building. It would be folly to do it. You have not only the post office there, a very large post office, growing very rapidly, but you also have the United States court there; you have the revenue headquarters there; you have the prohibition-enforcement officers there; you have the civil-service secretary force there; you have the post-office inspection headquarters there; you have the Weather Bureau there; you have the district judge of the United States, whose personal office is in that building; you have the United States district attorney; you have the home office of the United States marshal; you have a good many people who are necessarily in there at night a good deal. Now, when the question was asked, because you can not close the building up, why he gave the order if he did not have a labor watchman, the official responsible immediately put the blame on Congress, that the Congress will not appropriate, and therefore there is not enough money. Now, I presume from the hearings they did not make any request for any additional watchmen for cities that have no watchmen at the present time but those which have had them heretofore, and the excuse he gave, recognizing the necessity for the watchman there, was that he could not do this with the appropriation, because Congress did not give enough money. That is not exactly a candid excuse to give to the postmaster.

Mr. GOOD. No; I think not. But I will say to the gentleman in 1915 they had \$2,650,000 for this purpose, and for this year they have \$3,700,000 and asked for \$845,000 additional. Now, all we gave them was this. We did not give that amount to increase their force or to increase the pay. To have given that would be to increase the allowance by 100 per cent since 1915, which we have not done in any other service in the field. That we did not feel was a deficiency, but they did require, as stated, \$12,000. There was a deficiency in their regular force at the end of the year of \$12,000, and we gave them that.

Mr. WINGO. My position is this: I recognize the position of the committee, and what I say is not in criticism of the committee, but there are special reasons which there is no use in going into; but the prime reason for the order which was given is that a danger is now present in that building at Fort Smith because of the headquarters of certain elements in a town not far away from there, so there is a present danger which should be guarded against. Now, the only excuse which is given is not that a watchman is not needed, not that there is no danger there, but that Congress will not let them have enough money. He says we do not appropriate enough to pay persons to be watchmen, and therefore Congress is to blame if that building is destroyed or its property stolen, or its doors are broken open, or whisky is stolen—

Mr. MADDEN. What is whisky doing there?

Mr. WINGO. I do not know that it is stored there; I think there are Liberty bonds, revenue stamps, and other things stored there. The place to take care of it is on the sundry civil bill, and this is a deficiency bill, but I simply wanted to protest against the statement, where Congress is trying to economize, of simply saying to the custodian that the reason we can not meet a public necessity is because Congress is too penurious and will not give us sufficient funds. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY OF THE ARMY.

For pay of the Army, including the same objects, except mileage, specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$24,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the chairman a question. I would like to ask him how they could make such a mistake in the pay of the Army as to have a deficiency of \$24,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. The amount requested for this deficiency was \$40,000,000. The appropriation was made for an Army of something less than 170,000 men—just how much less I could not tell the gentleman. I think the officials of the department do not agree as to that, but it was something less than 175,000 men. Now, we have at present about 240,000 men in the Army, and this estimate of \$40,000,000 was made on the theory that there would be an average during the year of 227,650 men. Now, when the matter was under discussion, the question was asked:

How much can you get along with for the pay of the Army for the rest of this year if the resolution reducing the size of the Army to 175,000 men shall pass?

And it was stated if that resolution passed by the 1st of February they could get along with about \$24,000,000. We have carried that in the bill.

Mr. SNELL. And this is simply because they enlisted a larger Army than Congress authorized?

Mr. GOOD. Largely so. Practically that is what it is for.

Mr. GARRETT. Not than Congress authorized.

Mr. GOOD. Larger than Congress appropriated for.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I wish to suggest to the gentlemen who have just been on the floor that it seems unfair for the charge to be repeatedly made here that the Secretary of War enlisted more men in the Army than were authorized. Gentlemen frequently go down to the departments seeking information, and come back with the charge that everybody down there is "passing the buck," by which is meant they are placing the responsibility somewhere else. This seems to me a plain case in which Congress is "passing the buck" to the Secretary of War. All of us know that in the Army reorganization act we authorized by law 280,000 men to be enlisted. Now, it is true that in the appropriation act for 1921 for the Army it was provided, so gentlemen say, that the appropriation should be for only 175,000 men. In all fairness I submit that an examination of that appropriation act will disclose that Congress simply made a lump-sum appropriation. There is nowhere in that act any legislative limitation to the effect that for that fiscal year the appropriation should be limited to the payment of 175,000 enlisted men. The Secretary of War had no more right to assume that by merely appropriating that lump sum this Congress intended to limit the amount to the payment of 175,000 men than any other head of a department had the right to assume that Congress would not grant a deficiency appropriation when the head of that department should come before the Appropriations Committee. You may take the present bill. What is this bill which we hold in our hands and which we are considering here to-day? It is a deficiency bill, carrying deficiencies for practically every branch of this Government. The heads of the departments knew when you appropriated last year for their various departments that when they came back here and made out a case you would appropriate a deficiency for them, and it is unfair, I submit in all candor, to try to pass the responsibility from the House to the Secretary of War.

I do not want a big Army. I voted, when the Army reorganization bill was before this House, to fix the strength of the Army at a maximum peace strength of 175,000 men, and those of us on the Democratic side of the House pleaded with the majority to fix that as the maximum strength of the Army. But gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle insisted on fixing the maximum strength of the Army in time of peace at 280,000 men, and because the Secretary of War took your words to mean what they said and went ahead with recruiting, and because he happened to recruit above 200,000, you fill the air with your complaints, and with your recriminations, and with your accusations against the Secretary of War for doing what

you had authorized him by statute law to do. I voted to reduce the Army the other day to 175,000 men, but, in all candor and all fairness, it seems to me Congress ought to admit its own fault when it makes that fault, and acknowledge that it did a foolish thing when it fixed the size of the Army at 280,000 men.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HUSTED. In all fairness, do you not think that the authorization, which, of course, is not a direction at all, was limited by the appropriation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not.

Mr. HUSTED. Has not that been the practice in the past? The Army in the past has not been enlisted up to its full strength. That is a mere authorization for a maximum number of soldiers in the Army, and when Congress appropriates for two-thirds of that number it does seem to me that a fair interpretation of that appropriation would be to construe it as a limitation upon the authorization and keep the number down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Lack of time precludes me from replying to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] asked the chairman of the committee, in charge of the bill, how was it that the War Department could make a mistake of \$24,000,000 with reference to the pay of our men in the Army. I want to ask a question of the chairman that is a little more apropos, and that is, How could the great, distinguished chairman of this committee make a mistake of more than \$24,000,000 with respect to the pay of our Army in appropriating only \$24,000,000 in this bill as a deficiency? The gentleman knows that for the men we have already recruited, whether the Secretary of War did it lawfully or unlawfully—I do not approve of his doing it; but no matter how he did it, he did it—that for the men we already have in this Army there will be a deficiency on June 30, 1921, of at least \$50,000,000, and maybe \$70,000,000, instead of \$24,000,000.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. Why does he take two bites at a cherry here? Why does he not come in and appropriate enough money to meet that deficiency at one time and not take it by piecemeal?

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. GOOD. Now, Gen. Lord was asked the question that if the resolution, which was pending, and which has passed, became a law before the 1st of February this year how much he would need instead of the \$40,000,000. They asked for only the \$40,000,000.

He said they would need \$24,000,000, and that the average size of the Army for the year would be 208,797 men. Now, it is very possible that because this resolution did not become a law until the 6th or 7th of February this amount will not be quite enough. But the gentleman is mistaken; there will not be very much more; there can not be very much more.

Mr. BLANTON. The great chairman of this committee is no fool; he knows what the facts are down here; he is a sensible man, of good financial judgment, and he knows that with 240,000 men already in the Army and a Secretary of War who will not turn one soldier loose unless you use a sledge hammer on him—he knows that by June 30 next of this year we shall have a deficiency of at least \$50,000,000. Does the gentleman say we will not appropriate any more money than \$24,000,000?

Mr. GOOD. I will not. Now I will ask the gentleman a question. If the Secretary of War should continue, in violation of this law, which I do not think he will—if he should continue to enlist men—

Mr. BLANTON. He has stopped that; but we have already got 240,000 men.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Secretary will not be in office 30 days longer.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Illinois will prevail upon the new Secretary of War after March 4 to turn some of these boys loose and let them go home—these boys who are now in the Army, who were enlisted through the misrepresentations of sleek-tongued recruiting sergeants—and let them go home, because they want to go home.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If he had as good judgment as the gentleman from Texas and myself, he would let a lot of them go.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I agree with much that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has said about the criticism of the Secretary of War. When my friend from

New York [Mr. SNELL] asked whether or not it has been the custom prior to this time to have an authorized strength and then to appropriate for a smaller Army, I must say that has been the custom, and it has also been the custom for the Secretary of War to cause a deficiency in this appropriation for every year back to 1900.

Now, my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] said the other afternoon that we could not prosecute the Secretary of War. He shows in that statement a wonderful and rare restraint. He would not prosecute the Secretary for recruiting the Army above 175,000, because he knew that it was not a violation of the law. He knows that as to the pay of the Army the Secretary of War can create a deficiency. The gentleman has shown the same restraint on other occasions, because, as was shown by the gentleman from Montana to-day, there has been a deficiency under this item nearly every year for the last 20 years. From 1900 to 1913, a period of 13 years, there were 18 deficiency bills carrying deficiency appropriations under this item of "Pay of the Army." I do not think the gentleman criticized Secretary Root, and yet during his term as Secretary of War there was a deficiency for pay of the Army every year; and as to Secretary of War Taft, I know that the gentleman showed the same rare restraint and did not prosecute, or offer to prosecute, Secretary of War Taft; and I know when Mr. Dickinson was made Secretary there was a deficiency, and an estimate was sent to Congress and the money was voted with absolutely no criticism.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What was the size of that deficiency as compared with this?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In 1900 it was \$14,900,000, and \$14,900,000 was some money at that time.

Mr. GOOD. That was about the time when we were having considerable trouble along the Mexican border, was it not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. It was after the Spanish-American War, when the conditions were similar to those which exist after this recent war.

Mr. GOOD. I understood the gentleman to say it was in 1914.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. According to the ideas of the gentleman from Iowa, there must have been trouble along the Mexican border from 1900 up to 1914, if that is the explanation of the deficiencies.

Mr. GOOD. I understood the gentleman to say in 1914.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. Under Secretary of War Taft and Secretary of War Root, and under every man who has occupied the position of Secretary of War deficiencies have been incurred under pay of the Army, and Congress has appropriated the money without criticism; but only now, when Secretary of War Baker incurs a deficiency, have we heard criticisms.

Mr. GOOD. The criticisms are mostly from the gentleman's side of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No. The criticism has come mostly from the gentleman's side, and the gentleman's leader, Mr. MONDELL, with rare restraint, said he would not prosecute the Secretary of War.

Mr. MADDEN. He is a very modest man.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, we are appropriating in the Army bill just passed for only 150,000 men, and yet on the motion to recommit, which showed we are only making an appropriation for 150,000, the Members on the majority side voted against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I said that Gen. Lord had said that he would need only \$24,000,000. I think perhaps I have misstated the case somewhat, and I want to correct my statement. In a letter written to the chairman of the committee on January 18, Gen. Lord said:

I have had a most careful study made of this matter and am convinced that if the strength of the Army be so restricted from the date indicated, namely, February 1, 1921, the amount required to meet the deficiency in "Pay of the Army" will not exceed \$25,000,000.

And so the committee felt there was some leeway there, and so we put \$24,000,000 in the bill, assuming that perhaps that would be sufficient.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

It is rather interesting and entertaining to listen to the efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the



gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to defend the Secretary of War, who has the reputation in the State from which he hails as being the leading pacifist in our country. So far as I am concerned, and so far as the people at large are concerned, there is absolutely no excuse for such a deficiency as he has produced in the War Department in the face of the circumstances. Trying to shift the burden from one place to another does not make any difference, and the people are not interested whether you place it on this side or the other side.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I can not now. The deficiency was created in the face of conditions under the like of which no Secretary of War ever created a deficiency before. That was a simple mandate from this body, which from the standpoint of creating the size of the Army is both the legislating and the appropriating power. That mandate simply limited the size of the Army under the possibility of an emergency. I think gentlemen on that side of the House find themselves in a rather embarrassing position. The facts are that Mr. Baker wants to bring into disrepute the whole Military Establishment. He does not want an Army of even 100,000 men, because he is a confessed and rank and open pacifist. We all know what he wants; and in order to satisfy a little pique and to bring disfavor on the whole Army he takes advantage of a technicality—if it is a technicality. The biggest reason he can possibly have is a lawyer's technicality and not a layman's reason.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. The gentleman brings a rather serious charge against the Secretary of War.

Mr. BEGG. I think he deserves it.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman know that in the recommendations he has made up here and in the action taken in making these enlistments he has acted in accord and in cooperation with the Chief of Staff and all the Army officers, who certainly are not anxious to bring the Army into disrepute?

Mr. BEGG. It does not make any difference to me, and I question the statement of the gentleman. I do not question the gentleman's veracity, but I question the accuracy of his statement when he says Secretary Baker is acting in accord with all the Army officers. Now, the gentleman knows that every military man would have an army of 500,000 or 1,000,000 men if he could get them; but the gentleman also knows that the American people in peace times do not want an Army of 175,000 or 200,000 men; and what is more, we are not going to have it. And I think, so far as I am personally concerned, there can not be too harsh criticism laid at the door of the Secretary of War. I for one absolutely hold him responsible for the condition. I voted last spring for the bill creating the Army, and every other man in the House who voted for it did so with the distinct understanding that there was a possible elasticity in the law, put there to meet an emergency, that elasticity amounting to 100,000 men, and it was fully understood that no Secretary of War would take advantage of that technicality. I grant the technicality; but you gentlemen who are eminent lawyers know that the intent of the lawmakers has much to do in determining the meaning of the law before the courts, and nobody could stand up and defend Mr. Baker in putting his interpretation on the law.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I suppose a little contribution to the ideas on this subject will not do anybody any harm.

I think the funniest combination I have ever heard of is Secretary Baker and Gen. March, Chief of Staff. One has no use for an Army of fighting men, but wants to educate all the poor people in the world and make every illiterate a scientist and every farmer boy a mechanic. The other has no use for literacy, but wants everybody to be a fighter; and between the two, like Jack Spratt and his wife, they have licked the platter clean. [Laughter.]

I have no criticism of Secretary Baker for increasing the enlisted force of the Army, though I think he possibly deserves some censure for paying no attention to the evident wish of Congress; but I think the fault largely is on the part of Congress itself. [Applause.] I am going to chide my side of the House, even if I am applauded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] alone. [Laughter.] Our side of the House having just charged that Secretary Baker was in effect violating the will of Congress, if not the law of Congress, by enlisting a force exceeding 175,000 men, which we had appropriated for, we turn right around and appropriate for an Army of 150,000 and refuse to limit it to that. And if the new Secretary

of War should get under the influence of the Army clique during his first year of administration, that side of the House will criticize him. I do not know whether the Army clique will get the new Secretary during the first three months or the first year. They will get him if he stays in office for four years, because that is human nature. [Laughter.] If he keeps up an enlisted force above 150,000 men, the Democratic side of the House will be abusing him next year, just as this side of the House are now abusing Secretary Baker, when both Secretaries in the main are under the direction of the Chief of Staff. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION OF THE ARMY AND ITS SUPPLIES.

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$1,932,000.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The other day when we were passing the Army bill and we had under consideration the item for transporting troops I noted that we appropriated \$33,800,000 for that purpose. I do not know how much we appropriated last year for transportation of troops, but under this item we have a deficiency appropriation of \$1,932,000.

On last Saturday I put into the Record the cost of the removal of troops from Camp Funston to Camp Pike and Camp Meade on December 1, the freight and passenger expense of which was over \$600,000. These troops had been taken to Camp Funston within a year. Thousands of dollars had been expended at Camp Funston for their comfort and convenience, and a few months afterwards they were taken to other camps at an expense of \$600,000 to the taxpayers.

I am advised that at Camp Meade, to which most of them were taken, they are now uncomfortable and soon we will have requests for additional quarters to house them. It does seem that some action should be taken to limit the amount of money that the War Department can spend for the transportation of troops. They send troops from one end of the world to another, keep them a few months, and then bring them back again. There is no end to the amount that they can expend. It does seem to me that there should be legislation limiting the amount of money to be expended for the transportation of troops, so as to stop this unreasonable expense of the people's money?

Mr. MADDEN. What line would the gentleman draw as to how much money could be expended for that purpose?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I would say that the men should not be transferred until they had remained at a particular station two or three years.

Mr. MADDEN. But suppose an emergency should arise after they had been there one day, what would the gentleman do?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. There was no emergency that arose for taking the troops away from Camp Funston, and there is no emergency now anywhere for sending men to Siberia, then to the Philippine Islands, and then to Hawaii, all within a year.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would not a provision be sufficient, in the gentleman's opinion, providing that no troops should be taken away from Camp Funston? [Laughter.]

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. No; but I hate to see hundreds of thousands of dollars spent for no other purpose than to place the troops in southern camps.

Mr. BLANTON. There are two ways of stopping it: One is to limit the appropriation, and the other is to limit the places to which they may come and go. We are trying to cut off two places—Camp Funston and Camp Dodge.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. But you are not trying to cut off Camp Meade and Camp Pike.

Mr. BEGG. Can this be controlled in any other way than by a proper action taken by the War Department? And will not that be done after the 4th of next March?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not know, but it seems to me that there ought to be a limit on the amount that the War Department can expend for that purpose in the time of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the word "the" in line 24, page 16. Should not that be "this"?

Mr. GOOD. It should, and I offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the word "the," line 24, page 16, will be changed to "this."

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PANAMA CANAL.

For civil government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, including the same objects specified under this head in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$24,670.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This bill provides for a deficiency appropriation of more than \$24,000 for the expense of the operation of the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal is one of the greatest financial liabilities possessed by the United States. It is a liability to the extent of anywhere from \$13,000,000 to \$20,000,000 a year. That is, if you count the interest on the investment, the cost of construction, and expense of operation. The Panama Canal cost approximately \$460,000,000. At 3 per cent that is between \$13,000,000 and \$14,000,000 annually.

According to the daily report of the Treasurer of the United States as of June 30, 1920, it shows the loss incurred in the operation of the Panama Canal for the current year as \$6,000,000. The loss in operation for the previous year was \$5,000,000. That added to the investment would make the operating expenses and overhead charges of the Panama Canal something like \$20,000,000 a year.

In reading the report of the Secretary of the Treasury I found on one of the pages a paragraph which gave a different expense account. It stated that the loss incurred in the operation of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year of 1920 was \$455,000, making a difference between the statement as it appeared in the report and the report as issued by the Treasurer of the United States approximately \$5,000,000. I wrote and asked the Secretary why this difference existed, and the reply which I received was not very enlightening. It appears that each year there are book accounts which do not appear in the daily operating expenses. Now, this is what I want to impress on the Congress: The Panama Canal, no matter whether the deficiency is \$13,000,000 a year or \$20,000,000 a year, is being operated by us at a tremendous financial loss.

There may be some military advantage in our owning the Panama Canal, and to what extent that offsets the financial liability I am not able to state, but it seems to me that the tolls on the Panama Canal should be increased. This afternoon we have been talking about our deficiencies. The tolls on the vessels which go through the Panama Canal should be increased so as to make it self-sustaining. We built that canal, and yet other nations use it more than we use it ourselves. Thirty-two per cent of the tolls which went through the canal last year were from the United States and 38 per cent from Great Britain. The other 30 per cent was paid by the other countries of the globe. The canal is advantageous to the people of the whole world as well as to the United States, but we have to pay the price of operation. The tolls on all vessels that go through the Panama Canal should be increased so as to bring us a revenue of \$25,000,000 a year instead of something like six or seven million dollars a year.

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

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman in that connection care to give us his opinion as to whether American coastwise vessels should be permitted to pass through the canal free of toll?

Mr. DUNBAR. If we have a treaty with Great Britain which we entered into, that treaty should be observed, and our vessels should be made to pay toll in accordance with that treaty, but in any event the toll should be increased so as to make the canal self-sustaining.

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

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this item does not involve tolls. It has nothing to do with the expense of the canal.

Mr. DUNBAR. I am aware of that, but it is an appropriation for the canal.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object, but I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman, I am aware that this item of \$24,000 has nothing to do with the tolls on the Panama Canal, but I deem it appropriate inasmuch as the chairman of our committee and other members of the committee have this afternoon been discussing the revenues of our Government. Here is an opportunity where they may be increased to the extent that these deficiencies may be reduced and the taxes on other items reduced.

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

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is there any other source of revenue at all except through the tolls?

Mr. DUNBAR. The item as it appears in the daily report of the Treasury is for tolls, and "so forth." I do not know what the "so forth" means, but the only item that is considered as of sufficient importance to mention is the item of tolls.

Mr. FESS. We have several towns of some significance in the Canal Zone and a railroad. Is there any other source of revenue besides the toll?

Mr. DUNBAR. I do not know.

Mr. FESS. Another question I wanted to ask the gentleman, and I am asking for information purely, is this: Is there any other outlay except for the operation of the canal?

Mr. DUNBAR. The outlay mentioned in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury last year stated over \$3,000,000 was spent for fortifications.

Mr. FESS. What about the cost of schools and other items that usually go with municipalities? Is that an item of cost to the Government?

Mr. DUNBAR. If the cost of the schools is a liability on account of the Panama Canal, then the vessels that use the Panama Canal should also pay that liability.

Mr. FESS. Is that a cost on the Government of the United States?

Mr. DUNBAR. It is a cost on the Government.

Mr. FESS. I agree with the gentleman that there ought to be some way by which the canal must be made nearer self-supporting.

Mr. DUNBAR. My only object in bringing this before the committee to-day is in order that the Ways and Means Committee may take cognizance of the fact that the Panama Canal, used by the whole world, is being paid for by the people of the United States, and I submit that it should not be so and that the tolls should be raised in order that the operation may be made self-sustaining.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to pay from the appropriation "Pay, miscellaneous," for the fiscal year 1919, the sum of \$57.96 to the Virginia Pilot Publishing Co. and \$65.06 to the Ledger Dispatch Corporation, both of Norfolk, Va., for their services in advertising for laborers during the week commencing December 15, 1918.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. These are two small items that seem to have gone over since 1918. What authority of law is there for them?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to these two small advertising bills is this: They have the authority of law to advertise. They must advertise for purchases, but they must first get the direct order from the head of the department. They inserted these advertisements and subsequently got the order. Therefore, not having had the order to insert the advertisements before they were inserted, the auditor held up the claim.

Mr. BLANTON. These two items are not anything like the Chicago newspaper items that the gentleman provided for immediately after the return from that city?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; the item the gentleman refers to was inserted in the bill over a year ago with respect to the Chicago newspapers.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand; but I refer to the visit that the gentleman made there, when he was so royally entertained.

Mr. GOOD. Oh, no; the gentleman is entirely mistaken about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1, of Title I, of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, and for other purposes, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. BRANDEGEE, and Mr. WALSH of Montana as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) to extend the authority of the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge over the North Branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Dorancton, county of Luzerne, Pa.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded in pursuance of the Constitution to reconsider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 440) entitled "Joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States except in the case of those men who have already served one or more enlistments therein," returned to the House of Representatives by the President of the United States with his objections, and sent by the House of Representatives to the Senate with the message of the President returning the joint resolution;

*Resolved*, That the joint resolution do pass, two-thirds of the Senate agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State of Florida, with a view of satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 441):

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. FRED L. BLACKMON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

*Resolved*, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed by the House of Representatives to take order for the superintending of the funeral of Mr. BLACKMON at Anniston, Ala.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

#### DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval training station, Great Lakes: Maintenance of naval training station: For labor and material, and so forth, including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$62,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in line 4, page 23, I move that the sum of \$62,000 be increased to \$100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 4, strike out the figures "\$62,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$100,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that on a deficiency bill only such amounts as are real deficiencies are in order, and that the gentleman's amendment is out of order, because there is no such deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not entertain that, because the Chair is not yet advised, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, my friend is entirely in error in this instance, and I desire to explain to the committee just why I am making this motion. When Capt. Williams, of the Bureau of Navigation, was before the Committee on Appropriations he was questioned about the cost of coal and the necessity for a deficiency appropriation at Great Lakes. The original estimate for the Great Lakes was \$198,000. It was prepared by the commandant of the Great Lakes training station and submitted through the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy Department. The Secretary of the Navy in his desire for economy arbitrarily reduced that amount to \$100,000, and that was the way the deficiency estimate reached the Committee on Appropriations. In questioning Capt. Williams about the coal contract and the price of coal at the Great Lakes it was suggested that coal was cheaper now than it was last year, which is very true. The captain did not understand the contract conditions of purchase of coal at the Great Lakes, and before the committee got through with him they figured out that they could reduce this appropriation by \$38,000, based on the estimated reduced price of coal. It is purely problematical.

Some gentleman on the committee was a coal man and suggested that coal really was cheaper now, which is true, but it develops after the reduction was made by the Committee on Appropriations that a contract existed for the purchase of coal at Great Lakes which permits the contractor to deliver up to but not exceeding 75,000 tons and the date of the expiration of that contract is April 1. All of the coal necessary at Great Lakes for a number of months subsequent to April 1 will soon be in their bins and, of course, will have to be paid for, so that the Committee on Appropriations was in error in making the \$38,000 reduction. Let me suggest to the committee that if the Great Lakes station is expected to operate under a deficiency appropriation of \$62,000, the fire-fighting force at that place—and we have got there \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 worth of buildings of temporary wooden construction—that the civilian fire-

fighting force at Great Lakes will have to be discharged and a fire-fighting force made up of enlisted personnel substituted. We will have to detail enlisted personnel to the boiler rooms doing fireman's duty. We have 10 or 12 heating plants at that station. Gentlemen will recall that that station was developed in the course of the war and to meet the necessity for men in the Navy and merchant marine, which had become apparent. We had some 52,000 boys at Great Lakes at one time. It was one of the greatest naval stations the world has ever known. The result is that with its mushroom growth it developed a number of heating plant units, some 16 of them. Now we can not possibly take care of the station unless we have a proper civilian personnel. In other words, if, through lack of funds, we have to discharge them, we may have to take boys out of the training schools and put them in the engine room, put them on the garbage plant, the crematories, the filtration plant, and that is not what the enlisted personnel is expected to do, and no Member of Congress desires to have them do that character of work which takes them out of school. We have two of the most important schools in the Navy established at Great Lakes. We have the greatest ground aviation school there, which now accommodates probably 5,200 boys undergoing training which requires some seven or nine months. We have an excellent radio school there. Now, no one will contend for a moment in the interest of economy that those boys should do ordinary civilian labor, and yet if this appropriation goes through at \$62,000 that is exactly what will have to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

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

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think that is a pretty good training for the young fellows, after all?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is not the kind of training they go into the Navy for.

Mr. BLANTON. We fellows who live in Washington and maintain residences have to fire furnaces, attend to the garbage can, and attend to the ashes every morning. It is pretty good training, after all.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will not agree with the gentleman that it is good training.

Let me suggest that in the estimate prepared by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts for \$198,000 for this station as a deficiency estimate, \$25,000 was intended to care for the repair of barracks. Those temporary buildings will last from 15 to 20 years if given reasonable care. If they are allowed to go into decay they will not last five years. I maintain it is economy at an institution of that kind to properly protect those temporary structures. After all, they are only temporary, because in the course of 15 or 20 years, as I have said, we will have to renew them. Twenty-five thousand dollars for garbage disposal is desired in this estimate and \$3,000 for instruction at radio school—and these reliable estimates are made up by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—\$88,000 because of the increased cost of coal over last year, \$15,000 for steam-pipe covering—and that is an important item; any man who owns a building knows that that saves fuel—\$4,000 for the fire fighting and for the filtration plant, \$20,000 for the repair of roofs, and \$15,000 is scattered over miscellaneous expenditures, making a total of about \$198,000.

Now, the Secretary of the Navy cut that amount in two arbitrarily, saying that they might get along with \$100,000. As I suggested to the commandant, maybe they can get along with \$100,000 by proper economy and by having a company of the boys at the station doing certain maintenance work on the premises. During the war, when we had 50,000 boys up there, there were several companies known as construction troops. They repaired pipes and did steam fitting, electric wiring, carpentry work, plumbing, road work, and all kinds of construction work. That was a good thing, and I suggested to Capt. Wurtsbaugh that he do that very thing now, only on a smaller basis, in order to meet the wishes of Congress for economy. And that is going to be done. But, gentlemen, Great Lakes can not live the balance of this fiscal year on \$62,000 if the original request for \$198,000 was at all consistent. And it simply means this, that they will have to discharge all of their civilian personnel, and take boys out of school, out of the radio schools and out of the aviation and other schools, and put them at doing civilian work, handling garbage, coal, and making repairs on roads and on buildings. Take a youngster away from mechanical work and set him at carpentry or repair work that he is not qualified to do is not economy. It interferes with his instruction. That is not what he is there for.

I hope the chairman will allow this appropriation to be raised to at least \$100,000, which I am certain is economical and will be used to good advantage.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague, Mr. CHINDBLOM, is greatly interested in the Great Lakes station and would have offered this amendment if he were here to-day. He is at home suffering with a bad case of la grippe. He received this night letter from Great Lakes, which I would like to read for the information it contains:

GREAT LAKES, ILL., February 7, 1921.

HON. CARL R. CHINDBLOM,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Under existing coal contract, station is required to obtain its supply of coal from contractor up to 75,000 tons, unless contractor fails to make deliveries. Present prospects are that contractor will deliver all coal required. If he does, this coal for the year will cost \$75,400 more than last year. Increase over last year is due, first, to largely increased population of station; and second, to poorer quality of coal; and third, to increased price over last fiscal year. Other items which have increased cost of maintenance of station this year are garbage removal, for which the cost per ton is greater than under existing contract, and the quantities are greater, due to doubled population; the cost of maintaining the regimental barracks, such as the cleaning gear in galleys and barracks; the increased cost of equipment for instruction purposes for the greater number of men under instruction. All these are chargeable to maintenance, Naval Training Station, and will raise the cost of this maintenance to at least \$100,000 more than the appropriation. In addition to these increased demands, the Bureau of Yards and Docks expresses opinion that that bureau should not pay for electric current purchased from public-service corporation used in lighting the station and furnishing power, even although that bureau originally approved the requisition for this current under the appropriation "Maintenance, yards and docks." Should it be decided that the appropriation for maintaining the training station should pay for electric current, an additional deficiency appropriation of \$60,000 is imperatively needed, and unless provided the commandant sees O. K. to retain any part of the civilian force attached to the station for the balance of the fiscal year; that is, those paid from appropriation for maintaining the station, which includes power plant and fire-fighting forces, a large part of clerical force, and other employees who have been on the station for many years and whose retention is considered essential to effect operation. Commandant must take action very soon in dismissing civilians unless deficiency appropriations, amounting to \$160,000, are made available quickly. Otherwise, balance available for maintaining the station would not be sufficient to purchase coal and other necessities.

GREAT LAKES.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am not so much interested in the gentleman's suggestion about the boys not being sent there for the purpose of firing boilers, and I can not really catch his viewpoint as to that any more than I can catch the viewpoint of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], although the gentleman from Texas called attention to the fact that he had to fire his furnace and carry out his garbage can. That is an interesting thing, and I hope that Mr. Berryman, the well-known cartoonist, will not read the RECORD, because I imagine I can see him getting up one of his celebrated cartoons showing the gentleman from Texas in his long-tailed English walking coat, which he so often wears, carrying a garbage can down the alley. And I am afraid it will bring Congress into a more mirthful attitude before the Nation than it is now.

Here is what I want to go to seriously: I have given some study to the question of fuel saving. I think there is a point that the gentleman might have made, and that is this, that the economical operation of the boilers and the fuel plants out there at Great Lakes can not be carried on by the general run of boys brought into that training school. It is economy to have men who know something about handling those fuel plants. We all know that our former colleague, Dr. Foster, gave a great deal of attention to this question, and it was at his instance that we established a Government fuel yard here in Washington, which was built, and which has saved a great deal of money.

I think it would be the part of wisdom to extend the powers of the Government fuel yard here in Washington, under the direction of the Bureau of Mines, so that they could not only purchase for the departments here in Washington, but that every fuel plant of the Government throughout the Nation, Army posts, and naval stations, and everything else, would be required to submit their requisitions to this fuel yard here, and that the purchases would be made here, and that they should have further authority so that they be given some control over the question of the kinds of fuel plants put in. The erection of most of the fuel plants in the public buildings throughout this country is done not from the standpoint of the economical fuel which is available for that particular plant, but in accordance with some architect's whim, or something else, and by consulting these experts and having their advice on plans and the planning for the fuel plant of any public building, they could then recommend a type of plant suitable for the particular building, and they could recommend the arrangement of the fuel most accessible to the supply, so that you could save millions of dollars throughout the country. Not only that,

but if they were given the purchasing power, you would stop the scandal of coal and fuel being bought for an eastern Army post from some western coal mine, and the purchase of coal for a western Army post at some eastern coal mine, and all that sort of thing. I think we ought to take these fuel plans and treat them as something that requires expert knowledge, and by making proper appropriations for men who do know something about it you could save millions of dollars on your fuel each year.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct not only as to the character and size of coal, but the Scientific American last week came out with a very clever article in which it was shown that 96 or 98 per cent of all the coal burned in the United States goes up the chimney.

Mr. WINGO. Yes; if you take the average apartment house in the city of Washington—and I make that remark from a knowledge of the apartment house that I live in—and the proprietor knew how, he could cut his fuel bill in two. But in his misdirected desire to save money he is making his fuel bill twice what it ought to be, whereas if he would only go over to the Bureau of Mines he would ascertain what kind of coal he should buy and what kind of coal he should use in that equipment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this item for the Great Lakes Naval Training Station was gone into by the committee, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois, very carefully. The committee did not want to cast any reflection on the Committee on Naval Affairs which reported out the bill last year. They reported what was supposed to cover the entire situation. After that the price of coal went up, and it went up about a dollar a ton. We found that the price of coal, after the estimate had been made for \$100,000, had gone down, and by taking the reduction in the price of coal that has been made and applying that over the balance, we found that they could probably get along, as we thought, with \$62,000. That is the reason why we have recommended that sum in the item.

Now, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] that since the committee reported out the bill I have received a letter from the Navy Department that would indicate that they have purchased a part of the coal for the remainder of the year at a higher price. I do not know whether we have cut the amount too much or not. They say they can not possibly get along with less than \$88,700. I would not object to an amendment to that extent, but I do not think we ought to appropriate into a deficiency bill maintenance items that were not estimated for by the Secretary of the Navy.

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

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am sure that the chairman desires to be very fair in the premises. Let me suggest that when the appropriation bill was framed last year by the Committee on Naval Affairs we arbitrarily cut the amounts for Great Lakes Training Station and every other training station with a view to securing economy.

Mr. GOOD. We know that last year you had an addition of \$75,000. The Secretary asked for only \$500,000, and you got an appropriation of \$575,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. I have here a statement from the commandant of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, in which he said that coal would cost \$75,400 more this year than last year. Now, the contract under which the coal was furnished does not terminate or die until April 1 this year. They have had all their coal purchased for this year.

Mr. GOOD. They say, notwithstanding that, that they will not need more than \$88,700 for coal.

Mr. BRITTEN. In all fairness to the station, inasmuch as the gentleman realizes that he can not be positive in the premises, I submit that the amount should be increased. The gentleman himself suggested that he would not object to an amendment bringing the amount up to \$88,700.

Why not increase the amount about \$14,000, and let the item go in at \$100,000, just as the Navy Department originally requested? That is the substance of my amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Because that permits them to do something that the Navy Department did not intend they should. If the naval bill goes through as reported, they will have to dismantle some of this plant. We should proceed with great care, therefore, with improvements.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; we are going to dismantle a great portion of the plant, and none of these repairs will, of course, apply to that portion of the property that is to be either returned or salvaged.

Mr. GOOD. I do not believe the gentleman's amendment ought to prevail with regard to the \$100,000, but I think it is quite possible and, indeed, probable that they will need the \$88,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRITTEN. I desire to offer an amendment increasing the amount to \$88,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: Page 23, line 4, strike out "\$62,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$88,700."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 31, noes 1.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.: For improvements to central power plant and distributing system, \$23,600.

Mr. BLANTON. I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman what is the use of continuing appropriations for this Mare Island Navy Yard, Calif., if the special select committee that we lately sent out there have determined in their report to do away with that navy yard, that is such a distance from the bright lights of San Francisco that the officers who have to stay there have quite a lot of trouble in getting to San Francisco?

Mr. GOOD. We allowed only a very small part of the estimate, and that was for the improvement of the heating plant, which must be made right away.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows what is in the wind with regard to this yard?

Mr. GOOD. Oh, yes; but that is not involved in this at all.

Mr. BLANTON. In regard to building a navy yard a little closer to San Francisco, for the special benefit of those officers out there.

Mr. GOOD. That matter will come up on another bill, but this is just to make some needed repairs.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is preparing to meet that issue, is he?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; when we reach it.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. HICKS. I want to say that probably the gentleman will not be in Congress when Mare Island is given up as a construction yard. The report to which the gentleman has referred does not contemplate that Mare Island shall be given up in the near future as a great construction and repair yard.

Mr. BLANTON. But what about that new base that they are preparing?

Mr. HICKS. That is a naval base, an operating base, entirely distinct and separate in its conception from a great construction yard.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to tell the gentleman that I will be in Congress when that item comes up, and I am going to be on the side of the people in fighting it.

Mr. HICKS. Which side is that?

Mr. BLANTON. That is against the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. On the naval side.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: The limitation specified in the Naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921 on expenditures for pay of chemists and for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year 1921, under "Maintenance, Supplies and Accounts," is increased by \$750,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph, that this change of the limitation is unauthorized by law and is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. GOOD. The item is not subject to a point of order. Last year's bill fixed a limitation of \$3,500,000 that could be used for a given purpose out of the appropriation. Without that limitation they could have expended the total appropriation for that purpose. What we have done here is not to increase the appropriation, but simply to increase the limitation. Now, when that item was up for consideration before, instead of putting on a limitation of \$3,500,000 we could have placed a limitation of \$4,250,000 and it would not have been subject to a point of order. It has been found that it will be necessary to spend more money for this purpose during the next year, and

this simply increases the amount fixed in the limitation of the current appropriation that can be used for a certain purpose.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman remembers the fight we had over this item, and he remembers that at the beginning, when this was offered as an amendment to increase this, the Chair sustained the point of order against the whole item, and the limitation was put in after the point of order had been sustained. That is my recollection of it. The gentleman remembers the fight that was made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and it was held up for two or three days. Clearly this is not a deficiency, and I make the point of order that it is not a deficiency.

Mr. GOOD. It seems that where Congress has put on a limitation that to increase the limitation is admissible because it is purely a limitation.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Iowa is in error. The facts are that the item deals with current law and the limitation is in the current law. There is no permanent legislation on the question. The point is that in making the current appropriation bill the House put on a limitation for this purpose, that the general sum appropriated should not for this specific purpose exceed three and a half million dollars. So far as this item is concerned and so far as this bill is concerned, it makes no difference whether it is permanent law or current law. There is an "existing law" which this changes. It being a change of law, then, it can only be in order because it is a limitation or a reduction. It is neither, but, as a matter of fact, removes to a certain extent a limitation, and increases instead of decreases. The point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not contended that this item is authorized by statute law, but at best only by current law as carried in the appropriation bill of 1921. In that bill, in that provision which generally applies to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, there is a proviso which runs as follows:

*Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, shall not exceed \$3,500,000.

That is the proviso which this particular item undertakes to amend. It is clear to the Chair that if there is any law at all on the subject, it is current law, and that the intention of this paragraph is to change the existing law.

The Chair is familiar with the rulings holding that items carried in an appropriation bill create law at least for the year in which the appropriation is carried. It seems to the Chair that is an attempt to change the current law, or at least to extend the limitation provided in the current law. It seems to the Chair that if this item in the bill was in order it would be idle to put any limitation on an appropriation bill in current law. The Chair feels compelled to sustain the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fuel and transportation: For coal and other fuel for steamers' and ships' use, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$20,000,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS: Page 24, after line 23, insert as a new paragraph:

"The Navy Department is authorized to pay to Mr. and Mrs. Clifton Cates, of 530 William Street, Key West, Fla., such sum as may be found to be due them by the Government for rent of rooms by Lieuts. Mayer and Myers during the months of April and May, 1918, there being no Government quarters available."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this paragraph although I realize that it is subject to the point of order, with the hope of getting some information. The facts are that in May, 1918, Lieuts. Mayer and Myers, of the Navy, were left at Key West when no Government quarters were available for them. Rooms were rented from Mr. and Mrs. Cates by a Government official of the Navy Department, and these two lieutenants took possession of the rooms. The total amount claimed by Mr. and Mrs. Cates, as I understand it, is \$63. They have been trying to get this amount ever since 1918, and while the Navy Department acknowledges that the claim is meritorious, they state that this amount can not be paid without some law, the comptroller having ruled that it can not be paid. I have left the amount open, because the Navy Department may not agree that

\$63 is the proper amount, simply with the hope of trying to collect it.

Only yesterday we passed an act appropriating several hundred million dollars in behalf of the railroads of the country, and I voted for the measure, and it does seem to me that some plan should be devised for paying these small claims of private citizens similar to the one included in my motion.

Mr. GOOD. I would say to the gentleman that we had some hearings on the matter, but inasmuch as the amount asked for was indefinite, and as the gentleman's amendment is indefinite, and inasmuch as it is legislation, we did not feel that we ought to enter that realm. If the amount were fixed and the gentleman knew it to be fixed at \$63, I would not object to the amendment.

Mr. SEARS. Then, I will ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by inserting the amount, \$63.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment. This is a claim, and it ought to go to the Committee on Claims.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to sincerely thank the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the steering committee, for keeping this lady out of what she is justly entitled to and—

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Then I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. [After a pause.] I withdraw it, because even though the gentleman from Illinois wants to be mean, I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs of barracks, Marine Corps: Repairs and improvements to barracks, etc., including the same objects specified under this head in the naval appropriation act for the fiscal year 1921, \$150,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HICKS for Mr. BUTLER: Page 25, line 25, after the figures "1921," insert: "and including not to exceed \$850 for painting the gymnasium at Quantico, Va."

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering the amendment is this: In passing let me say that I doubt very much if it is subject to the point of order, for it is for maintenance, but the gentleman has reserved it, and I want to address myself to the amendment. At Quantico, Va., as the members of the committee know, we have a great training camp for marines. There is a gymnasium there, and the foundations were constructed entirely by the enlisted men. They contributed their time and labor during their times of recreation. The cement was supplied them by the department, and they have furnished that gymnasium from canteen and entertainment funds, and included in its equipment is a fine organ which cost the men several thousand dollars. They now want to paint the building. Many of these men are painters by trade; that is one of the things we are teaching them in the vocational training school. They are willing to give their time, from their recreation and rest, in order that the gymnasium may be painted, but they do ask that the paint shall be supplied by the Government. That is all they are asking. They are willing to give their labor and time and paint the gymnasium, and in view of their energy and thrift, always so manifest in the Marine Corps, I feel this amendment should carry. It is a Government building, and if the Government will supply them with the material which will cost \$850, they will do the rest.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. So I sincerely hope the gentleman from Arkansas will not make a point of order against this item.

Mr. WINGO. This is not for painting the Government barracks down there; this is for painting the gymnasium.

Mr. HICKS. This is for the gymnasium which the men use for their own pleasure, and for which they have contributed their money and time.

Mr. WINGO. Is it to be painted inside or out?

Mr. HICKS. It is to be painted on the outside I know. I am not sure whether it is to be painted on the inside also.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I suggest to the gentleman this building was completed out of funds taken out of the Marine Corps canteen? They had no proper gymnasium, no recreation place; they

had no organ down there. Marines always care for themselves. It does not make any difference where you see a marine company or detachment, they care for themselves in every direction. This building is constructed of partly new lumber, never having been painted, and should be painted. They need paint, and are willing to apply it themselves.

Mr. WINGO. What size building is it?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not know; it may be 180 or 190 feet long.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a work that is most deserving of your cordial support where men will do this of their own volition, and I believe the gentleman from Arkansas sees the value of this when it can be done at such a nominal expense to the Government.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest this is purely a maintenance amendment. The building has never been painted. It ought to be painted and ought to be maintained, the same as the other buildings down there are maintained and painted. The Marine Corps personnel will paint the building—

Mr. WINGO. I will make this trade with the gentleman, that if he will stop talking I will withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman also be in favor of the amendment?

Mr. WINGO. I will withdraw my reservation of the point of order if the gentleman will stop talking.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of the Interior, public buildings.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I now renew my point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty gentlemen are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

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

Ackerman	Emerson	Kitchin	Reavis
Anthony	Evans, Nev.	Kiecicka	Reed, N. Y.
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Lampert	Reed, W. Va.
Ayres	Ferris	Langley	Rhodes
Babka	Fisher	Lankford	Riordan
Bacharach	Focht	Layton	Robinson, N. C.
Baer	Fordney	Lee, Ga.	Rodenberg
Bankhead	Frear	Leshner	Rouse
Barkley	Freeman	Linthicum	Rowan
Bell	Fuller	Loneragan	Rowe
Benson	Gallagher	McAndrews	Rucker
Bland, Ind.	Gallivan	McArthur	Sanders, Ind.
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	McCulloch	Sanders, La.
Boles	Gard	McDuffie	Sanders, N. Y.
Bowers	Garrett	McGlennon	Sanford
Bowling	Glynn	McKiniry	Scott
Brinson	Godwin, N. C.	McKinley	Scully
Brooks, Ill.	Goldfogle	McLane	Sells
Browne	Goodall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sherwood
Brumbaugh	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Shreve
Buchanan	Goodykoontz	Major	Siegel
Burke	Gould	Mann, Ill.	Sims
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Mann, S. C.	Small
Caldwell	Griffin	Mapes	Smith, Idaho
Candler	Hamilton	Martin	Smith, Ill.
Cannon	Harrell	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Cantrill	Harrison	Mays	Smith, N. Y.
Carew	Hawley	Mead	Stagall
Casey	Hays	Minahan, N. J.	Stedman
Chindblom	Hersey	Montague	Steele
Christopherson	Hersman	Moon	Stevenson
Clark, Fla.	Hill	Mooney	Stinnes
Clark, Mo.	Hooey	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Classon	Holland	Morin	Taylor, Tenn.
Coady	Houghton	Mudd	Taylor, Tenn.
Cole	Howard	Neely	Upshaw
Cooper	Huddlestone	Nelson, Mo.	Vare
Copley	Hull, Iowa	Nelson, Wis.	Venable
Costello	Humphreys	Nicholls	Vestal
Crago	Igoe	Nolan	Vinson
Currie, Mich.	Jacoway	O'Connell	Voigt
Dale	James, Mich.	Oldfield	Volk
Davey	Johnson, Ky.	Oliver	Walters
Dempsey	Johnson, Miss.	Olney	Weaver
Dent	Johnson, S. Dak.	Padgett	Welby
Dewalt	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Whaley
Dickinson, Iowa	Johnston, N. Y.	Parker	White, Me.
Dickinson, Mo.	Jones, Pa.	Patterson	Wilson, Ill.
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Peters	Wilson, La.
Donovan	Kahn	Porter	Wise
Dooling	Kearns	Pou	Wright
Doremus	Keller	Radcliffe	Yates
Doughton	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, Ala.	Young, N. Dak.
Dupré	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, John W.	Young, Tex.
Echols	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Zihlman
Elliott	Kettner	Randall, Calif.	
Ellsworth	Kincheloe	Rayburn	
Elston			

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 15962, the

general deficiency bill, finding itself without a quorum, he had caused the roll to be called, and that 199 Members, a quorum, had answered to their names, and that he presented therewith a list of the absentees for insertion in the Journal and Record.

## DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For inland transportation by railroad routes, \$35,650,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. 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. STEENERSON: Line 7, page 31, strike out "\$35,650,000" and insert "\$34,850,000."

Mr. STEENERSON. I understand this is satisfactory?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, there was included in this item about \$800,000 for airplane service, that they expected to expend. You have simply stricken out that amount?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is all.

Mr. GOOD. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

## UNITED STATES HOUSING CORPORATION.

Salaries: For officers, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia necessary to collect and account for the receipts from the sale of properties of the United States Housing Corporation, the Bureau of Industrial Housing and Transportation, property commandeered by the United States through the Department of Labor, and to collect the amounts advanced to transportation facilities and others, \$35,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$5,000 per annum and only one person may be employed at that rate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The last two paragraphs, I note, are under the head of salaries, and that work seems to be limited to the collection and accounting for receipts from the sale of property. What is the necessity for so much expense in collecting the amount due?

Mr. GOOD. They are selling all the property, and my understanding is that their total expense for the collection here in Washington, in running the entire establishment, is less than four-fifths of 1 per cent of the amount collected. They are selling all this property, as I said, but they have not sold it all. There is some property in Syracuse and some property in California they are about to sell, and they are getting the houses well disposed of. It has been a tremendous task, as the gentleman can understand, when they are selling this property to persons for homes, and it has meant thousands of individual sales.

Mr. WINGO. Does that include deferred payments, or are they cash sales?

Mr. GOOD. That includes the actual collection, as I understand.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman did not catch the question. The sales are made in some instances on deferred payments?

Mr. GOOD. I think practically all of the property is sold on deferred payments. Most of it is sold under contract.

Mr. WINGO. And the provisions carried in these two separate items are to cover that accounting and the office force that is incident thereto. It is not a question of litigation at all.

Mr. GOOD. Not at all, except one of these items is to provide for the funds where there is a foreclosure or something of that kind.

Mr. WINGO. There was no particular piece of litigation that you had in mind? It is the current expense of the office force that is looking after the sales that are to be made?

Mr. GOOD. That is correct.

Mr. PARRISH. Does the gentleman know whether they pay any commission in connection with the sale of these houses?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; there have been some commissions paid.

Mr. PARRISH. Does this appropriation cover that item or not?

Mr. GOOD. No; this does not. It is simply for the collection of the money. Wherever there is a commission charge, my understanding is it is paid out of the receipts. They have authority to pay it that way. But I understand their commissions have been very modest.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Washington, District of Columbia, Government hotel for Government workers: For maintenance, operation, and management of the hotel and restaurant therein, including personal services, \$45,000: *Provided*, That

no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$5,000 per annum, and only one person may be employed at that rate.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is this item for the group of buildings down here on the Plaza?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And the maintenance, operation, and management of that hotel and restaurant is costing us \$5,000 a year in addition to what they get out of it?

Mr. GOOD. No. The estimate is that there will be something of a surplus. The total cost of running the hotel is about \$1,000,000 a year, and the income is a little over that. This amount here was made necessary because of the application of the minimum wage law in the District of Columbia, which added \$75,000 to their expenses over and above what was estimated.

Mr. WINGO. Possibly my inquiry was predicated upon lack of information of the legislative regulations. As I recall, we simply make the appropriation, but make it payable out of the receipts?

Mr. GOOD. No. The receipts are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and we make a direct appropriation for the expense. So we have a record of the receipts.

Mr. WINGO. So in the current law you appropriate the money that was estimated would cover the expenses?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The item of deficiency is because of the increase under the minimum wage law?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; the minimum wage law.

Mr. WINGO. And the receipts that are coming in and that are covered into the Treasury are going to cover all the expenses, even including this?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and producing a surplus.

Mr. WINGO. Is it the intention to continue this hotel and restaurant indefinitely, or is it intended soon to dispense with them?

Mr. GOOD. I think it is the plan as soon as possible to wreck those buildings. They ought to be wrecked in the near future. Just how long it will be necessary to continue the hotel I can not state.

Mr. WINGO. I can not recall whether the sundry civil bill carried an appropriation for this fiscal year or not. Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. GOOD. An appropriation is carried next year for that service. It is thought that some time next year there will be some disposition made of the whole subject.

Mr. WINGO. To what particular class of employees does that apply?

Mr. GOOD. Practically all of the employees are under the law. Their compensation is fixed by a compensation commission. The waitresses and help of that kind have their salaries fixed.

Mr. WINGO. If the increase costs \$45,000, the natural inquiry arises in my mind whether they must not have a big lot of cooks and chambermaids down there to take care of those young ladies.

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they have a great many.

Mr. WINGO. I understand they have 1,800 people there, and the increase, which was a very small percentage after all, would make a \$45,000 increase, just for chambermaids and cooks for 1,800 ladies?

Mr. GOOD. My recollection is that about 500 persons are employed.

Mr. WINGO. I say 1,800 guests, and it takes 400 or 500 chambermaids and cooks?

Mr. GOOD. About 1,800 guests are provided with accommodations, and about 500 waitresses and clerks and employees of all kinds are employed.

Mr. WINGO. With that number, I presume, there is no complaint about the treatment they are getting now?

Mr. GOOD. I understand not.

Mr. WINGO. They should be satisfied.

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

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Chairman, during the war we had an elaborate housing commission, which had charge of these Government houses. I would like to know if the same housing commission has charge of this Government property?

Mr. GOOD. No. It is under the Secretary of Labor now. The Housing Bureau is now a bureau of the Department of Labor.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Does the gentleman know how long it is intended to maintain these buildings?

Mr. GOOD. No; I will say to the gentleman that I do not know. That will depend somewhat on future legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$105,500: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations heretofore made and available for expenditure by the United States Housing Corporation shall be expended for the purposes for which appropriations are made herein.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15962) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### COLD STORAGE BILL (S. DOC. NO. 377).

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, presented for printing under the rule the conference report and accompanying statement on the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is ordered printed under the rule.

Mr. WALSH. What is it?

The SPEAKER. The conference report on the cold storage bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo] reserved all points of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes. That is not necessary.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, according to previous order, until to-morrow, Thursday, February 10, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

407. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting supplemental report in connection with claims arising under the provisions of section 9 of "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," on account of road construction in various States; to the Committee on Roads.

408. A letter from the Farm Loan Commissioner, transmitting report by the Federal Farm Loan Board (H. Doc. No. 998); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3737) to carry out the provisions of an act approved July 1, 1902, known as the act entitled "An act to accept, ratify, and confirm a proposed agreement submitted by the Kansas or Kaw Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes," and to provide for a settlement to Addie May Auld and Archie William Auld, who were enrolled as members of the said tribe after the lands and moneys of said tribe had been divided, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1308), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3125) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus machine tools and other equipment to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No.

1309), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15831) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell a portion of the Federal building site in the city of Duquoin, Ill., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1310), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4924) to retrocede to the State of Virginia exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States of America over the property and persons of the town site or territory known as United States Housing Corporation project 150A, located in Norfolk County, State of Virginia, and called Craddock, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1311), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16043) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1312), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 16060) to amend the interstate commerce act by adding thereto a new section, No. 20b, and to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, by adding a new paragraph to section 10 thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 16061) authorizing the bestowal upon the unknown, unidentified British soldier buried in Westminster Abbey and the unknown French soldier buried in the Arc de Triomphe of the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 16062) to create a cause of action for compensation in damages for injuries sustained and death resulting from injuries to any person through the wrongful act or omission by an agent, officer, or employee of the United States Government, and to provide the procedure therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 16063) authorizing the readjustment of certain star route and powerboat mail contracts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 16064) directing the Mississippi River Commission to make an examination and survey of the Atchafalaya, Red, and Black Rivers and to report plan for protection of their basins from flood waters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 16065) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16066) to authorize the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, to grant permits for certain installations in public grounds under his control in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16067) for the erection of a vault building for the use of the Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OGDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 677) directing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to furnish the House of Representatives certain information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, in connection with the sale of supplies by the War Department; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 16068) granting a pension to Florence Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 16069) granting an increase of pension to Alice D. Knight; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 16070) granting a pension to Maurice Roach; to the Committee on Pensions.



## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5615. By Mr. CALDWELL: Petition of representatives of the pearl button workers of the Eastern States, New York, favoring a high tariff on pearl buttons and pearl novelties and on cut blanks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5616. Also, petition of Henry L. Doherty & Co., of New York, favoring the passage of the Nolan bill; to the Committee on Patents.

5617. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Mrs. Theodore Benoist, Myrtle Wheeler, Maureen King, John A. Mueller and others, C. Schmitz and others, G. S. Wiehms, Luke E. Hart, Julia Ginder, W. E. Lindsey, Mrs. J. H. Boyes, Mrs. Alice McWash, Josephine Behler, Loretto Degzhardt, Beatrice Brown, J. Robson, and William F. Hendrix, all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5618. Also, petition of the Mothers' Club, Frank A. Aug, and others, all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; also petition of J. A. Meyer, of St. Louis, Mo., in favor of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5619. Also, petition of Mrs. L. E. Thorn, L. A. Peabody, Oliver J. Voelpel, Clara A. Duerr, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Biermann, Mrs. Helen Risse, Alice P. Moskop, Jennie J. Kuehl, R. J. Pietz, Sadie C. Pounds, Walter N. Gindra, H. Floerchinger, Christina Peters, John E. Massengale, D. M. Haskin, Clara Belle Haskin, Mrs. Charles S. Gerber, Mrs. J. A. Life, Mr. and Mrs. F. R. Thorn, Mrs. Mae F. Meyer, Henry Ries, Mrs. Edward Orr, Ernst Lewitz, Mrs. E. Lewitz, Sabine Coleman, Laura R. Moskop, Magdalene M. Willis, Mrs. Jennie B. Bartlow, A. C. Cecelia Schoknecht, James B. Farrell, Emma Oeterbeck, Miss E. Loch, and Lucy M. Hayes, protesting against Capper-Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

5620. Also, petition of Mrs. Cornelia E. Hildebrand, Lillian Schultz, Matthew Voney, Norma B. Voney, Lillian Voney, O. J. Fickeissen, Dorothy Koetzli, Sadie M. Sankup, and Nat. L. McGuire, all of St. Louis, protesting against the Capper-Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

5621. Also, petition of Mrs. L. Finger and E. M. Finger, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 160; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5622. By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of certain citizens of New York City, opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5623. By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of the New Century Club of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 14469; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5624. Also, petition of Donald T. Shenton Post, No. 130, the American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., urging Congress to pass legislation affecting former service men; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5625. By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the reduction in the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5626. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of John H. Barlow, chairman conference of All Friends, Philadelphia, Pa., regarding world disarmament and economic reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5627. Also, petition of residents of Sauk County, Wis., favoring beer and light wines and protesting against the Sunday blue law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5628. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Commissioner W. A. L. Bazeley, department of conservation, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging favorable action on appropriation of \$300,000 in deficiency bill to complete gypsy-moth work in cooperation with the States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5629. Also, petition of Commissioner Arthur W. Gilbert, department of agriculture, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging restoration of an appropriation of \$214,000 for white-pine blister rust work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5630. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Rev. M. D. Collins and others, of the fourteenth congressional district of Missouri, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5631. By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5632. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Chilton, Wis., protesting against the so-called Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5633. By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Connecticut Council of Catholic Women, protesting against the Smith-Towner bill because it is un-American, unconstitutional, and economically and politically unsound; to the Committee on Education.

5634. By Mr. MANN of Illinois: Petition of certain citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring an amendment to the Volstead law and protesting against the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5635. By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the faculty and student body of St. Mary's Theological Seminary, of West Norwalk, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5636. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Cuyahoga County Council, the American Legion, Cleveland, Ohio, representing 31 American Legion posts, urging the immediate passage of S. 4613 and H. R. 14961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5637. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of members of St. Augustine's parish, Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5638. Also, petition of the Ladies' Aid Society of St. Paul's Cathedral, Mrs. Joseph Kunkel, president, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5639. Also, petition of Rev. Philip Knupfer, O. M. Cap, and others, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5640. Also, petition of the Holy Spirit Greek Catholic Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., Dr. Thoe M. Vasochik, rector, protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5641. Also, petition of members of the Physical Education Club of the University of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging passage of Fess-Capper bill; to the Committee on Education.

5642. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the White Motor Co., of New York, asking the passage of bills to stimulate foreign trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5643. By Mr. OGDEN: Petition of the Louisville Real Estate Board, Louisville, Ky., opposing the passage of the Ralston-Nolan bill, H. R. 12397, also H. R. 14157; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5644. Also, petition of certain citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French colonial troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5645. By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of the Outlook Club, of Orange, Mass., protesting against commercializing our national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5646. Also, petition of Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, No. 292, of Fitchburg, Mass.; Charles T. McMurray, Fitchburg, Mass.; Edmond Chapdelain, president of the Association of Catholic Men and Women, West Warren, Mass.; and James H. Nellie L., and Mary A. Sheehan, of Fitchburg, Mass., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5647. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Clinton, Mass., indorsing the Smith-Towner and Shepard-Towner bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5648. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of Renville County, N. Dak., asking for the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid for farmers to enable them to plant crops in the spring of 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5649. Also, petition of citizens of western North Dakota, favoring the passage of H. R. 15453, guaranteeing a price of \$2.28 for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5650. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the National Council of Catholic Women, Pittsburgh, Pa.; E. F. Quinn, of Beaver Falls, Pa.; F. A. Stewart, New Brighton, Pa.; Jos. H. Reiman, supreme president, Knights of St. George in the State of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa.; and the Charleroi Council, Knights of Columbus, No. 956, of Charleroi, Pa., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5651. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of the Board of Charities of the District of Columbia, favoring a home for the care of the feeble-minded; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5652. Also, petition of the American Chamber of Commerce, Manila, P. I., for amendment to revenue act, 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.