

4052. Also, petition of Bernus A. Soli and 42 other residents of Bentley, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4053. Also, petition of Hon. R. W. Patten and 32 other citizens of Plaza and Parshall, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4054. Also, petition of Ed Fossaa and 30 other residents of White Earth and Powers Lake, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4055. Also, petition of O. B. Barfuss and four other residents of Cooperstown, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4056. Also, petition of P. J. Hutton and 36 other residents of Reeder, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4057. Also, petition of Hon. W. J. Maddock and 21 other residents of Plaza, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4058. Also, petition of Hon. P. F. Doyle and 22 other residents of Charlson and Sanish, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4059. Also, petition of Jack Henrick and 12 other residents of South Heart, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4060. Also, petition of Clarence Anderson and 13 other residents of Veblen, S. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4061. Also, petition of Nils G. Dahl and 16 other residents of Watford City and Cherry, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4062. Also, petition of J. M. Carr and six other residents of Carrington, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4063. Also, petition of Joseph A. Tupa and two other residents of Regent, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4064. Also, petition of Don Birdsall and 29 other residents of Berthold, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4065. Also, petition of North Dakota Farm Bureau Federation, urging that an appropriation of \$15,000 be made for the investigation of the manufacture of flax straw into paper and pulp; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4066. Also, petition of William M. Martin, county auditor, Bottineau, N. Dak., on behalf of the county commissioners of Bottineau County, favoring the passage of a bill to provide aid in the purchase of seed this spring by needy farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4067. Also, petition of A. N. Winge and 30 other residents of Van Hook, N. Dak., urging the revival of the United States Grain Corporation and a stabilized price for farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4068. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of the historical societies of the American Historical Association for the erection of a modern historical building in the city of Washington; to the Committee on the Library.

4069. By Mr. SWING: Petition of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Imperial Valley, Calif., supporting the adjusted compensation bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4070. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of members of Mispah Council, No. 361, and Friendship Council, No. 201, Junior Order United American Mechanics of Washington, Pa., in support of House bill 9458; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4071. Also, petition of Albert L. Pierce, rural delivery route No. 3, Washington, Pa., in support of House bill 8086; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4072. By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of the Pan-Albanian Federation of America, for recognition of the present Government of Albania, dated January, 1922; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1922.

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

Our Father, we thank Thee that though all secrets are known unto Thee and our ways are scrutinized we can come to Thee, notwithstanding our failures, and ask from Thee a continuance of Thy mercy, assured that Thy goodness shall never fail us. Help us to fulfill our tasks, to do Thy will, and to prove acceptable before Thee. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, February 13, 1922, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## ACCOUNTS OF THE EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION (S. DOC. NO. 105).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury calling attention of Congress to the necessity for legislation to provide for an audit of the accounts of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation by the General Accounting Office, and suggesting an amendment to the act approved July 1, 1918, for this purpose, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2373) to authorize association of producers of agricultural products.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1268. An act for the relief of the Six-Minute Ferry Co., of Vallejo, Calif.;

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of M. Fine & Sons;

H. R. 1370. An act for the relief of Col. Herbert Deakyne, Corps of Engineers, United States Army;

H. R. 1372. An act for the relief of the M. Feitel House Wrecking Co.;

H. R. 1721. An act to authorize the refund of a part of the purchase price of Camp Mills to the Buffalo Housewrecking & Salvage Co.;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of W. R. Grace & Co.;

H. R. 2144. An act for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Charlotte W. Miller*;

H. R. 2373. An act to authorize association of producers of agricultural products;

H. R. 3249. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Bureau of Lighthouses;

H. R. 5597. An act granting an increase of pension to N. May Jernegan;

H. R. 6437. An act for the relief of the Cleveland Trinidad Paving Co., of Cleveland, Ohio;

H. R. 6622. An act for the relief of Gaetano Davide Olivari fu Fortunato;

H. R. 8217. An act to authorize the payment of \$872.96 to the Government of Italy for the relief of the heirs and assigns of N. Ferro;

H. R. 9724. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9931. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River.

## VIEWS OF JUDICIARY ON LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on yesterday I called the attention of the Senate to a speech of Mr. Justice Clarke, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in regard to the cancellation of our foreign war debts when Members of the Senate and the House had delayed discussing those questions on account of the Limitation of Armament Conference being in session. In my address I also expressed regret that the Republican Party had nominated Mr. Hughes for President while a member of the Supreme Court. Since then it has been called to my attention that Mr. Justice Clarke made a speech in New York in which he discussed other matters with which Congress has to deal, including prohibition. I have also been informed that Chief Justice Taft has recently made some speeches which have

been different from those made by any other Chief Justice, but I do not recall them.

We all know the efforts of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] in directing attention of the country to the baseball contract which Federal Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis made, and how that has lessened the respect for the judiciary. I think the Senator from South Carolina has rendered a splendid service in this and many other important matters. All such things will injure the judiciary of our country.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Has the Chief Justice or the associate justice expressed an opinion upon the Muscle Shoals project?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am a great admirer of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. My colleague and I differ with reference to him. I voted for his confirmation and my colleague voted against it. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has the respect and confidence of the people of my section. While President he appointed an ex-Confederate soldier, Justice White, of Louisiana, Chief Justice at a time when it took a brave and generous man to do it, and our people will never forget him for that. There was at a time when there was a Federal soldier on the bench whom he might have promoted to that high office. He also appointed Joseph R. Lamar, one of the ablest lawyers of my State, a Democrat, to be a member of this highest court. Justice Lamar distinguished himself and our section by the splendid services rendered on the Supreme Court, but the hard work shortened his useful life.

I think William McKinley and William Howard Taft rendered the country a great service when, as Presidents of the United States, they tried to do away with sectionalism and reunite our people. I am a great admirer of the present Chief Justice, but the judiciary is going to be injured, and the people will not have the same high respect for it if the Chief Justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States make speeches in public not in their line of duty as has been done recently.

I have referred to the generous and broad-minded spirit shown ex-Confederate soldiers by the present Chief Justice and the late President McKinley, and I hope I may be pardoned for a personal reference. When I was made Director of the United States Census Bureau in 1913 one of the first things I discovered was that a number of the ex-Federal soldiers and widows of Federal soldiers employed in the bureau were not having the comforts that younger men and younger women were receiving.

One of the first acts of my administration was to see that they were given the best attention and every comfort. When I left that bureau all the ex-Federal soldiers and the widows of Federal soldiers came to me in a body and said that I had shown them more consideration than any director who had ever held the position, although I was the only southern man appointed to fill that office up to that time. While in that position it gave me pleasure to appoint ex-Confederate soldiers to many positions in the South. There is an agent in each county in the South to collect cotton statistics for the Census Bureau. I probably appointed more ex-Confederate soldiers to Federal positions in the South than any other person. My father was a Confederate soldier, served four years, and I am proud of his record, but he quit fighting when the war was over and there was no bitterness in him. In my humble way I have done what I could to bring about a complete understanding between our sections. During the Spanish-American and the World War there was never any complaint made about the sons of the Northern or Southern soldiers failing to do their duty—just as their fathers did in the Civil War no matter which side they fought on.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sisseton and Peever, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation reviving the Government Grain Corporation so as to stabilize prices of certain farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MOSES presented the memorial of Mrs. Daniel Connell and sundry other ladies of Somersworth, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed increase in the rates of duty on women's leather gloves in the pending tariff bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NEWBERRY presented petitions of the Woman's Literary Club, of Pontiac, and of sundry members of the American Association of University Women, of Birmingham, both in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation

creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I report back favorably with amendments from the Committee on the Judiciary the bill (H. R. 9103) for the appointment of additional district judges for certain courts of the United States, to provide for annual conferences of certain judges of United States courts, to authorize the designation, assignment, and appointment of judges outside their districts, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 497) thereon.

I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD as well as printed under the general order, so that Senators may acquaint themselves with the subject. It is a very important measure and I give notice that within a short time the bill will be called up for consideration.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I ask the Senator from Iowa if that is the bill known as the pork barrel judges bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not recognize the designation applied by the Senator from North Carolina, but I am sure he understands pretty well what the bill is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar, and without objection the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9103) for the appointment of additional district judges for certain courts of the United States, to provide for annual conferences of certain judges of United States courts, to authorize the designation, assignment, and appointment of judges outside their districts, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report it back to the Senate with an amendment, and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the following number of district judges for the United States district courts in the districts specified in addition to those now authorized by law:

"For the district of Massachusetts, two; for the eastern district of New York, one; for the southern district of New York, two; for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, one; for the western district of Pennsylvania, one; for the northern district of Texas, one; for the eastern district of Michigan, one; for the northern district of Ohio, one; for the northern district of Illinois, one; for the district of Minnesota, one; for the eastern district of Missouri, one; for the eastern district of Oklahoma, one; for the district of Montana, one; for the northern district of California, one; for the southern district of California, one; for the district of Arizona, one; and for the northern district of Georgia, one.

"Whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of any district judge appointed pursuant to this act the same shall not be filled unless the Congress shall so provide.

"Sec. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Chief Justice of the United States, or, in case of his disability, of one of the other justices of the Supreme Court, in order of their seniority, as soon as may be after the passage of this act, and annually thereafter, to summon to a conference on the last Monday in September at Washington, or at such other time and place in the United States as the Chief Justice, or, in case of his disability, any of said justices in order of their seniority, may designate, the senior circuit judge of each circuit. If any of said senior circuit judges is unable to attend, the Chief Justice, or, in case of his disability, any justice of the Supreme Court in the order of seniority, may nominate any other circuit or district judge belonging to the circuit whose senior circuit judge is unable to attend, that each circuit may adequately be represented at said conference.

"It shall be the duty of every such senior or other circuit or district judge to attend such conference, and to remain throughout its proceedings, and to advise as to the needs of his circuit and as to any matters in respect of which the administration of justice in the courts of the United States may be improved.

"It shall be the duty of the senior district judge of each district court of the United States to make, on or before the 1st day of August of each year, a report to the senior circuit judge as to the condition of the business in his district and a recommendation as to what additional judicial force, if any, is needed to dispose of the business of such district with reasonable dispatch. It shall not be sufficient for him merely to state in his report the cases as shown upon the docket of the court, but, after investigation, he shall express his best judgment as to the condition of business existing or likely to arise in his court during the ensuing year. The senior circuit judge, or, in his absence, a judge representing the circuit at the conference, shall present such reports to the conference, with a summary thereof, and his comments thereon.

"The Attorney General shall, upon request of the Chief Justice, report to said conference on matters relating to the business of the several courts of the United States, with particular reference to causes or proceedings in which the United States may be a party.

"The said conference shall be presided over by the Chief Justice of the United States, or in case of his disability, by any justice of the Supreme Court in the order of seniority.

"Said conference shall make a comprehensive survey of the conditions of business in the courts of the United States and prepare plans and schedules for the assignment and transfer of judges to or from circuits or districts where the state of the docket or the condition of business indicates the need therefor, and shall submit such suggestions to the various courts as may seem in the interest of uniformity and expedition of business.

"The Chief Justice and each justice or judge summoned to and attending said conference shall be allowed his actual expenses of travel and his necessary expenses for subsistence, not to exceed \$10 per day,

which payments shall be made by the marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States upon the written certificate of the Chief Justice.

“Sec. 3. That sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, as amended by the act of October 3, 1913 (chap. 18, 38 Stats., p. 203), of the Judicial Code, be amended to read as follows:

“Sec. 13. (1) A district judge for a district may be designated to act in another district or the same circuit (including territory attached thereto)—

“(a) In the place of a district judge who is physically or mentally unable for the time being to perform his duties or who is or who is to be necessarily absent from his district;

“(b) In aid of a district judge who on account of the accumulation and urgency of business is unable to perform speedily all the work of his district;

“(c) In aid of a district judge when the public interests so require.

“(2) Such designation shall be made by the senior circuit judge whenever he is satisfied that condition (a), (b), or (c) exists and that the designation can be carried out without such prejudice to the regular work of the designated judge as to make it inadvisable.

“Sec. 14. (1) A circuit judge may be designated to act as district judge in any district of his circuit or of attached territory in any case where a district judge might be so designated.

“(2) Such designation may be made by the senior circuit judge (who may designate himself) whenever he is satisfied that the occasion therefor exists and that the public interests so require.

“(3) This section shall apply to the circuit judges formerly comprising the Commerce Court.

“Sec. 15. (1) A district judge of a district (called herein the home district) may be designated to act in any district of another circuit or its attached territory (called herein the aided district) in place of or in aid of a judge thereof, in case—

“(a) The senior circuit judge of the aided district shall certify to the Chief Justice of the United States that the public interests require the designation of an additional judge or judges in such district and that it is impracticable to supply the need from among the judges of his circuit; and

“(b) The senior circuit judge of the circuit of the home district shall certify to the Chief Justice of the United States that neither the business of that district nor of other districts in that circuit will suffer by the proposed designation.

“(2) Such designation may be made by the Chief Justice if, in his judgment, the public interests so require.

“(3) For the purposes of this section the District of Columbia is to be deemed one of the districts which may be aided and likewise a circuit, the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia is to be deemed a district court to which designations may be made, the justices of the Court of Appeals as circuit judges, and the Chief Justice thereof as the senior.

“Sec. 16. (1) The designation provided for by sections 13, 14, and 15 shall be in writing, signed by the judge or justice designating, and shall specify the district aided, the judge designated, and the period of service.

“(2) It shall be filed in the clerk's office and entered in the minutes of the district court of the aided district; and when so filed and entered shall be conclusive evidence of all the facts necessary to support it.

“(3) A certified copy shall at once be furnished by the clerk to the judge designated; also to the judge of the aided district; also (if under section 15) to the senior circuit judge of each of the two circuits.

“Sec. 17. (1) During the period of service named the judge designated under sections 13, 14, or 15 shall have all the duties, powers, and rights of the judge of the aided district (excepting the power of appointment to a statutory position or of permanent designation of newspaper or depository of funds): *Provided, however,* That in case a trial has been entered upon before such period of service has expired and has not been concluded, the period of service shall be deemed to be extended until the trial has been concluded.

“(2) Any designated judge who has held court in another district than his own shall have power, notwithstanding his absence from such district and the expiration of the time limit in his designation, to decide all matters which have been submitted to him within such district, to decide motions for new trials, settle bills of exceptions, certify or authenticate narratives of testimony, or perform any other act required by law or the rules to be performed in order to prepare any case so tried by him for review in an appellate court; and his action thereon in writing filed with the clerk of the court where the trial or hearing was had shall be as valid as if such action had been taken by him within that district and within the period of his designation.

“(3) Whenever, pursuant to any law, more than one district judge is authorized to hold court in the same district, each may, separately, but at the same time, hold a district court and discharge the judicial duties of the district judge therein, but subject to section 23 hereof.

“Sec. 18. (1) Any power given by section 13, 14, or 15 to the senior circuit judge may be exercised by the Chief Justice or associate justice allotted to that circuit, or by the circuit judge who, on account of the illness or absence from the circuit of the senior, is acting as such.

“(2) In case of vacancy in the office of Chief Justice, or his disability from illness or absence, any power given to him by this section or section 15 may be exercised by the senior associate justice.”

“Sec. 4. That section 118 of the Judicial Code, as amended by the act approved February 25, 1919 (40 Stats. L., p. 1156), be, and the same hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

“Sec. 118. There shall be in the second, seventh, and eighth circuits, respectively, four circuit judges; in the fourth circuit three

circuit judges; and in each of the other circuits, three circuit judges, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All circuit judges shall receive a salary of \$8,500 a year each, payable monthly. Each circuit judge shall reside within his circuit and when appointed shall be a resident of the circuit for which he is appointed. The circuit judges in each circuit shall be judges of the circuit court of appeals in that circuit, and it shall be the duty of each circuit judge in each circuit to sit as one of the judges of the circuit court of appeals in that circuit from time to time according to law: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent any circuit judge holding district court or otherwise, as provided for and authorized in other sections of this act.”

Section 1 of the bill provides for the appointment of 19 additional judges of the district courts of the United States in 17 districts, as follows: Two judges in each of the districts of Massachusetts and the southern district of New York, and one judge in each of the following-named districts: Eastern New York, eastern Pennsylvania, western Pennsylvania, northern Texas, eastern Michigan, northern Ohio, northern Illinois, eastern Illinois, Minnesota, eastern Missouri, eastern Oklahoma, Montana, northern California, southern California, Arizona, and northern Georgia.

The committee feel that the appointment of so many additional district judges at this time can only be justified by the fact that an emergency exists in the business of the courts of the districts named. This emergency has largely been brought about by the increase of business on account of recent legislation of Congress, an accumulation of business occurring during the recent war, the intricate character of the litigation in certain districts, and the large size of some districts making it difficult for one judge to do the work to advantage. The committee also feel that much of this accumulation of business is of a more or less temporary character, and have therefore provided that whenever a vacancy occurs in the office of any district judge appointed, pursuant to this act the same shall not be filled unless the Congress shall so provide.

Section 2 provides for an annual conference of the senior circuit judges of all the circuits, to be held at Washington, and to be presided over by the Chief Justice of the United States. It is made the duty of the senior district judges of each district to report to the senior circuit judge of his circuit the condition of business in his district with his recommendations, and such reports shall be presented to the conference by such senior circuit judges together with their recommendations and comments thereon. The Attorney General is also, on request of the Chief Justice, to report to the conference on matters pertaining to the several courts of the United States with particular reference to causes or proceedings in which the United States may be a party. The object of the conference is to “make a comprehensive survey of the conditions of business in the courts of the United States and prepare plans and schedules for the assignment and transfer of judges to or from circuits or districts where the state of the docket or the condition of business indicates the need therefor,” and to “submit such suggestions to the various courts as may seem in the interest of uniformity and expedition of business.”

Section 3 amends sections 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of the Judicial Code, so as to provide more efficient machinery for the designation, assignment, and transfer of district judges from one district to another district in the same circuit, from a district in one circuit to a district in another circuit, and the designation of a circuit judge to act as a district judge within his own circuit, and to arrange the provisions in a more logical order.

The amendment to section 13 covers the subject of assigning district judges within their home circuit, and includes everything on that subject found in House bill 9103, and in sections 15, 16, and 17 of the Judicial Code.

Section 14 of the Judicial Code as amended covers the subject of appointing circuit judges to hold the district court.

Section 15, as amended, covers the subject of assigning district judges to service outside of their home circuit. It includes what is now found in section 18 of the Judicial Code and section 5 of House bill 9103; also, it brings into the same frame the treatment of the District of Columbia courts found in section 7 of House bill 9103.

Section 16, as amended, covers the manner of designation in all cases. It includes the provisions on that subject made by sections 3 and 4 of House bill 9103 as affected by the remaining sections of the Judicial Code.

Section 17, as amended, unites into one section everything that is found about the duty and power of the designated judge, in House bill 9103, and in sections 13 to 18 of the present Judicial Code. It adds only the power to decide certain matters after the judge has gone home, which is the present practice.

Section 18, as amended, unites into one section the power of other judges to designate in addition to the primary one.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 118 of the Judicial Code only to provide for three circuit judges in the fourth judicial circuit instead of two as now provided in said section. This is the only circuit that now has only two judges.

A table showing the state of the business in several districts is hereto attached.

Amend the title to read as follows: “An act for the appointment of additional district judges for certain courts of the United States, to provide for annual conferences of certain judges of United States courts, to amend certain sections of the Judicial Code relating to the designation, assignment, and appointment of judges outside their districts, and for the appointment of an additional circuit judge in the fourth circuit.”

BUSINESS PENDING IN ALL THE DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Statement showing business pending in United States district courts, year ending June 30, 1921, compiled from information furnished by the Attorney General.

	Number of judges.	Number of cases pending June 30, 1921.							Population, 1920.	
		United States civil.	Criminal, including prohibition.	Admiralty.	All other civil.	Total.	Bankruptcy.	Draft cases.		Prohibition cases.
FIRST CIRCUIT (5 DISTRICTS).										
Maine.....	1	22	244	92	233	591	152	8	50	768,014
Massachusetts.....	1	206	186	142	923	1,478	1,494	3,943	68	3,852,356
New Hampshire.....	1	14	45	3	58	120	136	.....	21	443,083
Rhode Island.....	1	39	202	25	93	433	160	18	95	604,397
Porto Rico.....	1	16	47	3	98	194	111	30	43	1,297,772
Total.....	5	297	733	265	1,405	3,670	1,993	3,900	277	6,965,622

Statement showing business pending in United States district courts, year ending June 30, 1921, etc.—Continued.

	Number of judges.	Number of cases pending June 30, 1921.							Population 1920.
		United States civil.	Criminal, including prohibition.	Admiralty.	All other civil.	Total.	Bankruptcy.	Draft cases.	
<b>SECOND CIRCUIT (6 DISTRICTS).</b>									
New York:									
Northern district.....	2	83	323	74	771	1,251	499		224
Eastern district.....	2	177	560	1,552	705	2,994	1,047	2,036	480
Southern district.....	4	2,890	1,893	3,230	2,413	10,426	2,740	7,004	2,015
Western district.....	1	135	475	32	213	855	638	5	231
Vermont.....	1	11	117	1	55	185	254	24	64
Connecticut.....	1	62	166	37	120	386	1,016	2	125
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3,358</b>	<b>12,605</b>	<b>4,926</b>	<b>4,278</b>	<b>16,096</b>	<b>6,194</b>	<b>9,071</b>	<b>3,139</b>
<b>THIRD CIRCUIT (5 DISTRICTS).</b>									
Pennsylvania:									
Eastern district.....	2	283	342	286	1,887	2,788	880	59	210
Middle district.....	1	25	41	1	292	359	459	1,096	13
Western district.....	2	137	450	178	1,684	2,449	1,859	3	324
New Jersey.....	3	331	1,989	178	562	2,060	914	10,593	429
Delaware.....	1	14	13	58	149	234	41		4
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>1,825</b>	<b>701</b>	<b>4,574</b>	<b>7,890</b>	<b>4,159</b>	<b>11,751</b>	<b>980</b>
<b>FOURTH CIRCUIT (9 DISTRICTS).</b>									
West Virginia:									
Northern district.....	1	25	97	2	120	244	283		25
Southern district.....	1	49	222	3	282	556	195	3	80
Virginia:									
Eastern district.....	1	90	239	271	151	751	423		45
Western district.....	1	38	458		70	566	249	2	108
Maryland.....	1	51	33	69	56	209	163		13
North Carolina:									
Eastern district.....	1	27	371	46	204	648	145		270
Western district.....	2	134	788		152	1,078	165	17	448
South Carolina:									
Eastern district.....	1	27	316	24	89	456	421	3	133
Western district.....	1	30	416		75	521	102	25	196
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>2,912</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>1,199</b>	<b>4,977</b>	<b>2,133</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1,318</b>
Texas:									
Northern district.....	2	140	557		523	1,220	464	28	185
Eastern district.....	1	54	141	19	156	370	492	1	45
Southern district.....	1	79	126	25	130	360	172	4	66
Western district.....	2	128	279		109	515	197	3	131
Louisiana:									
Eastern district.....	1	70	282	252	233	837	78	6	67
Western district.....	1	60	207		144	401	366	14	57
Mississippi:									
Northern district.....	1	3	131		52	186	323	2	
Southern district.....	1	18	215	4	155	392	481		79
Alabama:									
Northern district.....	2	30	451		168	649	3,556	292	205
Middle district.....	1	10	85		77	172	522		26
Southern district.....	1	20	169	30	32	241	138	5	85
Georgia:									
Northern district.....	1	559	1,900		130	2,589	809	447	113
Southern district.....	1	134	1,238	43	173	1,588	804	15	509
Florida:									
Northern district.....	1	4	147	26	32	209	192	1	22
Southern district.....	1	250	594	165	327	1,336	235	18	247
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1,559</b>	<b>6,511</b>	<b>564</b>	<b>2,441</b>	<b>11,075</b>	<b>8,829</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>1,837</b>
<b>SIXTH CIRCUIT (9 DISTRICTS).</b>									
Michigan:									
Eastern district.....	1	109	378	16	251	754	583	87	181
Western district.....	1	11	38		82	131	60	15	22
Ohio:									
Northern district.....	2	155	579	21	656	1,411	722	540	317
Southern district.....	2	67	71	1	309	448	497	6	18
Kentucky:									
Eastern district.....	1	96	433	1	323	853	332	4	208
Western district.....	1	151	115	3	261	530	558	2	56
Tennessee:									
Eastern district.....	1	44	257	2	57	360	115		69
Middle district.....	1	68	443		50	561	458		105
Western district.....	1	41	195		262	498	103	15	70
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>2,509</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>2,251</b>	<b>5,546</b>	<b>3,428</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>1,046</b>
Wisconsin:									
Eastern district.....	1	30	83	12	138	263	132		31
Western district.....	1	65	319	4	111	499	106	56	110
Illinois:									
Northern district.....	2	229	1,092	10	863	2,184	1,322	16	275
Eastern district.....	1	36	276		146	458	281		128
Southern district.....	1	109	539	1	163	812	658	28	344
Indiana.....	1	96	304		262	662	234	2	136
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>2,613</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1,683</b>	<b>4,888</b>	<b>2,733</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>1,024</b>
<b>EIGHTH CIRCUIT (17 DISTRICTS).</b>									
Minnesota.....	2	399	382	29	1,130	1,940	469	2	179
Iowa:									
Northern district.....	1	15	63	1	174	253	385	1	23
Southern district.....	1	155	163	2	190	510	272	73	23
Missouri:									
Eastern district.....	1	46	257	3	316	622	350		188
Western district.....	1	48	170		297	515	442	1	76

Statement showing business pending in United States district courts, year ending June 30, 1921, etc.—Continued.

	Number of judges.	Number of cases pending June 30, 1921.							Population, 1920.	
		United States civil.	Criminal, including prohibition.	Admiralty.	All other civil.	Total.	Bankruptcy.	Draft cases.		Prohibition cases.
<b>EIGHTH CIRCUIT (17 DISTRICTS)—Continued.</b>										
Arkansas:										
Eastern district.....	1	21	136		196	353	288		44	1,157,452
Western district.....	1	51	331		137	519	67	29	44	593,543
North Dakota.....	1	40	292		100	432	97	212	189	645,730
South Dakota.....	1	30	87		232	349	364	18	24	635,839
Nebraska.....	2	97	183		490	770	364	1	80	1,295,502
Kansas.....	1	52	88		296	436	280	29	3	1,709,257
Oklahoma:										
Eastern district.....	1	233	764		394	1,391	343	1	163	1,177,823
Western district.....	1	43	285		172	500	110	6	42	849,735
Wyoming.....	1	25	108		67	201	40	7	38	194,402
Colorado.....	1	48	107		158	313	203	2	25	939,376
New Mexico.....	1	24	67		54	145	74	9	48	390,237
Utah.....	1	39	101		90	230	165	157	17	449,446
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1,367</b>	<b>3,514</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>4,493</b>	<b>9,409</b>	<b>4,313</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>1,205</b>	<b>18,258,896</b>
<b>NINTH CIRCUIT (14 DISTRICTS).</b>										
Alaska:										
First division.....	1	3	68	8	151	230	5		1	55,035
Second division.....	1		5	3	38	46	1			
Third division.....	1	1	14	2	54	65	6	12		
Fourth division.....	1		13		91	104	11			
Hawaii.....	2	11	18	2	11	42	43		10	255,912
Montana.....	1	81	309		135	525	218	31	71	547,593
Idaho.....	1	20	103		324	447	270	6	15	431,825
Washington:										
Eastern district.....	1	23	30		51	104	99	1	6	437,034
Western district.....	2	121	265	57	270	713	255	4	75	919,282
Oregon.....	2	52	209	43	183	485	691	3	41	783,389
California:										
Northern district.....	2	147	811	755	2,413	4,126	1,156	288	415	1,746,408
Southern district.....	2	129	538	22	490	1,179	520	196	250	1,680,128
Nevada.....	1	17	39		118	174	151		4	77,407
Arizona.....	1	16	122		160	310	84	12	20	333,273
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>2,544</b>	<b>802</b>	<b>4,489</b>	<b>8,596</b>	<b>3,460</b>	<b>553</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>7,267,188</b>
Grand total (86 districts in United States).....	105	9,770	26,686	7,869	26,813	71,138	37,242	27,677	11,735	106,840,877
District of Columbia Supreme Court.....	6	75	2,732	5	3,544	6,622	46	8	266	487,571

Statement showing business pending in United States district courts, year ending June 30, 1921, of districts affected by H. R. 9103.

	Present judges.	Judges granted.	United States civil.	Criminal, including prohibition.	Admiralty.	All other civil.	Total.	Bankruptcy.	Draft.	Prohibition.
Massachusetts.....	1	2	206	186	142	923	1,457	1,434	3,943	68
New York:										
Eastern district.....	2	1	177	560	1,552	705	2,994	1,047	2,036	480
Southern district (P.).....	4	2	2,890	1,893	3,230	2,413	10,426	2,740	7,004	2,015
Pennsylvania:										
Eastern district.....	2	1	283	342	286	1,887	2,788	886	59	210
Western district.....	2	1	137	450	178	1,684	2,449	1,859	3	324
Texas, northern district.....	2	1	140	557		523	1,220	464	28	185
Florida:										
Southern district.....	1	1	250	594	165	327	1,336	235	18	247
Northern district.....	1		4	148	26	32	200	192	1	22
Michigan, eastern district (P.).....	1	1	109	378	16	251	754	583	87	181
Ohio, northern district.....	2	1	155	579	21	656	1,411	722	540	317
Tennessee, middle district.....		1	68	443		50	666	458		105
Illinois:										
Northern district.....	2	1	229	1,092	10	863	2,194	1,322	16	275
Eastern district.....	1	1	36	276		146	458	281		128
Minnesota (P.).....	2	1	399	382	29	1,130	1,940	460	2	179
Missouri:										
Eastern district.....	1	1	46	257	3	316	622	350		188
Western district.....	1	1	48	170		297	515	442	1	76
Oklahoma, eastern district.....	1	1	233	764		394	1,391	1,343	1	163
Montana (P.).....	1	1	81	309		135	525	218	31	71
California:										
Northern district (P.).....	2	1	147	811	755	2,413	3,126	1,156	288	415
Southern district.....	2	1	129	538	22	490	1,183	520	196	250
Arizona.....	1	1	16	122		160	298	84	12	20
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5,783</b>	<b>10,840</b>	<b>6,435</b>	<b>15,795</b>	<b>38,860</b>	<b>15,805</b>	<b>14,206</b>	<b>5,916</b>

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up the resolution (S. Res. 236) which I introduced on Monday last and which comes over under the rule.

Mr. CURTIS. In the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads [Mr. TOWNSEND] I ask that the resolution may go over without prejudice until his return.

Mr. SWANSON. The request of the Senator from Kansas is entirely proper. I think the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should be here when the resolution is disposed of, and I ask that it may go over without

prejudice and with the privilege of calling it up in the morning hour on any day after the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads shall have returned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will go to the Table Calendar.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 213) to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate so that all general appropriation bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 498) thereon.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 3154) for the relief of C. M. Reives; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3155) for the relief of L. S. Boyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON (for Mr. UNDERWOOD):

A bill (S. 3156) to change the terms of the district court for the northern division of the southern district of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 3157) for the relief of John G. Sessions; to the Committee on Claims.

## PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On February 13, 1922:

S. 2124. An act to relinquish, release, remise, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all the lands contained within sections 17 and 20, township 3 south, range 1 west, St. Stephens meridian, Alabama;

S. 2468. An act providing for the sale and disposal of public lands within the area heretofore surveyed as Tenderfoot Lake, State of Wisconsin; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution relative to payment of tuition for Indian children in Montana State public schools.

On February 14, 1922:

S. 2802. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920;

S. 2994. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakely Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala.," approved October 5, 1917; and

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution providing a site upon public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., for the erection of a statue of Dante.

## THE FOUR-POWER TREATY.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask that the Secretary may read it.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 237), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, all drafts or forms presented to or considered by the delegates of the United States, the British Empire, Japan, or France in considering the subject of the four-power treaty.

Also copies of all proceedings, records, negotiations, arguments, debates, discussions, and conversations which occurred between the delegates of the United States, the British Empire, Japan, or France, or any of them, covering the subject of the four-power treaty or the supplementary note which accompanied it or the supplementary agreement relating to it and subsequently signed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If there is no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, I should like to have it acted on at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations is not here to-day, but expects to be here to-morrow. I ask that the resolution may go over under the rule. I understand that nearly all the matter asked for has been printed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No, Mr. President. I had the impression, when the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations asked to have certain documents printed, that there would be printed a full report of the negotiations which occurred between the American delegates and the delegates of France, Great Britain, and Japan which led up to the four-power treaty, but after a very careful examination of the records printed reveals the fact that there is absolutely nothing which records the negotiations or the conversations or forms of discussion or debates which led up to the four-power treaty.

The large volume which was printed (S. Doc. 126, 67th Cong., 2d sess.) is divided practically in two parts. The first half of it relates to the details of the discussion of the disarmament treaty. The latter half of the volume relates almost exclusively to discussions of the Chinese question. There is almost nothing at all explanatory of the four-power treaty, which, as we all know, is the most debatable of all those presented.

I may say to the Senate that this is not without precedent. We have the very best possible precedent for asking for the information. Inasmuch as great interest attaches to the four-power treaty, it seems to me there ought not to be any opposition to laying before the Senate the full details of the discussions.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will say that this is all the more important because there was an open and notorious disagreement between the President of the United States and his chief representative upon the American delegation, the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, as to the meaning of the four-power treaty, and that disagreement led to some revelations at the time and finally to a supplementary note explanatory of the treaty itself.

I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that we are all familiar with the precedent to which he has alluded. I think the precedent also carried another element, namely, the reference of all such inquiries to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I will say further to the Senator that the Committee on Foreign Relations is to meet to-morrow morning, and in this connection I ask if he has any objection to having the resolution referred to that committee. I assure the Senator that when the committee meets to-morrow morning I shall very gladly join with him in asking for any proper documents which we have not yet received. I have not examined the bulky document which has been sent to us, and while I have no disposition to question the Senator's summary as to what it contains, it is altogether probable that the chairman of the committee, who will be here to-morrow, may be able to furnish any further information desired.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I see no need for referring this simple resolution asking for information to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can see the propriety of having it go over until to-morrow, when the chairman of the committee will be here. It may be that the whole matter can be adjusted on the floor. At least, in preference to having it referred to the committee, I would like to adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas that it lie on the table and go over until to-morrow.

Mr. MOSES. Under the rule it would have to do that in any event, unless it were referred to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over under the rule. The morning business is closed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 7077) to increase the force and salaries in the Patent Office, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

## RELIEF AGAINST DEPRESSION AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

Mr. KENYON. In accordance with the notice which I gave on yesterday, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2749) to prepare for future cyclical periods of depression and unemployment by systems of public works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill named by him. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like first to have the bill read, and I then wish to explain its object to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Whereas a sound economic policy requires that a larger percentage of the public works and projects of the United States be undertaken and prosecuted during a period of major industrial depression and unemployment, when labor and capital are not fully employed in private industry, that a smaller percentage of such works and projects should be undertaken and prosecuted during a period when private industry is active and competing for the same men and material with resulting business strain and overextension, and that the prosecution of such works and projects should be utilized as a stabilizing force during a period of overexpansion as well as during a period of depression. It is the purpose of this act to grant the authority necessary to carry out this policy: Therefore

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the head of each executive department is authorized to prepare and to periodically revise the necessary plans for all public works and projects within his jurisdiction concerning which a report has been requested by Congress or a committee thereof under the provisions of existing law, and to make the surveys and to prepare the engineering plans necessary for proposed public works and projects, in order that the work may be commenced immediately and properly prosecuted when an appropriation becomes available therefor.

Sec. 2. (a) That the Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and publish monthly reports as a supplement to the Current Survey of Business of the Bureau of the Census, or otherwise, concerning the trend of business conditions, the approach of periods of business strain and overextension, or of periods of business depression, in order that the Presi-

dent, the heads of the executive departments, the Congress, the governors of the respective States, the mayors of cities, and persons engaged in private industrial enterprises may properly prepare for and plan against such periods.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall transmit, with his recommendations, copies of such report to the President, the heads of departments, and to the Congress.

(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall utilize the available statistics collected or compiled by any department, bureau, office, or agency of the Federal Government or of a State, or by an industrial, banking, labor, or other association, and he is authorized to obtain such additional facts and statistics as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

Sec. 3. That the head of each executive department is authorized, upon the advice of the President, to postpone the date of the commencement or retard the prosecution of such portions of the public works and projects within his jurisdiction as may be necessary, in order to prepare for and to prevent a further rise in the cylindrical wave of industrial expansion and resulting business strain and overextension and, within the appropriations therefor, to enter upon a maximum program of public works and projects as a preparation for and in order to counteract an impending period of industrial depression and unemployment. Where a time limit has been specifically provided within which any such work or project, or any part thereof, is to be commenced or completed, this section shall not be construed to extend or remove such limit.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I think this is an important measure, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Fernald	Keyes	Phipps
Borah	Fletcher	McKinley	Poindexter
Brandegee	Gooding	McNary	Sheppard
Bursum	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Harris	Nelson	Sterling
Caraway	Harrison	New	Trammell
Culberson	Hitchcock	Newberry	Wadsworth
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie	Watson, Ga.
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Willis
Dial	Kellogg	Page	
Ernst	Kenyon	Pepper	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Assistant Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and the following Senators answered to their names when called:

Heflin	Lenroot	Simmons	Swanson
Kendrick	Norris	Smith	Warren
Ladd	Pomerene	Stanley	

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is absent on account of illness.

The following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Cameron	Glass	McCormick	Shortridge
Colt	King	Ransdell	Stanfield

Mr. RANSDALL. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. BROUSSARD] is detained from the Senate on official business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the following Senators are detained from the Senate in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Finance: The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, from the recommendations of the Unemployment Conference which was held at Washington some time ago has come this bill. I have been anxious that some concrete thing be passed by the Congress as a result of that conference, and for the purpose of helping the situation as to unemployment in the country.

I want to say now that I do not believe this bill will accomplish very much as to the present situation of unemployment, nor do I believe that it will be a panacea for that condition, or a solve-all for the future. I believe that it will merely be helpful.

This bill does not seek to assist the unemployment situation with charity or by any abnormal expenditures. It carries no appropriation, but simply proceeds on the theory that public works in the country should be stimulated during times of industrial depression and held back during times when there is great activity in all lines of business and great demands for labor and great demands for material. That is the theory of the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not exactly understand that. Suppose that one corporation in one line of business is very active in doing business and another is not. Does the Senator mean that the power is given to stop the business which is going on and is prosperous?

Mr. KENYON. Oh, no. What I mean is this: Here is a general market for labor. Private industry is after labor. Labor is being employed at good wages. In those times there is not much necessity for Government work from the labor standpoint; so under this bill the President could hold back certain parts of public work, and then concentrate that work at the time of industrial depression. It does not interfere, of course, with anybody's private business.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he does not think section 3 gives very broad arbitrary power to the President—who would act, perhaps, on the recommendation of the head of a department—to postpone work or operations in any one portion of the country and to carry it on in another, and to stop work in one part of the country and proceed with it somewhere else, and delay it as far as he might see fit, in order that, looking ahead, he might arrange conditions so that what he conceived to be for the public good might be accomplished?

The objection to this, to my mind, is that after Congress has authorized certain public works to be prosecuted, and has passed its judgment upon those public works, feeling that the necessity is there for the prosecution of that kind of work, it is proposed then to vest in the President, in a way, the power to nullify absolutely the acts of Congress, the expressed will of Congress, with reference to carrying on those works.

I suggest to the Senator that it seems to me that is a very broad power to put in the hands of the Executive, and the question in my mind is whether it is a safe thing and a wise thing to do. Of course, I do not question but that the present Executive would exercise great wisdom and splendid judgment in connection with that matter; but we know that the President has not the time to consider all these details and that he has to depend upon the heads of the different departments for their recommendations. The question in my mind is about the wisdom of vesting that extensive power practically in the heads of the different departments.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it is true that a good deal of power is lodged in the President under this bill; but I call the Senator's attention to the concluding paragraph of section 3:

Where a time limit has been specifically provided within which any such work or project, or any part thereof, is to be commenced or completed, this section shall not be construed to extend or remove such limit.

So that if Congress had provided a time limit the President could not do it.

I will say to the Senator that, as he knows, appropriations have been made for public buildings. They have been simply held up in view of the general financial situation of the country, and this very thing is going on now without any well-regulated plan, such as there would be under this bill. That is my answer to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I will ask the Senator from Iowa whether, under this bill, the heads of departments could not pile up against the Government a large deficiency bill, which the Congress would be legally bound to pay?

Mr. KENYON. No, I think not; because the works are merely to be planned and surveys and engineering plans made. That would cost something, of course; but I am advised that this work could be started without any appropriation, and none has been provided for here.

That simply stands in readiness to be used when Congress makes the appropriation. A bureau head could not stop anything and could not start anything. The heads of the executive departments would take up the matter with the President of the United States, and then he would determine whether a certain amount of this work could be retarded for a year or two.

Let me illustrate the matter in this way:

Suppose, under the reports which are provided under section 2, that the Secretary of Commerce is getting reports from the country—and I may say that we have no reports now that amount to anything, practically, as to the situation of unemployment—or suppose he sees that an industrial depression is to come. The President, under the appropriations made by Congress for certain lines of work, holds back this year 20 per cent, the next year he holds back 20 per cent, and the following year 20 per cent. Then suppose the depression starts. They have this reservoir of employment, 60 per cent more, to put right into that depression. That is the object of it.

The Federal Reserve Board is a reservoir for credit. This is a reservoir for labor to draw on. It will not be large; it will not accomplish a great deal, because the amount of labor engaged in public work is a very small percentage of the entire labor employed in all the work of the country. I will show what it is; but it is a little, perhaps, over 1 per cent.

Mr. President, the economic theory that I am trying to advance is the only proposition I have known to be before Congress at this session to do anything at all for labor, and I have hoped that we might give it some serious consideration. This bill was reported out of the committee unanimously. I think the committee felt that it would not accomplish a great deal, but that it would accomplish something, and that it was worth trying.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. PHIPPS. I do not recall having been polled on the matter of reporting out the bill, perhaps on account of absence during the holidays; but I have no recollection of any hearings having been conducted on this bill. I should like to ask the Senator what course was pursued in the committee in handling this measure?

Mr. KENYON. I am glad to inform the Senator, because I have had such difficulty in ever getting a quorum of the committee. I do not speak of it in criticism, but I think one of the most discouraging things about the American Congress, especially the Senate, is the fact that it is almost impossible to get quorums of committees. It has been almost impossible for the Committee on Education and Labor to get a quorum. I will say to the Senator that we had hearings on this bill and they have been printed. I think the Senator was in the West at the time.

Mr. PHIPPS. They must have been very short indeed. I was absent a very few days.

Mr. KENYON. There never has been a meeting of the committee without notice being sent to all the members, and I think the Senator from Colorado has been as diligent in attending the sessions of the committee as any of the members. Hearings were had, and the hearings are printed, and they were very interesting hearings.

Mr. PHIPPS. It just so happens that I have not had my attention called to the hearings, or to the action of the committee.

Mr. KENYON. I think at the time we voted on the bill the Senator was absent. I will state that this bill has been endorsed by the officers of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, by leading economists and professors, and by the American Federation of Labor, which is a very remarkable situation.

Mr. PHIPPS. Was any report ever submitted with the bill?

Mr. KENYON. No.

Mr. PHIPPS. No report was made?

Mr. KENYON. No report was made.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask his construction of subdivision (c), on page 3:

The Secretary of Commerce shall utilize the available statistics collected or compiled by any department, bureau, office, or agency of the Federal Government or of a State, or by an industrial, banking, labor, or other association, and he is authorized to obtain such additional facts and statistics as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

What is the Senator's construction of the language requiring the Secretary of Commerce to utilize statistics collected and compiled not only by any governmental agency but by any private agency?

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that the Secretary will get all the facts he can. The Bureau of Labor Statistics now, in gathering facts, have been compelled to go into reports of all kinds, private and others, the reports of the Bureau of Economic Research, and so forth; and that provision simply means that the Secretary is to utilize every available means of getting at the truth as to the labor situation.

The Senator will remember that in the conferences that took place the statement was made that there were over 5,000,000 men out of employment in this country. That was denied; it was disputed. A gentleman connected with the Government, who has made a great study of this matter, told me a couple of weeks ago that there were 7,000,000. There is absolutely no way, apparently, of getting authentic statistics now. This would enable the Secretary of Commerce to utilize every available fact he could get bearing on the question.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator think that should be mandatory?

Mr. KENYON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. LENROOT. Would the Senator object to the word "may" instead of "shall"?

Mr. KENYON. Not at all. I do not think it should be mandatory. I think it is for him to get all the information he can. I will be very glad to accept an amendment making that change.

In the report of the President's conference on unemployment, pages 96 and 97, this was stated:

When public works are done in greatest volume during periods of active industry the same men and material are being competed for by both public and private employers. The inevitable result is to raise the height of the crest of the wave of cyclical business inflation and to cause a greater crash when the heightened wave breaks, as it always does.

In a growing country like the United States the aggregate volume of public works of cities, counties, States, and of the Federal Government is so great that if a larger proportion were executed in years of depression than in years of active industry a powerful stabilizing influence would be exerted.

The leadership of the Federal Government in expanding its public works during periods of depression and contracting execution in periods of active industry requires no great change from existing procedure. Already the executing agency enjoys great latitude as to the period in which the period of intensive execution to synchronize with major periods of industrial depression.

Certain works of the Federal Government, such as reclamation, flood prevention, river and harbor work, roads, and public buildings, are peculiarly suited for consideration as large undertakings covering a long period and capable of elasticity of execution to synchronize with cycles of business depression.

A committee of the conference was empowered to make specific recommendations for utilizing a percentage of the ordinary necessary public works of the Federal, State, and city governments as a reserve against future periods of unemployment and industrial depression. This bill embodies the first steps recommended. It makes no provision for the present industrial depression and carries no appropriation. It seeks to adopt as a Federal policy the expansion and contraction of Federal public works to accord with the periods of fall or rise in private industry and employment.

In embarking upon a policy of long-time planning of public works and framing a program that will lighten public-work construction in years of prosperous private industry and concentrate it in depression years is the issue this bill brings up.

The measure of relief concentrating public work can bring is not large, but there is a great incentive to it as to States, counties, and municipalities.

I want to cite the interesting economic fact that in the whole history of the Government up to 1903 the periods of depression came practically every 10 years; they were almost unending. Since 1903 the periods of depression have come every five or eight years, but it is perfectly certain that there will be the lean years as well as the fat years.

In 1914 we had a serious depression. We had unemployment. The wages in 1913 of mining, manufacturing, railway, express, and miscellaneous hired labor were \$16,180,000,000. In the depression year of 1914 the wages paid for the same lines of industry were \$15,077,000,000, or a reduction of a little over a billion. If we had had a measure of this kind on the statute books, with that depression approaching, if 22 per cent of the public-work construction of the preceding five years could have been held back, it would have put in an extra \$183,000,000 of wages, or one-sixth of the total wage reduction. If it continued for 10 years, it would be a third instead of a sixth, so that the load of the major depression would be lifted at least one-sixth by some policy of this kind carefully worked out.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the Senator apparently attributes to the executive branch of the Government, without regard to party, an economic and administrative perspicacity which I have never been able to find in them.

Mr. KENYON. Not equal to the congressional perspicacity.

Mr. McCORMICK. I do not want to pass compliments with the Senator. Who, in the administration of any government, clearly foresaw the time of the onset of the present depression? There were a few academic economists, I think, who forecast it. In the world of business, certainly, men of the highest authority, of presumed intelligence and information, believed a year ago last September that a few weeks, or a few months, at most, would see us on the upward curve in the resumption of industry.

I raise that point because the argument of the Senator presumes that public works, needed or believed to be needed by communities and the Congress, would be held back upon the judgment of executive experts for long periods, until, in the judgment of those same experts, we could go ahead.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, they could not be over long periods. There is a good deal in what the Senator says, but, as I said a few moments ago, the economic history of the country shows that up to 1903 the cyclical periods have come regularly about



every 10 years. Since 1903 we have had them every five or eight years.

Mr. McCORMICK. Of course, there is no one who can be prophet enough to know just when they are coming.

Mr. KENYON. The object of the second section is to enable the Secretary of Commerce to collect all the information he can get and to issue bulletins, so that business will not be taken unawares, but will know just what is coming on.

It is said that will bring on scares; but the warnings are given now by unreliable sources, and the result might be much better if it were done by some governmental agency simply telling the truth about the conditions.

Mr. McCORMICK. I will not hold that the other sources are reliable, but I do hold that we can not presume that the Department of Commerce could reliably assume a responsibility proposed to be vested in it by paragraph (a) of section 2. Let me say at this time that I subscribe as cordially as does the Senator to the principle of this bill, but under sections 2 and 3 it purposes to vest a discretion in the Executive and to impose upon the Executive a responsibility which might work to the inestimable injury of industry and labor in this country.

Mr. KENYON. It might; and, of course, if the Executive wanted to injure business or industry or anything else he could do it.

Mr. McCORMICK. I do not presume he would want to, because that would injure him. I only hold that if he were called upon, or if the Secretary of Commerce were called upon, to act under sections 2 and 3, through mere misjudgment the Secretary of Commerce or the President by Executive order or Executive pronouncement might work havoc in industry and inestimable injury to labor.

Mr. KENYON. They could now, could they not?

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes; but this makes the action mandatory.

Mr. KENYON. No, not mandatory. It is entirely up to the President.

Mr. McCORMICK. If they could not, what virtue is there in it?

Mr. KENYON. We are making nothing mandatory. The Senator made a pretty good speech here yesterday on "Trust the President."

Mr. McCORMICK. I think not.

Mr. KENYON. The President of the United States, when these matters are brought before him by the heads of executive departments, will not make some fool order about them, I imagine.

Mr. McCORMICK. I think the Senator would not hold, if he had followed my speech, that it was upon the subject of "Trust the President." In view of the President's recent appointment to the bench, my confidence in him is enhanced.

Mr. KENYON. I am sure it would be; but we assume that the Secretary of Commerce has certain information that trouble is coming, maybe a year away, maybe two years away. All this does is to enable the President to postpone or retard the prosecution of part of the public work and concentrate it at another time.

Mr. McCORMICK. I think paragraph (a) is the most dangerous provision.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator if there would not be danger of precipitating the very thing he wishes to avoid if they were mistaken? In my judgment, no matter how honest they were, if they actually began desisting from the prosecution of certain public works, the whole public not being advised as to just the reasons which caused them to take that precaution, it might magnify the thing and precipitate the very condition the Senator is hoping to mitigate by this legislation.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, if the Secretary of Commerce should issue a bulletin that there is going to be a panic on the 1st day of September, 1923, it would help to precipitate it. I assume men are not going to do things of that kind. This simply provides for a recitation of the business conditions. The Senator knows that within the last few years, during war times, we appropriated for certain things the Government was to do which were not carried out at once because the cost of construction was so tremendous. I do not think it made any very great hubbub in the country or that anybody has been afraid that trouble was going to follow from it.

Mr. SMITH. The public was thoroughly advised of the reasons why the work was not carried on, that there were extravagances which had been practiced, and that there was a lack of urgency for it; but suppose in the ordinary course of events the time approached when there was disturbance in business more or less, and suppose there were evidences here and there which might not be of sufficient magnitude, or whose causes might not be so far-reaching as to ultimately develop into

a business panic, and suppose while those symptoms were manifest, and business was attempting to adjust itself, the Government began to stop work in certain places, began to retrench, to get ready for trouble, in order to avoid the very conditions which they feared were about to arise; the public would be advised, the newspapers throughout the country would begin to publish that the Government had quit work at such and such a place and that at another place it was retrenching, and the psychology of it would be that the public would magnify the cause.

So I am asking the Senator if that of itself would not create an impression in the minds of the public that if the Government, with all its facilities for gathering knowledge and for getting information as to conditions, was beginning to reef and prepare they should do the same, and if it would not precipitate the very thing the Senator is attempting to avoid?

Mr. KENYON. Of course I see the force in the Senator's suggestion, and I have thought a good deal about it. If it was unwisely handled it would result in some such situation, that is true. Any question that may come up to the Government, if it is not wisely handled, makes trouble, and if it is wisely handled it may be beneficial.

Mr. SMITH. The question of the wisdom of handling these things finds its sanction in whether or not the Government would take this action before or after the symptoms were so pronounced that everybody knew it was intended.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator, for instance, think the Government could hold back in this way? Suppose we had a number of public buildings to be constructed and the Government were to hold back one year 20 per cent and the next year 20 per cent, in order to have this reservoir for labor. Does the Senator think the mere holding back of the doing of that work would be injurious to the business condition of the country?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know. I was just taking the purpose of the bill as I read it, which is to retrench in the face of what might be a serious condition that might develop. For that reason, unless it was incorporated in the bill that full notice should be given to the public as to what were the conditions, it might lead to an unsatisfactory condition.

Mr. KENYON. That is what the Secretary of Commerce does now. He issues a monthly bulletin that goes out and the people know what is going on. We have now the survey of current business which is issued every month by the Department of Commerce. That would, under a section of the bill, contain more than a mere survey, but this has been going to the country, so we have one in a general way and when the people come in contact with this they know what are the general business conditions of the country.

Mr. SMITH. Merely giving this survey would not help very much. The Senator and I have had experience where prices have gone down and there was more or less business depression, but it was a healthy one, it was from perfectly natural causes, and as soon as those were over the country rebounded easily.

The thing I fear would be that a mere publishing of a bulletin by the Government, stating the business conditions, would not necessarily mean in the minds of the public that any real tangible disaster was imminent, but if, coupled with the bulletin, the Government begins to retrench and take its forces away from work, people will say, "it is of sufficient seriousness and of sufficient importance for the Government to begin to conserve its labor forces and its money, and therefore we had better retrench," and it would create a psychology that could not be controlled. That is the only point I was attempting to make.

There is quite a difference between issuing just a formal statement as to the business conditions of the country, and coupling with that formal statement a further statement in which it is shown that the Government is beginning to retrench. The public, not being thoroughly advised, as the Government is, as to why the Government is doing those things, might start a panic, just like an avalanche, without rhyme or reason, like the panic of 1907, and the whole world would be shaken to its foundations without any adequate cause save the psychology precipitated by just a slight unfortunate condition.

Mr. KENYON. I think the Senator is borrowing quite a good deal of trouble. The panics which we have had in the past have occurred without anything of this kind being invoked, but I know there is some force in what the Senator said. I think where the bulletins are issued showing the exact facts and the country knows the facts it is better. There is nothing to be gained by keeping the facts from the country. The country makes up its mind from the facts. We can not have too much truthful information before the country as to conditions.

If, coupled with that, the Government commences the policy of conserving and retarding public work in order to assist when the crash comes—it may not be a crash, but when the depression comes—it would be helpful. The Senator makes the argument that that would help along the crash or the depression. That is to be thought about.

Mr. SMITH. The point I was making was that it would help precipitate perhaps a crisis that might otherwise be tided over, because there is nothing so sensitive as business and commerce, especially where there is liquid capital invested for quick turnover. If the Government gives out these bulletins and there are weak spots emphasized, showing such and such conditions are prevailing that are not as promising as they might be, and coupled with that is the overt act in that the Government begins to retrench here and there, there is danger. The public would attach infinitely more importance to the overt act than they would to the mere statement, and others who were getting along and did not see the danger and were not feeling it might be affected. The very effort of the overt act on the part of the Government beginning to retrench might cause everybody else to stop who were in a position to want to take care of their property, and thus precipitate a tightness and a crisis that might otherwise be avoided.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, we have the reports, showing the facts, coming out monthly. That would not be a shock to the business world. Even now there is nothing to prevent every kind of frenzied statement being given out about business and industrial conditions. Would it not be better to have something that is really authentic, something the people can understand and believe in, than to have the danger arising from unauthorized and inaccurate frenzied statements?

Mr. SMITH. As the Senator is very well aware, in these business depressions the mere fact that certain Government operations have gone on at full speed has had a reassuring effect upon the public rather than a deterring effect.

Mr. KENYON. That is getting exactly at the point which is the purpose of the bill. When that feeling comes the Government starts and accelerates the municipalities, the cities, and the counties to go ahead with their work. The mere part of the Government would be small, because it has only about 1 per cent of the entire labor of the country engaged in its work, so it accomplishes the very thing the Senator is afraid of. His idea is that it will create that condition before we get down to business.

Mr. SMITH. My idea is that if the Government begins to retrench in order to get a full head of steam when the crash comes, it may precipitate the crash which we are then trying to avoid.

Mr. KENYON. It will be used before the crash comes, and the department will not wait for the crash to come. It would be used to avoid the crash.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My understanding of the provision is that when the President and the head of the department, the Secretary of Commerce, apprehend that business may be slowing up, they do not start to intrench, but they start to increase expenditures and employ more men. When business is expanding they slow up on the governmental activities.

Mr. KENYON. That is the purpose of the bill exactly.

Mr. SMITH. Then I have misunderstood the purpose of the bill. According to the statement of the Senator from Connecticut, the idea is that during a flood time the Government will not go ahead.

Mr. KENYON. It will hold back then, of course.

Mr. SMITH. And when it begins to see a time of stress coming, it will then go ahead with the full employment of labor.

Mr. KENYON. That is what I have been trying to say for a good while, but the Senator from Connecticut has stated it in very few words. When we have a maximum of private employment, then the Government will hold back. When it commences to go down, then the Government will concentrate on its work.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In other words, if business through the country is slack and it is desired to help out labor that has been employed in private business, if the Government can then step in and employ a lot of the unemployed labor and perhaps get the advantage of cheaper prices of construction, it tends to keep labor better employed. When business is good, instead of rushing into the labor market and competing with employers of labor at rising prices for labor upon construction, it defers or slows down Government construction, and private industry is relieved of Government competition, and the Government

projects generally can wait a little while for the surely recurring period of industrial depression.

Mr. KENYON. That is the exact philosophy of the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. My only objection is this—and I refer to it now only because I do not expect to be on the floor longer. I realize how embarrassing it must be to the Senator, who is endeavoring to make a consecutive statement upon the general features of the bill, to be interrupted with special questions as to particular portions of the bill, but I am obliged to leave the Senate very shortly.

Mr. KENYON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Section 3 reads:

That the head of each executive department is authorized, upon the advice of the President, to postpone the date of the commencement or retard the prosecution of such portions of the public works and projects within his jurisdiction as may be necessary, in order to prepare for and to prevent a further rise in the cyclical wave of industrial expansion and resulting business strain and overextension.

It seems to me that the power given to the head of a department, even upon the advice of the President, to postpone the date of the commencement of a work that Congress has ordered to be commenced within a particular time, or before a particular date, is a pretty large one.

Mr. KENYON. I hope the Senator will read lines 19, 20, 21, and 22 and see if they do not cover the point.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No. The lines which the Senator suggests I read are:

Where a time limit has been specifically provided within which any such work or project, or any part thereof, is to be commenced or completed, this section shall not be construed to extend or remove such limit.

Mr. KENYON. That was intended to cover the very objection the Senator is raising, that no power should be granted to set aside what the Congress has done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the words "such limit" refer to the date of the commencement, it would cover it; but where a time limit has been specifically provided within which any such work or project is to be commenced or completed, it may not apply. However, if the Senator is satisfied that wherever Congress has authorized or directed a thing to be done before a particular date the provision I have read does not apply to it, I have no objection.

Mr. KENYON. That was the purpose of it. If it does not cover that, I want it to do so.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. I also dislike to interrupt the Senator, but I am obliged to leave the Chamber. I appreciate the Senator's remarks about my diligence in attendance upon the meetings of the committee. I think I can say that I have never missed a called meeting unless it was interfered with by another committee hearing or meeting. However, I was unavoidably absent at the time the bill was considered by the committee, and my attention has not been called to the hearings, which I understand are printed.

I wish to direct the Senator's attention to the language of section 1 of the bill, and I think in order to understand it the entire section would have to be read:

That the head of each executive department is authorized to prepare and to periodically revise the necessary plans for all public works and projects within his jurisdiction concerning which a report has been requested by Congress or a committee thereof under the provisions of existing law, and to make the surveys and to prepare the engineering plans necessary for proposed public works and projects, in order that the work may be commenced immediately and properly prosecuted when an appropriation becomes available therefor.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that engineering plans necessary for such works will involve the expenditure of perhaps 10 per cent of the entire amount for the undertaking, and therefore I inquire where authority is conferred for the expenditure of that money? Can we in a bill such as this confer blanket authority for all time to expend for the preparation of plans in the engineering necessary in public works?

Mr. KENYON. They can only carry out that provision to the extent of the appropriation which they may now have, and I am informed that they can commence the work without additional appropriation.

Mr. PHIPPS. I am afraid that would not be the interpretation of the section, as I read it.

Mr. KENYON. Oh, I think so, because there is absolutely no appropriation, so they could not spend it.

Mr. PHIPPS. If we connect up the entire thing it would read:

To make the surveys and to prepare the engineering plans necessary for proposed works and projects \* \* \* when an appropriation becomes available therefor.

Where is the appropriation for the surveys and engineering plans? How can the departments do what is contemplated until an appropriation has been provided?

Mr. KENYON. They can not unless it is possible to do it out of appropriations which they already have.

Mr. PHIPPS. That would be my understanding under the general law, but I do not think this is quite in accordance with the general law.

Mr. KENYON. It is the idea that this measure shall not at this time carry any appropriation. Eventually there will have to be some appropriation to carry it out, but not now. It is merely intended that the department shall do what they can with the funds they have on hand. They assure me that they can do a large part of what is contemplated by the bill without any more funds.

Mr. PHIPPS. If they have been properly called upon by the Congress or by a committee thereof to report on a project that would necessarily involve the making of some preparatory plans, and when it comes to working plans and surveys they involve very heavy expense which can not be taken care of out of the ordinary appropriations allowed the various bureaus for their maintenance.

Mr. KENYON. They can not go ahead under this bill in excess of the funds they have. If they can not do the work, then they will have to come to Congress and ask for an appropriation.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President—

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BURSUM. I simply desire to make a suggestion to which I call the attention of the Senator from Colorado. Would not the effect of this proposition be that the department would be requested by Congress to supply certain information and to report, and in the event there was not a sufficient amount of funds on hand, the natural thing would be for Congress to appropriate for the specific purpose, and it might be made an emergency matter?

Mr. PHIPPS. It would be the duty of the department to report back to Congress that it could not furnish the information unless provided with the necessary appropriation.

Mr. BURSUM. That would be the natural consequence. That is the limitation, as I understand, imposed by this bill. It is aimed only to cover such matters as Congress may designate.

Mr. KENYON. No; I wish to be perfectly fair about that; I do not desire any misunderstanding to arise. The Senator will observe, beginning in line 8, that each department is authorized to make surveys and to prepare plans.

Mr. BURSUM. Exactly; but limited to such information as has been called for by Congress.

Mr. PHIPPS. I do not think it is limited to that under the language of the section, but, on the contrary, it is broad and comprehensive enough to cover any kind of public work that the head of a department may think necessary or advisable.

Mr. KENYON. Where he has the funds on hand to provide for it.

Mr. BURSUM. Section 1 provides:

That the head of each executive department is authorized to prepare and to periodically revise the necessary plans for all public works and projects within his jurisdiction concerning which a report has been requested by Congress or a committee thereof under the provisions of existing law.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; but then the section goes on to mention other things which the departments may do.

Mr. BURSUM. But they must be done upon the request of Congress.

Mr. KENYON. It is not the intention, I will say to the Senator, to have the making of surveys and engineering plans limited to those things which Congress may request, but it is for the department head to go ahead and plan some public work.

Mr. BURSUM. Even if that be true, if they are short of money, the natural thing would be to call upon Congress for an appropriation. I do not see that the objection is serious at all.

Mr. KENYON. I do not think it is, either. Mr. President, I will be glad to discuss this bill, but I think there is really no use doing so at this time, for there are only five or six Senators present.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. I am going to yield the floor, for there seems to be no particular interest in the pending measure.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, in my opinion, the pending bill must either not be taken seriously or be taken extremely seriously, for I think it puts upon the Government certain obligations and certain duties which it is absolutely beyond the power of the Government or of man to intelligently discharge.

Mr. President, there is a book to which I occasionally refer, not so often perhaps as I should, but in the opening book of the Book of Books I find the story of Pharaoh's dreams. Pharaoh was a gentleman of prominence in those days, which was at least before the present administration. He had a dream, and the dream ran after this fashion:

And, behold, there came up out of the river seven well-favored kine, and fat-fleshed; and they fed in a meadow.

And, behold, seven other kine came up after them out of the river, ill favored and lean fleshed, and stood by the other kine upon the bank of the river.

And the ill-favored and lean-fleshed kine did eat up the seven well-favored and fat kine. So Pharaoh awoke.

Pharaoh also had another dream, but we will omit that. He sought an interpretation of his dreams. A young man named Joseph was called upon to interpret them. Joseph had established a reputation for the correct interpretation of dreams, and Joseph said:

The seven good kine are seven years, and the seven good ears are seven years; the dream is one.

And the seven thin and ill favored kine, that came up after them, are seven years; and the seven empty ears, blasted with the east wind, shall be seven years of famine.

This is the thing which I have spoken unto Pharaoh: What God is about to do, he showeth unto Pharaoh.

So that these recurring periods of plenty and of famine have been going on for some time. There seems to have been devised no successful method of arresting their progress, and I very much doubt if one can be provided even by the Congress of the United States.

I notice that section 3 of the bill provides:

That the head of each executive department is authorized, upon the advise of the President, to postpone the date of the commencement or retard the prosecution of such portions of the public works and projects within his jurisdiction as may be necessary, in order to prepare for and to prevent a further rise in the cyclical wave of industrial expansion.

I am not entirely clear as to just what this reference to cyclical waves means, but I suppose I know. Mr. President, who is going to guarantee the correctness of any man's prognostication as to what is going to occur in the business world? The wisest business heads have failed to do it; they all know, just as everybody in every walk of life knows, that we have recurring periods of prosperity and depression. I think that this bill puts the Government really into competition with Mother Shipton, Hicks, the weather man, and other prognosticators of greater or less degrees of success and conspicuousness. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the bill puts the Government almost in the bucket-shop business.

Suppose the Secretary of Commerce, under the authorization of section 2, should predict a period of depression; that would be pretty good advice to the man who wants to utilize it for the purpose of buying futures. I repeat my opening statement, that it seems to me that the bill must either not be taken seriously or that it must be taken very seriously. That feature of it alone is one which, in my judgment, renders the enactment of this bill of at least very doubtful expediency.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, the Biblical selection rendered by the elder from Indiana is interesting, but it will be remembered, too, that Joseph set up a reserve fund of grain against the seven years of famine, just as we are trying to do something here in setting up a reserve unemployment fund.

Yes, Mr. President, the bill should be taken seriously or not at all. It is designed to do something to meet a most distressing situation. If it is a dream it is a dream of some of the best economists of the United States and of the world, who, perhaps, have given as much study to it as has the Senator from Indiana.

The Canadian Government is going much further than the United States would go under a bill of this kind. They are going ahead with systems of public work to provide against unemployment. The unemployment situation in this country may not trouble some gentlemen; they may sneer and deride any attempt, however small and however humble, to help solve the unemployment situation. This is the first attempt which has been made. If the Senator from Indiana has anything better, let us have it. It is very easy to deride and sneer at any attempt of this character.

Mr. NEW and Mr. POINDEXTER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. KENYON. Let me yield, first, to the Senator from Indiana, and then I will yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa speaks of my sneering at the bill. I am not sneering at the bill at all.

Mr. KENYON. To call it a "bucket-shop bill" comes pretty near sneering at it.

Mr. NEW. If the Senator will permit me, I think that he is prone to take any man's opposition to a measure in which he is

interested as personal to himself or as a sneer upon what he is undertaking.

Mr. KENYON. Not at all.

Mr. NEW. That is not intended at all. The criticisms I make of this bill are seriously made and well-intentioned. They are not intended as sneers or anything of the kind.

Mr. KENYON. Does not the Senator think that calling it a "bucket-shop bill" is pretty nearly a sneer at the bill? I am not in the habit of trying to help bucket-shop bills, and I have no objection to anybody finding any fault he can with the bill. I have not any particular pride in the bill. It grew out of the unemployment conference here, and Mr. Hoover and other men connected with that conference felt that this proposition should be carried out into law. Other nations have done the same thing. It has not been a dream with them, as the Senator suggests.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if the Senator will further indulge me for one moment, I do think that that very criticism is a sound one. I do not believe for a minute that a Secretary of Commerce would willingly or purposely make predictions with the idea of having them turned to that kind of account at all, but I do believe that he might be honestly mistaken. I do believe that his judgment might be honestly wrong, his forecast a mistaken one, and that information might be fed to him by designing people that would be calculated and intended to cause him to make predictions that were founded upon misinformation rather than upon solid fact, and that in that way they might be turned to very unfavorable account, and be open to the very objection that I have just urged.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, in the first place, where is there any power for the Secretary of Commerce to make predictions or prognostications? Under section 3 he merely publishes the reports; and reports of a similar nature are being published now. Has the Senator from Indiana seen those—the Current Surveys of Business, published every month?

Mr. NEW. Yes; I have.

Mr. KENYON. What prediction is there about those of panics, or what panics have those brought on?

Mr. NEW. I think the bill must be taken as a whole, and the authority to have these predictions made is given in section 3, for instance, if not in section 2. That is the very purpose of it—to have advance predictions made as to what is probably going to occur in the business world.

Mr. KENYON. The purpose of it is to give the facts and then let the consequences follow; and that is being done now in a way that would not be as substantial or merit the standing that the reports would merit under this bill, because there is no particular law to cover it.

I spoke of Canada. France has followed this idea, and has not thought it was a dream.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask, for information, as to when either Canada or France adopted a plan like this? What was the date of it?

Mr. KENYON. Canada has gone even further than this, but I have not the date.

I will say to the Senator that in 1902 and in 1907 an inquiry was made in France by the minister of public works into the effect of depressions upon railways, and it was reported as feasible for the railways to distribute their orders over a full period of the industrial cycle so as to increase the volume in a year of depression.

In 1908 a commission set up by the President of France reported favorably upon plans for allocating public contracts so as to compensate in part for the lack of private contracts in bad times.

In Great Britain before the war a sum was appropriated by Parliament to be expended upon roads during future periods of unemployment only.

During the post-war period Great Britain is pushing an extensive program of public works, including great arterial roads about the outskirts of London. Great Britain does not find it such a dream to try to provide some method of public works to help the unemployed.

The Belgian Government set up what is called the national crisis fund for the execution of public works during periods of unemployment only.

Czechoslovakia, a new country, in 1919 adopted legislation compelling communes and industries to undertake public works, the State paying two-thirds of the wages of those employed. They have not yet discovered the philosophy of the Senator from Indiana, that it was all a dream.

Switzerland has a traditional policy of subsidizing local public works in order to cover the additional expense resulting from the employment of untrained workers.

Some of these measures would be undesirable in the United States.

Mr. President, just a few weeks ago the President of the United States wrote a letter on this subject. It might be well for the Senator from Indiana to read that letter. I ask to have it placed in the RECORD. Also, I should like to have printed in the RECORD portions of the President's address of welcome to the conference on unemployment, and Secretary Hoover's address at the opening of the conference on unemployment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have these matters read?

Mr. KENYON. No; I think not. I ask to have them published as part of my remarks.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to have read the letter from the President, which the Senator says refers to this bill.

Mr. KENYON. No; it does not refer to this bill. It refers to the general subject, but not to this bill.

Mr. NORRIS. If it has any application to this bill, I should like to have it read.

Mr. KENYON. It has application to the question of doing public work.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read the letter.

The reading clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, January 26, 1922.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The response of employing interests throughout the country, to the appeal for special effort to afford employment to the greatest possible extent during the winter, has produced highly gratifying results. Thanks to this fine cooperation, the situation has been much less difficult during the winter thus far than it might otherwise have been.

The most difficult period of the winter, however, is still before us, and I am therefore writing you to bespeak the utmost cooperation that your department may be able to afford in extending further employment.

States and cities, as well as private companies and individuals, have taken more comprehensive and effective measures than probably have ever been taken before in such a situation. The natural self-reliance of the American citizen has been supplemented in these times by neighborly help, by part-time work, by odd jobs; employers have, to a marked degree, exerted themselves to find work for employees, and have anticipated repair and construction operations, which otherwise might have been taken up later.

City and State authorities have generally organized to provide work and prevent or alleviate distress due to lack of employment. In substantially every city where the need has appeared the mayor has appointed emergency committees to lead the community's action. Municipal bonds have been sold to an unprecedented degree, to provide for construction as early as possible of needed municipal work. In this way much winter work has been provided.

Of course, I do not need to urge upon you the vital importance of having the Federal Government also do everything possible, in a sound way, to ameliorate the situation. My purpose in writing you now is to ask you to have a thorough examination made forthwith of all repair and construction plans in your department, to determine what necessary work, which otherwise would not have been undertaken until later in the year, might be advanced so as to provide employment during the months immediately ahead of us, and to suggest that so far as is possible and practicable such work should be undertaken at once.

The response of the general public to appeals for the widest possible employment has been so generous and effective that I think we should be the more concerned to have the agencies of the Federal Government do their very utmost share in this humane effort.

Very sincerely,

WARREN G. HARDING.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa desire to have the addresses to which he has referred printed in the RECORD?

Mr. KENYON. I should like to have them printed in the RECORD, but they need not be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From President Harding's address of welcome to the Conference on Unemployment.]

If out of your councils there comes a remedy which all America helpfully may apply to-day, it may be helpfully employed some time again when similar conditions are encountered. \* \* \* Fundamentally sound, financially strong, industrially unimpaired, commercially consistent, and politically unafraid, there ought to be work for everybody in the United States who chooses to work.

[From Secretary Hoover's address at the opening of the Conference on Unemployment, Sept. 26, 1921.]

There is no economic failure so terrible in its import as that of a country possessing a surplus of every necessity of life in which numbers, willing and anxious to work, are deprived of these necessities. It simply can not be if our moral and economic system is to survive. It is the duty of this conference to find definite and organized remedy

for this emergency, and I hope also that you may be able to outline for public consideration such plans as will in the long view tend to mitigate its recurrence.

It seems to me we can on this occasion well give consideration to and expression of the measures that would tend to prevent the acute reactions of economic tides in the future.

It is my belief that we shall be able to lay out a program by which in great measure these things can be accomplished.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall have to leave the Chamber in a moment to attend a committee meeting, and I want to ask the Senator a question about some of the language in his bill.

In line 5, page 2, after the word "jurisdiction," does not the Senator think that the words "concerning which a report has been requested by Congress or a committee thereof under the provisions of existing law" should be stricken out? Why confine the revision of the plans simply to those projects concerning which a report has been requested by Congress?

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator will read that carefully, I think he will find that it does not do what he fears, because, if the Senator will follow on, the words on line 7 "and to make the surveys and to prepare the engineering plans necessary for proposed public works" are not limited to those things for which Congress has requested a report.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Secretary is not limited in making surveys and making plans, but he is limited in his authority to revise the necessary plans for all public works and projects within his jurisdiction to those concerning which a report has been requested by Congress. I think those words should be stricken out. Let him have authority to revise all projects under his jurisdiction, and to make surveys and prepare engineering plans. I am making that suggestion in the interest of the bill, because I am in favor of the Senator's bill.

Mr. KENYON. I want to consider that a little.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish the Senator would consider that language. It seems to me that it does nothing except to limit the activities of the Secretary in directions in which I think it is desirable that he should go.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator would strike out the phrase "concerning which a report has been requested by Congress or a committee thereof"?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; strike that out and let it read, then, in this way:

That the head of each executive department is authorized to prepare and to periodically revise the necessary plans for all public works and projects within his jurisdiction, and to make the surveys and to prepare the engineering plans necessary for proposed public works and projects, in order that the work may be commenced immediately and properly prosecuted when an appropriation becomes available therefor.

Mr. KENYON. I really see no objection to that, if the Senator will make that motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If I can do so now, I will move to strike out, after the word "jurisdiction" in line 5, the words "concerning which a report has been requested by Congress or a committee thereof under the provisions of existing law." I move to strike out those words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, lines 5, 6, and 7, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

Concerning which a report has been requested by Congress or a committee thereof under the provisions of existing law.

Mr. KENYON. I think that is all right.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator about one other matter in line 14. Does the Senator think that we really ought to have these reports published monthly? Does he not think that quarterly publication would be sufficient?

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that they are publishing the reports monthly now. I hold in my hand the one for December. They are quite valuable to the business world.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They are publishing this supplement to the Current Survey of Business?

Mr. KENYON. No; not the supplement. They are publishing the Current Survey of Business.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, I see—as a supplement to the Current Survey of Business.

Mr. KENYON. Yes. It would simply, perhaps, enlarge it a little. It serves a very useful purpose in the business world and to business men.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wondered, if we did so much printing, and the department gets going along this line, if it

would not be just as advantageous to make it quarterly and save that much. Of course it is not a very large amount.

Mr. KENYON. The quarterly reports might be three times the size of the monthly reports.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That might be true.

Mr. KENYON. I will think about that, though.

Mr. JONES of Washington. All right.

Mr. KENYON. I want to put in the Record, in reply to some of the things which have been stated as to the prophecy proposition, the statement that the bill does not carry any provision for any prophecies at all. It sets forth business conditions which the business world is anxious to have, just as the present Survey of Current Business does.

I could insert in the Record, which I think may be some reply to that, a letter from a manufacturer in Massachusetts, who might not desire to have his name used, but the letter is here for anybody's perusal.

Of course the number of men employed on Federal public work is small compared with those employed in all the public works in the United States, and that is why this bill, as I said in my opening, is not going to accomplish wonders. It is simply going to assist in stimulating.

In 1914 there were about 293,000 men employed in all public works, of which only 73,000 were employed in Federal public works. In 1914 all public works employed 1.09 per cent of the labor of the country. I have given before the amounts paid in wages during those times, the point being that good will come, and the comparison should be made between the concentrated public-work employment and the fluctuations in the private employment, because there are a lot of industries which take as many men at all times of the year.

It takes as many men to bring in a poor crop as to bring in a good crop in agriculture, so that agriculture might not be affected. So with street railways, gas and telephone companies, and other public utilities; they carry the same force of men, generally, in bad times as in good times.

We are not looking so much to the direct effect of putting men into this public-work employment in times of depression as to the stimulation upon general industry. When you put men to work who are idle, it makes more business for the garment workers, the cement workers, and the builders, unskilled labor everywhere. You can not have depression in part of industry and prosperity in other parts, and what depresses a few industries depresses all.

You can not compare the depression of 1921 with any of the other depressions I have spoken of, except the one which followed the Civil War. Then for a time there was a depression in which there were as high as 33 per cent off the pay roll of those who had been on the pay roll, and it averaged 20 per cent during the first 12 months of the depression. The concentration of public work could not have stopped that. It can not stop the present situation, but it will be a basis for relief of future depressions.

In this letter to the heads of the Federal departments, which has been read, the President has asked them to expedite the execution of all public work under their control for which appropriations are available. He did not think it was a dream. That is exactly what would happen if this bill were made a law, where the plans had been made, and they could go ahead with the work. We are in a situation right now where the President of the United States wants to do these things, and there are no plans, and there is no way of carrying it out.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. I assume there are public works for which plans have been authorized and for which appropriations have been made.

Mr. KENYON. There are for public buildings, away back in the war times.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is nothing whatever to prevent the President, if he sees fit, as the Senator pointed out he did in the case he mentioned, from directing the use of any available appropriations for prosecuting those public works under the present law?

Mr. KENYON. I am not certain.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand the object would be to have public works carried on during the periods of depression, and I think that is a good policy; but I am a little confused about what change in the situation this proposed legislation would make. It carries no appropriation, and it is not intended to authorize public works which have not been authorized under some other law.

The situation is illustrated by the present status of the reclamation work. There are a number of reclamation projects which have been authorized by law for which plans have been completed. The unemployment conference made some investi-

gation into the number and status of those authorized reclamation projects and found that about \$16,200,000 should be expended upon them. There is no legislation necessary to carry on that work in this period of depression except to get the money with which to do it.

Mr. KENYON. That work is ready to go ahead.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The work is ready to go ahead. Why pass this bill or any other bill to carry out the policy of going ahead with that work in this period of depression if you get the money to do it with?

Mr. KENYON. That work was the result of a specific act, was it not?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The authorization was carried in a number of different acts.

Mr. KENYON. If there had been no act authorizing that work, they might have gotten ready to do the work if this bill had been a law, when it was apparent that there was a period of depression approaching.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is ready to go ahead.

Mr. KENYON. It is in that specific case.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Take the building of roads, for instance, I was just about to comment on the status of public-road work, in so far as the Federal Government is connected with it, as it relates to the policy advocated by the Senator from Iowa, of increasing and expediting work in periods of depression and slowing down in periods of unusual prosperity.

There was argued upon the floor of the Senate just the contrary of the policy advocated by the Senator from Iowa, I may say, by the Senator from Massachusetts, against the appropriation for Federal aid to roads, because a great number of men were out of employment; that it was a poor time to appropriate money for public work. That was the argument of some Senators. I took the same view taken by the Senator from Iowa and argued on the other side that the fact that they were out of employment was the very reason why we ought to provide means for their employment, and we appropriated \$90,000,000 for that purpose, and they are proceeding with that work. What change in the situation would be made by the passage of the bill of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. KENYON. Of course, we are in a period of depression now, so that you can not very clearly draw the lesson from it. This is not going to help this present period of depression. Suppose that were years ahead, taking the road proposition, and the President and the heads of bureaus concluded that it was better to hold up some of that work; suppose things were not looking good and they decided they would hold up 20 per cent this year and 20 per cent the next year. That is where this bill would come in. They could hold it off and use the 40 per cent to ward off the depression two or three years ahead. They have no legal authority to do that now. They do hold up these appropriations, there is no doubt about that, but this is the logical way of doing it.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. POINDEXTER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to ask the Senator from Washington a question.

Mr. KENYON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. Under section 3 this bill would give the right to suspend work of the kind the Senator from Washington mentioned, and not only that but it seems to me that under this section the head of a department might suspend work in the Senator's State and carry it on in my State, or, vice versa, suspend it in my State and carry it on in the Senator's State.

Mr. POINDEXTER. As I understand, the Senator does not contend that after the Congress has authorized the execution of public work and appropriated money for it, we should pass a law authorizing the head of some bureau, acting through the head of the department, to stop that work and wait indefinitely for some imaginary period of depression which might come some time in the future, take the authority away from Congress and give it to the executive department. Is that the idea of the Senator?

Mr. FLETCHER. They could stop not only the whole thing but stop any part of it. They might carry on some parts of it but stop any portion of it. The language is, "all or any portion of the work." That seems to me to be the danger in section 3.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Then we would not have any public works at all unless the heads of the departments were willing that we should have them. In other words, it would give a veto power to the head of every department, so far as public work authorized by Congress was concerned.

Mr. KENYON. The Senator does not want to say that, I am sure.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Provided you authorize them to suspend it in their discretion.

Mr. KENYON. Under the advice of the President. The President can veto what Congress does now; but if the Senator will take the closing lines, lines 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, he will see that where Congress has said that a matter shall be commenced or concluded within a particular time it can not be changed. The bureau heads only do this under the advice of the President of the United States.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I assume the President would not be able to give his personal attention to all these different projects, and if the executive branch of the Government be vested with the discretion of stopping public work on the order of the President, the President would be guided to a very large extent by the recommendations of the heads of the different departments.

Mr. KENYON. I do not see how that argument is sound, because the President of the United States can veto now an act of the Congress.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, if the Senator bases the policy of vesting discretionary power in the President on the ground that he has the veto power, it would apply to all legislation. On that theory we could do away with Congress altogether.

Mr. KENYON. I am simply answering the Senator's argument. The discretion is put in the hands of the President. It is not put in the hands of bureau chiefs. I would not advocate any proposition of giving a bureau chief power to set aside what Congress may do. It must be with the advice of the President. They are authorized but only authorized upon the advice of the President.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is another provision in the first section of the bill which gives the head of each executive department, without the advice of the President, authority to make surveys of public works. I do not quite understand that. The language is "to make the surveys and prepare the engineering plans necessary for proposed public works."

Mr. KENYON. I am going to make a statement which covers that. I have been trying to make it for some time. It epitomizes the general purpose of the bill, which does not seem to be very well understood.

Section 1 calls upon various public-works agencies of the Federal Government to be prepared in advance with engineering plans for proposed undertakings, so that when an appropriation is made in time of a depression the work can go forward immediately, rather than wait months and years until plans have been prepared and approved. At present there is no incentive for Federal departments to do so, because they have no reason to suppose that Congress desires it. Eventually I believe that this section will lead to taking a longer view of governmental construction. Instead of thinking only in terms of one year our departments will look forward over a period of a decade and plot its needs. Vast areas are certain to be reclaimed through irrigation and drainage. The territory of the United States will eventually be increased not by wars of conquest but by the pick and shovel, the dam and ditch. These great projects usually linger in Congress, because there is no immediate impetus to action. This bill would assist not only in having plans ready for such projects but in giving the final impetus at a time when general industry and employment are in need of stabilization. Many governmental projects contain intricate problems which will require years to solve. For instance, the Boulder Canyon Dam, Ariz., will develop more power than Niagara Falls. Before it can be built agreements must be had from several States not to divert the headwaters, and complex engineering problems must be determined.

Again, post offices and Federal buildings are needed in hundreds of towns. The Federal Government rents many cramped and inadequate quarters. These buildings will be built; the only question is when. This bill proposes that plans be made ready in advance, and the bulk of them executed when the local workers need employment in bad times.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

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

Mr. KENYON. I yield.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. The question I am about to propound may have been asked in my absence, as I have been temporarily from the Chamber. By what standard would the head of the department reach the conclusion that the necessary depression had arrived?

Mr. KENYON. I think he would have to be advised by the head of the department. Under the survey of current business that is to be published and is now being published and will be published under the bill, the Secretary of Commerce would be the one, I assume, to determine that question.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Would there be any way of revising his opinion or correcting it if we thought he made a mistake about the necessity for the extra work?

Mr. KENYON. Of course Congress could give him any instructions or advice it pleased.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. But in the meanwhile—

Mr. KENYON. He would simply be preparing plans.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. He could commit the Government in a legal way to an indefinite amount.

Mr. KENYON. Oh, no; not at all. He would simply have the plans drawn. He can not do a thing until there is an appropriation and act of Congress, but when the appropriation comes then he is ready to go ahead.

In the city of Washington the Government rents a considerable part of its office space, scattered inconveniently in many buildings. The main buildings of the Department of Justice and the Department of Commerce are rented. Parts of the same bureau are distributed among several buildings. Aside from the waste in paying rent at a far higher rate than the cost of borrowing the money to build, the division of a department into fragmentary groups delays public business in a way that no private corporation would permit. A 10-year city plan for Washington would be of use not only in satisfying departmental needs but also in providing for the growth and beautification of the city. Some of the more important work may well be earmarked for execution during the next depression. This policy would be economical, for a larger percentage of a 10-year program would be done at the lower prices that prevail during depressions and a smaller percentage executed when costs are increased in competition with private business during boom times. Some governmental plan of this kind would decrease the likelihood of unemployment.

Mr. President, I have explained the bill not perhaps as fully as I might. I realize there is very little interest taken in it. I yield the floor for the present.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and as such agreed that the chairman of the committee might report the bill, but at the same time I expressed some doubt as to the wisdom of such legislation at this time, indicating that I might oppose the bill.

Because of my sympathy for the unemployed, wherever they may be, I am reluctant to oppose any measure that would promise relief, but I can not reconcile my mind to the idea that this is safe and wise legislation. I can not agree with the underlying principles of the bill. There is involved in it more or less of paternalism, but that is not my sole objection.

The bill proceeds, I think, upon a wrong theory, namely, that periods of prosperity and periods of depression come in regular cycles—cycles which may be forecast by the student of business, industrial, or economic conditions. I do not believe that is true. I think we can trace some of the greatest periods of depression, the most marked and those in which there was the most of unemployment, to something aside from recurring or cyclical influences or conditions. It has been said that a thing exists as long as the condition exists, whether it be a moment or whether it be a cycle. That, Mr. President, illustrates the impossibility of foretelling these variations in business or industrial conditions that will enable us by any system to prepare against them.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has well said that the amount involved so far as the Government is concerned, the expenditure that will be made by the Government in any projects or improvements carried on by the Government, is comparatively small, is a mere bagatelle to the aggregate of public improvements—State, county, and municipal—throughout the country. I agree with him in that. That is true. So far as the Government alone is concerned, comparatively little relief would be afforded the unemployed by the withholding of its building or construction program until a period of depression has arrived or is about to arrive.

Mr. President, the vice of the bill does not consist, however, in that alone. By section 2 of the bill it is provided:

That the Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and publish monthly reports as a supplement to the Current Survey of Business of the Bureau of the Census, or otherwise, concerning the trend of business conditions, the approach of periods of business strain and overextension, or of periods of business depression, in order that the President, the heads of the executive departments, the Congress, the governors of the respective States, the mayors of cities, and persons engaged in private industrial enterprises may properly prepare for and plan against such periods.

Mr. President, one objectionable feature of section 2, as it appeals to me, is one that has already been mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in the colloquy between himself and the Senator from Iowa a while ago. It may be true that publications, bulletins, and so forth, are being sent out from time to time through the Department of Commerce as to the condition of business. They may be regarded as more or less authoritative. They may determine individuals or corporations to some extent in the character or conduct of their business.

But, Mr. President, if the bill becomes a law, then any statement made by the Secretary of Commerce foreshadowing a depressed condition of affairs, foreshadowing unemployment as the result of that depression, will, I am sure, tend to precipitate the very condition that we would have most wished to avoid, and perhaps would have escaped had not wrong advices come from an apparently authoritative source. We know how sensitive business and financial interests are to any question about any approaching crisis or period of depression.

But for the report, sometimes false, sometimes erroneous, it might have been tidied over and a feeling of optimism come rather than the feeling of depression from an apparently slight change in the condition of this or that particular great industry or great financial institution.

The report of the Secretary of Commerce, however, based on misinformation or a failure to understand the real conditions instead of tidying over, instead of giving a feeling and a spirit of optimism that would carry men through, would have the effect of perhaps closing the doors of great business houses or financial concerns.

Mr. President, that is not all of section 2 to which I find objection. As was stated a little while ago, the amount of the Government's business is comparatively small. The great volume of it will be in the several States, counties, and municipalities. Now, what does the bill invite? The bill will invite the importunities, not of the unemployed alone but of the industries, the great industries of the country, engaged in manufacturing, engaged in furnishing supplies, and so forth. It will encourage them to encourage the governors of States, the county commissioners of counties, the mayors and city councils of municipalities, to engage in public works when there is no need or when, on account of present conditions, they should not engage in such work but should postpone them for a period of prosperity and when, too, the resulting taxation would not bear so heavily upon the taxpayers of the community.

So, Mr. President, that is what I fear under the bill, and I am taking the bill seriously and in connection, too, I would have the Senator from Iowa understand, with my great sympathy for unemployment, wherever it may be. The demand will come in any time of depression as surely as we pass the bill, and for the purposes of the demand a period of depression will be forecast when there is really no substantial danger of it, but for the purposes of the demand for the Government, a State, a county, or a municipality entering upon a building or construction program, a period of depression to come sooner or later will be freely predicted upon them.

Mr. President, he may be never so wise a man and never so familiar with business conditions generally throughout the country, yet the Secretary of Commerce nor the head of any other department can take in the whole field and see at any given time what will really affect seriously the situation throughout the country. He may imagine because there is a decline in the prospects of a particular industry or a decline in the price of railroad stocks or in the stock of some industrial organization, that calamity is almost upon us, and advise accordingly, according to the provisions of section 2 of the bill send out his bulletins, and thus precipitate disaster when otherwise none would have existed.

I am willing, Mr. President, to go as far as anyone in trusting the President of the United States; I say that without reference to who may at any time occupy the presidential office; but section 3 of the pending bill confides more power to the President than I wish to see confided to the Chief Executive. What does it do? It provides:

SEC. 3. That the head of each executive department is authorized, upon the advice of the President, to postpone the date of the commencement or retard the prosecution of such portions of the public works and projects within his jurisdiction as may be necessary, in order to prepare for and to prevent a further rise in the cyclical wave of industrial expansion and resulting business strain and overextension and, within the appropriations therefor, to enter upon a maximum program of public works and projects as a preparation for and in order to counteract an impending period of industrial depression and unemployment.

Mr. President, it is true that upon the advice of the Secretary of Commerce this action may be taken; it is true that it may be taken upon the advice of the head of some other depart-

ment; but it, in effect, makes a prophet of the President of the United States in foretelling or predicting when there is to be a period of depression or when the period of depression is to end and when a period of general prosperity is to begin. I do not think that the President will particularly welcome such a great responsibility and the duties involved in connection therewith. He will have before his mind—I do not see how he can help but have—the fear that he may make a mistake, and by that mistake and by the advice thus given, instead of energizing he will paralyze the industries of the country.

I said a while ago, Mr. President, that it is not so much the unemployed, I think, as it is the industries themselves, the great corporations which are asking for this bill in order, not so much that they may find employment for their men in Government projects or in other public works in periods of depression, but rather that they may keep themselves going concerns and make money and pay dividends to their stockholders. I think the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has already revealed enough to indicate that the great industries more than the unemployed themselves are working for this bill.

Mr. KENYON. I do not think that is so. The American Federation of Labor has indorsed this bill, or the principle of the bill. It is true that the officers of the United States Chamber of Commerce have also indorsed it, and many of the leading business men of the country have indorsed it, but it also has the indorsement of labor just as much, and my chief concern with it was from the labor end.

Mr. STERLING. Yes. I will say, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Iowa is right. The Federation of Labor, pro forma anyway, has indorsed the bill, but during the limited time when I was able to be present at the committee hearings—and I was there at every hearing which I could possibly attend, though sometimes I had to divide my time between another important committee and that committee, those committees holding their meetings at the same hour—the men who were there giving their testimony appeared to me to be the representatives of big business rather than of the unemployed.

Mr. KENYON. Is the reason why the Senator from South Dakota is opposed to the bill because it is a big-business measure?

Mr. STERLING. Not altogether, but I do not want undue consideration to be given the question of the unemployed. I gave my reason for believing that big business is behind the bill; I stated that big business wants to keep on going in periods of depression, and the representatives of big business are asking the Government to adopt this course, not alone for what they may get out of the Government by reason of their business but what they may get, as intimidated in the very bill itself, from the several States in their public improvements and from the counties in their improvements and from the cities in theirs.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not want to let the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, that big business is behind this bill, go unchallenged. I do not know that there would be anything wrong about it, perhaps, if big business was in favor of the bill, but the bill has been proposed because of labor's side of the matter. It has been championed more by Mr. Otto Mallory, one of the labor leaders and thinkers of the country, than by anyone else. Because some business men may indorse the bill, because the United States Chamber of Commerce may have been for it, arouses at least some suspicion and might shake my faith in the bill a little; but, so far as I am concerned, the whole movement has been promoted because of the interest of labor and in order to help relieve the unemployment situation.

Of course, the Senator from South Dakota has the right to make the statement which he has made; but he knows, I think, that, so far as I am concerned, my activities in the matter have been along the line of trying to help a little on the unemployment proposition. I do, however, challenge the Senator's statement that big business is behind the measure.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I have not said that big business alone was behind this measure. I have said that big business was supporting the measure, as I believe; but I have not said that big business exclusively was supporting it. I have said that the Federation of Labor, at least pro forma, had advocated the measure, and I am not saying now that from labor organizations has not come an expression in favor of the enactment of this measure; but I hope the Senator will not get the idea that it is labor alone or the unemployed alone who are advocating it. I have said that big business and big industries favor it, and I have stated what I believe to be the motive for their favoring it. It is in order that in a period of depression they may suffer no financial loss or the least possible loss.

I have nothing more to say except this: Allusion has been made by the Senator from Iowa to France and Switzerland and Belgium. I have not had time to go into this matter or to study the systems or conditions in other countries; but the situation in those comparatively small and compact countries, and even in France, must be different from what it is in our own country. France, if I remember correctly, owns to a great extent the French railroads. It would be comparatively easy under such conditions for the Government to regulate to some extent the extension, the repair, and the improvement of railways or other public works owned by the Government. It would be a different proposition altogether in this great country where the railroads are all privately owned.

Mr. President, one other thought occurs to me right here. Reference has been made to Government public buildings scattered throughout the country, such as post offices, and so forth. I think in the past we have been making more appropriations than were really needed for Government buildings. We have appropriated for post-office buildings in little towns of 1,500 or 2,000 inhabitants, where it would be cheaper for the Government to rent a building than to erect and maintain a distinctive post-office building. Now, what would be the effect of this bill? Nearly every community of 1,500 or 2,000 inhabitants would say, "We need a post-office building; a period of depression is upon us and to erect a building will employ so many men in this community." So demands for work of that kind and for appropriations that otherwise we would not think of making will be made upon us, and, in sympathy, we may be induced to vote for the appropriations.

As I said at the outset there is a spirit of paternalism in the bill—and I think it quite pervades the bill—which I do not like. The various communities, cities, towns, counties, and States which will expend most of the money on their public works ought themselves to have the right to determine their needs and to determine their ability, financial and otherwise, to enter upon building programs at such times and under such conditions as they see fit, without being importuned to-day to erect a building, provide waterworks or sewerage facilities, as the case may be, and to-morrow, because a period of prosperity is on, to postpone them for that indefinite time when a period of depression may come.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I have such a high regard for the author of this bill that I regret very much to have to differ with him, but certainly it seems to me that the bill is absolutely uncalled for and is unsound. The great trouble now is that the public is looking too much to the Government at Washington to get help. What the country needs is for the people to go to work, and not to depend upon making a living out of the Government.

The bill is paternalistic; it is wrong in principle; and I deem it entirely out of place. We should construct buildings only when it is necessary to do so, and every community should be the judge of that necessity. To my mind, instead of giving employment to people, the bill would tend to create unemployment, for individuals would not inaugurate enterprises, perhaps, for fear that the Government would jump in and compete with them in labor and materials. It is a matter which I do not think is a proper subject for legislation, and I trust no such legislation will be put upon the statute books. What the people of this country need now is to stop looking to Washington and to be allowed to work out their own material interests in their own way. It matters not to me whether labor favors this bill, or whether big interests favor it, or anybody else; but I deem the proposition involved in the bill not governmental in its nature; it is only advisory. It has no force in it. It will encourage complaining, and I hope no such bill will pass.

#### POLITICAL CAMPAIGN ISSUES.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, on yesterday the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] made a speech that doubtless will be termed, at least by his friends, the Republican textbook in the coming campaign. I heard that speech. It was very edifying, and I have no doubt it presented in the strongest possible way the achievements of the present administration. I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator burned the midnight oil and racked his brain that he might remember and place in that speech all that might possibly reflect credit upon this administration. I have no doubt that he consulted with his friends over there, and that his friends at the other end of the Avenue censored it, subtracted certain parts from it, or added certain things to it. I have no doubt that a council of war, so to speak, was held on that speech, so that nothing would be left out of it. It no doubt was the strongest possible presentation that could be made of the accomplishments of the present administration.



I would not now notice the speech if it were not for the fact that it came from such a high source in the Republican Party. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is the chairman of the Senate Republican campaign committee, and that speech evidently was prepared and was intended for distribution throughout the country. It was unfortunate that another distinguished leader of the Republican Party spoke on yesterday, because they apparently have gotten their wires crossed as to certain so-called achievements of the administration; and then, too, if this other leader of the Republican Party had not spoken last night in Boston no doubt the newspapers would have carried and given more space to the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois on yesterday.

I am sorry the Senator from Illinois is not now in the Chamber. I wish he were here. I am sorry the distinguished leader of the Republicans in the Senate [Mr. LODGE] is not here, because there is some conflict of statement in those speeches.

The Washington Post of this morning prints the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] at Boston in large type on the front page. The heading is:

No Congress in peace time achieved more for the Nation than present, says LODGE.

Under that, in large type, appears the following:

Appropriations of \$5,337,000,000 asked by departments cut to \$1,428,000,000, he points out.

So, in this campaign document, carefully prepared, heralded throughout the country as one of the two parts of the coming Republican textbook, this leader says that the appropriations of \$5,337,000,000 asked by the departments were cut to \$1,428,000,000; so that is the great achievement of this administration.

I hope that the statements of the distinguished leader of the Republicans in this Chamber touching other matters are more accurate than that statement. I can not imagine how a man so well versed and so learned and so experienced in legislative matters, and who occupies such a high place in the councils of his party, could possibly make that statement in a keynote political speech; and I am sure that no one within the sound of my voice or who knows anything at all about the expenditures of the Government will agree with that statement, that appropriations of \$5,337,000,000 were asked for the departments and they were cut to \$1,428,000,000—a saving of \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield for an explanation of this inaccurate statement.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas did not rise to make any explanation. The Senator rose just to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he knew whether or not that was the exact statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts? I judge that what the Senator from Massachusetts meant to say was that the estimates had been reduced by that amount.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the best explanation or excuse that can be offered for this inaccurate statement in the speech of the leader of the Republican Party. I read this from the Associated Press. No doubt this speech was prepared and was distributed to the representatives of the press before it was made; so I will quote from his speech to see whether the heading there is incorrect. That is the part of the speech that caught the fancy of the Washington Post. Certainly none doubts the friendliness of the Post to the administration. That is the part of the speech that caught the fancy of every Republican paper in this country. That is the part of the speech that will be read more by the people throughout the country than any other, namely, that the great achievement of this administration is to cut the appropriations from \$5,337,000,000 requested by the departments down to \$1,428,000,000. Why, if you had accomplished that you would have achieved a great deal; but the statement made in explanation and excuse for this speech by the Senator from Kansas—one of the leaders on the other side, one of the best politicians in the world, who is always watching out for his party, who smooths out the wrinkles over there, who is ever on guard to correct any mistakes made by his coworkers and coleaders—that explanation on the part of the distinguished Senator from Kansas, a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, vice leader on the other side, and chairman of the Committee on Rules, will not go. The harm is done when such a statement from such a high source is published.

Here is what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said:

Since the present Congress has been in they have reduced appropriations asked for the departments of \$5,337,000,000 to \$1,428,000,000. This was the work of the present "do nothing" Congress.

That is about the only accurate statement that the Senator from Massachusetts made in that speech at Boston.

This was the work of the present "do nothing" Congress—

He says.

Mr. President, the facts about the matter are that there was some reduction in the fiscal year 1920 over the fiscal year 1919. There was a reduction for the fiscal year 1921 over 1920, and so on down the line; and you will observe that even though the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] yesterday counted as one of the great achievements of his party and the administration alleged large reductions for the fiscal year 1919, the estimates of the departments, then controlled by the Democratic administration, were made at a time when the war was in full blast. No one had any idea that the close of the war was in sight. They made their estimates at the beginning of the year 1918. They came to Congress, and on those estimates the Appropriations Committee worked; and then, when the war closed so suddenly and unexpectedly, such a saving was effected to the taxpayers of the country that then the big reduction from the estimates was shown in the appropriation bills.

So I submit to every fair-minded person whether it is an achievement, whether the leaders of the Republican Party have the right to claim it as an accomplishment of the present administration, simply because, through the magnificent way in which the Democratic administration—cooperated with, I might say, and helped by men in this Chamber and at the other end of the Capitol, and Republicans everywhere—brought the war to such a sudden close that it saved billions of dollars in the appropriations from the estimates.

In those estimates, running into the billions, it was estimated how much these millions of men who were to be maintained in France and Belgium would have cost for the coming year. The estimates of the Shipping Board, the estimates for aircraft, for artillery, for munitions, for the Navy, and for everything, were based upon the assumption that the war probably would run throughout the following year; and so, when it suddenly collapsed and these men were brought back home, through the efficient administration of the Government at that time and through the economies that were worked by the departments at that time these enormous sums, running into the billions of dollars, were saved to the taxpayers of the country; and yet the American people are to be buncoed, hoodwinked, and deceived by Republican spokesmen claiming that as an achievement of the present administration. Sirs, if it had not been for the magnificent messages of ex-President Wilson, and the terms he laid down upon which peace should come—messages that disheartened, discouraged, disorganized, and broke the morale of the opposing armies—these large appropriations estimated for would have been necessary and billions in addition.

Sirs, the Senator from Massachusetts, who made this remarkable speech, a keynote speech for his own campaign in Massachusetts, to be followed and copied by other Republican spellbinders, said that the appropriation of \$5,337,000,000 asked in the estimates were cut to \$1,428,000,000. The facts are that the estimates for 1922 were \$5,337,000,000, and that we appropriated over \$4,000,000,000, not \$1,428,000,000. He is just two and one-half billion dollars off, that is all. That does not amount to much, especially in this day of Republican political hypocrisy and deception.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois in making his speech yesterday did say there was a cut of just a billion dollars. He is nearer right than his leader.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi, as I understand him, quoted the Senator from Massachusetts as having stated in his recent speech delivered in Massachusetts that the appropriations asked for by the departments for the fiscal year 1922 of something over \$5,000,000,000 had been reduced by the present Congress to about \$1,400,000,000. As I now recall it, the estimate of the Treasury Department presented to the Committee on Finance for the fiscal year 1922 was something over \$4,000,000,000, and the committee was asked to provide money to pay these estimates, based as they were, upon the appropriations made by Congress, and Congress did so provide by the passage of a revenue bill, which it was estimated, together with customs revenues, would raise for the fiscal year 1922 the full amount of the estimates and leave a surplus in the Treasury of some fifty-odd millions of dollars.

The Senator from Massachusetts now says, as I understand the Senator from Mississippi, that these appropriations have been reduced by the present Congress to \$1,400,000,000. If the Senator from Massachusetts is correct in this statement, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that there should be a repeal of a large part of the taxes imposed in the present

revenue bill, because otherwise we will be collecting money out of the people not needed to support the Government. I wish further to suggest, if the Senator from Massachusetts is correct, and we do not repeal a part of these taxes, we will have a surplus in the Treasury more than sufficient to pay the bonus, and the Republican Party would be relieved of imposing additional taxes for raising money for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator. Of course, the mention of the bonus at this time creates a panic on the other side of the aisle. These offices were created to help to win the war, and these expenditures were made for various purposes, which we are gradually liquidating, and, of course, going through a readjustment period following the war, the estimates, as well as the appropriation, should naturally be reduced. We have not reached the time of "normalcy" yet. Just wait; the country will get its dose and understand its meaning before this administration gets through.

For the present year the estimate of the Budget Bureau is \$3,801,000,000. There has been reported out of the House Committee on Appropriations already bills carrying \$2,908,000,000, and all the bills have not been reported yet. To date the bills reported from the House Appropriations Committee have been reduced from the estimates of the Budget by only \$64,000,000, and there has not been an appropriation bill which has passed the House and come to the Senate which has not been increased by the Senate, first by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and generally by the Senate through amendments on the floor.

So there is a reduction of \$64,000,000 from the amount estimated by the Budget in the bills which passed the House, and when they shall have passed the Senate and finally become laws they will carry much larger amounts than the estimates of the Budget.

Another proposition which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] claimed as an achievement of the administration was the Budget system. The Budget system would be a wonderful thing if we had a Congress which would more earnestly practice economy and knew how to run this Government so that they could keep expenditures within the estimates of the Budget; but the trouble is with the lop-sided way you run things the Budget makes its estimates and the Congress increases the amounts.

Already during this Congress we have passed more deficiency appropriation bills than ever before in any other Congress. We have appropriated already in this Congress practically \$350,000,000 as deficiencies in three deficiency appropriation bills, and yet it is claimed that this Government is being run along economical lines. When you bring in the general appropriation bills within the Budget you make great claim to the country about practicing economy; then you pass some deficiency appropriation bills and undo all the work you had theretofore done.

If the Congress would stop passing deficiency bills, they might get along much better; but they do not do it. There is no cohesion on the other side of the aisle. You never know where you are going. You are just slipping and sliding, and sliding backward more than you are going forward. Halting and hesitating, and hesitating about as much as you halt. The country is thoroughly disgusted with your action, and yet your political leaders lay claims in their keynote speeches to your alleged wonderful achievements.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, does the Senator remember that during the last session in which his party was in power in the House and Senate they passed five deficiency appropriation bills?

Mr. HARRISON. They did not amount to one-fourth as much as these three deficiency appropriation bills that you have already passed in this Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, yes; they did.

Mr. HARRISON. I recall that before the war there had never been a deficiency bill carrying over \$35,000,000.

The Budget Bureau estimated recently in one deficiency for \$190,000,000, and the House appropriation bill cut it down to \$105,000,000. It came over to the Senate and, of course, you extravagant Senators increased the amount over the House appropriation.

Those are the things which the Republican leaders now are claiming in their speeches as achievements of the Republican Party.

I imagine that up in Boston last night the distinguished Senator had a splendid crowd. If I read the papers correctly, a lot of persons up there have nothing now to do but go out and listen to political speeches. The textile plants are closed down, industries have ceased to operate, wages are being daily cut, and thousands of unemployed thrown upon the tender mercies of their communities. The last count I saw showed that forty or fifty thousand men were thrown out in one day and the

wages of others were reduced. So I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts had a lot of unemployed last night listening to him speak.

This morning I received a letter from away out in Utah. I wish the Senator from Utah were here, because the man who wrote this letter is a wise fellow. I am not unmindful that there is every kind of propaganda being sent out to make the people believe normalcy has come about and that we have some kind of prosperity. I do not know how much money has been spent, and I do not know from what source it comes, but there is a well-ordered propaganda now throughout the country to delude the people and create a false impression as to present conditions. They have erected prosperity signs, somewhat like the "wobble and wiggle" signs used during the campaign. They have converted that "wobble and wiggle" sign of President Harding and Candidate Coolidge into signs bearing the slogan "Prosperity is here," or "Prosperity around the corner," trying to make the people believe it.

This good fellow wrote me this letter from Salt Lake City, and he says he is a Republican. He states in the letter:

Dozens of billboards in Salt Lake City have been placarded with numerous posters telling us that prosperity is just 'round the corner.

Senators have seen them.

And some wag possessed with considerable humor composed a short poem.

This is the poem:

THE BILLBOARD ON THE STREET.

Mark Hanna gave the dinner pail  
That made us feel so fine;  
Theodore used the big stick  
To keep us all in line;  
But Harding, in his great wisdom,  
Has outdone all such feats,  
He's given us prosperity  
On billboards on our streets.

A quick return to "normalcy"  
The thing he's striving at,  
And if we'll tighten up our belts,  
Some time he'll make us fat,  
Instead of the old dinner pail,  
Full of good things to eat,  
He'll serve us with prosperity  
On billboards on the street.

For many years I served you  
As puppet and as tool,  
But this last stunt has wised me up,  
No more a silly fool.  
I may be a poor workingman,  
My clothes are far from neat,  
But you can't fool me with prosperity  
On a billboard on the street.

I dedicate that poem to the present administration as the one great achievement the distinguished Senators who spoke yesterday failed to recount.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator said this man was a Republican?

Mr. HARRISON. He says so.

Mr. CARAWAY. Was he bragging or confessing when he said that?

Mr. HARRISON. He was commiserating. They do not brag any more. If the distinguished Senator who spoke yesterday had gone to places up in the State of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], where so many men have been thrown out of employment, or had gone to any of the industrial centers throughout the country, or had visited Kansas or Iowa, where the farmers are now receiving around 25 cents a bushel for corn, and a small price for wheat, and nothing scarcely for live stock, and made a speech bragging about that 7,000,000 majority they received at the last election, he would not have lasted as long as a celluloid cat in the fiery regions of Hades.

We do not hear much of that enormous majority now. We heard them for a while bragging about it, but no more. De-luded Republicans want to forget it, and innocent, independent progressives abhor the thought. And Democrats—well, those who strayed, they are sick and melancholy.

For the distinguished Senator from Illinois to throw his slurs at the Democratic standard bearer in that campaign is unbecoming and showed him to be a poor sport. Gov. Cox made a great fight, a game fight. No crusader ever engaged in a more noble and higher cause, and no campaign in the history of this Government was ever waged in a cleaner and manlier way, with less apologies or excuses over the results. Yes; the verdict was against us, but there never was a verdict returned by a patriotic people filled with more fraud than the one rendered in November, 1920, and the only persons who have a right to say that there was a verdict in that campaign against the League of Nations are those men who were consistent from the beginning to the end against any League of Nations.

Of course Senators like the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] were in an atmosphere which led them to believe that all the votes for the Republican ticket were against any League of Nations; but how can Senators like the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] or the leader of the Republicans in this Chamber have the audacity to go before the people now and say the verdict was along that line? The President of the United States in his message the other day harped on that, too.

The world has been hungering for a better relationship for centuries since it obtained its larger consciousness. The conception of the League of Nations was a response to a manifest world hunger.

So said the President of the United States. He was for it. He led the people to believe that he was for it. He voted at least twice for the League of Nations with reservations. The American people had a right to believe, on the record which he made in the Senate, that he was still for a League of Nations, in one form or another.

The President went further—

Whatever its fate, whether it achieves the great things hoped for or comes to supersede or to failure, the American unwillingness to be a part of it has been expressed.

"The American unwillingness to become a part of it has been expressed." Distinguished Senators who now sit before me will not forget that because of their speeches against the League of Nations idea, certain elements within the Republican Party thought you were doing injury to your party, that you were driving votes of the proleaguers within the Republican Party away from Harding and Coolidge, and for a while there was a cessation of activities on the part of you orators—you who had been speaking with eloquence and force and enthusiasm against the league.

Those activities were not renewed until candidate Harding went to Des Moines and made the speech which surprised the whole country. But he got away from it the next day, and then it was that he came forth with his statement which I wish to read at this time so the RECORD will show the true facts, to show that the hypocrisy of the administration now is in keeping with the deceit which was practiced in the campaign. There has not been a single promise made by the administration as a pre-convention pledge that has been kept. I admire consistency. If the campaign had been fought out on the question of a league or no league, and your standard bearers and party had taken that position, then well and good to live up to it. But it is unbecoming in men, in high places though they may be, to win public office on certain promises and as soon as they get in to break them.

Here is what the President said following the Des Moines speech:

Let me restate my position as explicitly as my power of words permits. \* \* \* I am in favor of a world association—call it what you will, the name is of slight consequence—that will discourage or tend to prevent war and that will encourage or tend to encourage a better understanding among the nations of the earth. The old order of things is done with, not only in America but throughout the world, and the United States, always quick with sympathy, always just and usually led by common sense, must play its part in this new order.

And thereupon an ex-President of the Republican Party, Mr. Taft, who had been one of the great advocates and champions of the league of nations idea, gave out a statement on August 9 in which he said:

I wish to have as many Republican Senators as possible stand by President Harding in the policy to which I believe the circumstances will lead him of obtaining such an amendment of the present league as will retain the great benefits which the covenant without article 10 will confer on the world.

Then the leaders of the Republican Party who had stood for a league of nations, but who were about to get away from Harding and Coolidge and the Republican Party in that campaign because of the activities against the league of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and other Senators, came out in a written appeal to the proleague Republicans throughout the country to stand by the Republican ticket and to vote for Harding for President, that the best way to get into the League of Nations was through the election of Harding. It was signed by distinguished men of your party, men who now assist in controlling the destiny of the country. Who were they?

Hughes. He had stood for the league. He was aroused because of the activities of the Senator from California and the Senator from Idaho.

Hoover. He is now Secretary of Commerce. He was indignant, and after Candidate Harding made that speech saying he was for an association, call it what you will, league, association, or what not, Mr. Hoover traveled all the way to California and addressed some college out there, in which address he ap-

pealed to the proleague Republicans and independents to vote for the Republican ticket, saying that it would hasten our entrance into the League of Nations. Let me refresh your memory as to the signed statement of those 31 distinguished leaders within the Republican Party. They said:

The undersigned—

That is Taft, that is Root, that is Hoover, that is Hughes, and 27 others who now apparently are against any League of Nations whatsoever. Oh, I say to the Senator from California, and his colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], you certainly brought the leaders of the Republican Party into line. They did not believe you at first, but their wobbling and wiggling, their vacillating and halting policy and deportment has brought them to your way of thinking. That is all right. I have no fault to find with them, but I dislike to see men high in the councils of the party or the affections of the people, leaders in the country, who will win the votes of the people by promising one thing before the election and doing another thing after the election. It is as reprehensible as denying a personal obligation to which you had affixed your signature.

The undersigned—

Said this remarkable document—

The undersigned, who desire that the United States shall do her full part in association with the other civilized nations to prevent war, have earnestly considered how we may contribute most effectively to that end by our votes in the coming election.

The question between the candidates is not whether our country shall join in such an association. It is whether we shall join under an agreement containing the exact provisions negotiated by President Wilson at Paris or under an agreement which omits or modifies some of those provisions that are very objectionable to great numbers of the American people.

Mr. Harding said in his speech of August 28:

There are distinctly two types of international relationship. One is an offensive and defensive alliance of great powers. \* \* \* The other type is a society of free nations or an association of free nations or a league of free nations, animated by considerations of right and justice instead of might and self-interest, and not merely proclaimed an agency in pursuit of peace but so organized and participated in as to make the actual attainment of peace a reasonable possibility. Such an association I favor with all my heart, and I would make no fine distinctions as to whom credit is due. One need not care what it is called. Let it be an association, a society, or a league, or what not. Our concern is solely with the substance, not the form thereof.

Mr. Harding has since repeatedly reaffirmed the declarations of this speech in the most positive terms.

The question accordingly is not between a league and no league, but is whether certain provisions in the proposed league agreement shall be accepted unchanged or shall be changed.

The contest is not about the principle of a league of nations, but it is about the method of most effectively applying that principle to preserve peace.

If the proposed changes in the Paris agreement were capacious or without substantial ground, one might question the sincerity of their advocates. This, however, is not the case.

We have reached the conclusion that the true course to bring America into an effective league to preserve peace is not by insisting with Mr. Cox upon the acceptance of such a provision as article 10, thus prolonging the unfortunate situation created by Mr. Wilson's insistence upon that article, but by frankly calling upon the other nations to agree to changes in the proposed agreement which will obviate this vital objection and other objections less the subject of dispute. The Republican Party is bound by every consideration of good faith to pursue such a course until the declared object is attained.

For this course we can look only to the Republican Party and its candidate; the Democratic Party and Mr. Cox are bound not to follow it.

The conditions of Europe make it essential that the stabilizing effect of the treaty already made between the European powers shall not be lost by them and that the necessary changes be made by changing the terms of the treaty rather than by beginning entirely anew.

That course Mr. Harding is willing to follow, for he said in his speech of August 28:

"I would take and combine all that is good and excise all that is bad from both organizations (the court and the league). This statement is broad enough to include the suggestion that, if the league which has heretofore riveted our considerations and apprehensions has been so entwined and interwoven into the peace of Europe that its good must be preserved in order to stabilize the peace of that continent, then it can be amended or revised so that we may still have a remnant of the world's aspirations in 1913 build into the world's highest conception of helpful cooperation in the ultimate realization."

We therefore believe that we can most effectively advance the cause of international cooperation to promote peace by supporting Mr. Harding for election to the Presidency.

Thus it was that the election was won, and yet the distinguished President of the United States in his message to the Senate the other day said that—

The American unwillingness to be a part of it has been expressed.

How does he know, except that he should follow what he promised the people in his campaign? Oh, they were so afraid in the disarmament conference that they would step into the track of the League of Nations. They shied away from it just as a wild mule shies along the road. They needed a blind bridle throughout the conference. That has been the attitude

of the administration from the beginning up to this good hour. That is what is damning the administration. It is because you have no settled policy, you have no program to follow. You are doing absolutely nothing. The President of the United States is so afraid, and you know it, that he might wean from him and his party some of the men within the Republican Party that he is always trying to compromise on something. If I had promised the American people that I would stand for some plan, whether an association or a league, I would go through with it. I would not be frightened because I might bring down upon my head the reproach of certain eloquent, forceful, militant, and aggressive Senators.

The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] yesterday talked about the disarmament conference as an achievement of the administration. He laid great stress upon it. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] did the same thing. I suppose every orator who goes out to speak for the party in the coming campaign will claim that as one of the great achievements of the party. Ah, Mr. President, there was one admission in the President's message to the Senate the other day that is very true. "Modest"—that was the term of affection applied to him yesterday by the Senator from Illinois. The Senator said President Harding was modest in his claims about the disarmament conference and the part he had played in it.

Do you recall a few weeks ago when Hughes's name was being heralded far and wide, when praise was being extended to him by men in every political party, when he was receiving the plaudits of mankind throughout the world for the courageous speech he had made at the opening of the disarmament conference? There then seemed to develop a little feeling of jealousy among certain leaders in the disarmament conference and at the other end of the Avenue. Then one morning there emanated from the White House a statement, carried everywhere by the Associated Press, that the proposal which was made by Secretary Hughes at the opening of the disarmament conference was not at all the proposal of Secretary Hughes, but was conceived by President Harding while he—and I presume our friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] accompanying him on that trip—glided peacefully and serenely down the beautiful waters of the Potomac. Just as the *Mayflower* glided into some pleasant nook, the President was writing away, and he wrote this proposal with his own hand and pencil. That was the propaganda, that was the modest part that he played in this disarmament conference. So in his speech the other day he said this:

Here—

He was then talking about the Senate—

Here was a beginning on your advice, no matter when conceived, and the program was enlarged only because assurances of tranquillity were deemed the appropriate concomitants of the great experiment in arms limitation.

So I am glad and delighted that the President, in his modest way, has told the country that "here in the Senate the movement for a limitation of armament was begun." It is well that he did so; and yet the Republican leader in his speech last night to the unemployed in Boston, as well as the Senator from Illinois on this floor, claims it as the great achievement of the administration.

Oh, will Senators forget how the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], following the introduction of his resolution for a Conference on Limitation of Armament, fought here for days and for weeks and for months to have it brought out of committee and pressed through the Senate? Will they forget how every Democratic member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate voted to report his resolution favorably, as well as a like resolution of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and how every Republican Senator in the Naval Affairs Committee voted against reporting the resolution?

The same thing happened in the House of Representatives. Word had come down the line to the majority members of the Naval Affairs Committee in that body not to report out the resolution. Such a resolution was not passed until the President sent word to the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], to allow the resolution to trickle through.

The disarmament conference was due to the sentiment which had been crystallized in this country through the magnificent fight which was waged by the distinguished Senator from Idaho, aided and abetted at every step by a solid minority of Democratic Senators. The idea was not original with the Senator from Idaho, neither was it original with the Senator from Montana. The first concrete proposition looking toward disarmament was found in article 8 of the League of Nations covenant, placed there by the man whom the Senator from Massachusetts

has criticized and maligned. However, the country is gradually waking up; it is beginning to learn the real facts. Generally when the Senator from Massachusetts gets right it is when he has reversed his former position and adopted the policy that was advocated by ex-President Wilson.

I shall not minimize the results of the disarmament conference. God knows I wish it had accomplished more than it did; but the disarmament conference in many respects brought much benefit to America; I speak primarily of the naval holiday program. I hope that will be effective, and that it will mean a great saving to the taxpayers of the country. However, Mr. President, I would suggest the thought that, not from the time the disarmament conference met to the time it closed has it failed to receive the united, whole-hearted cooperation of the Democrats both in the other House and in the Senate. There has never been a voice of criticism from this side raised against it. We have wished it well; we have tried to cooperate with Senators on the other side.

How different was the situation when the American delegation was at Paris trying to settle the great problems following the World War and to write a treaty of peace! Why, sirs, there was organized in this body a movement even to dispatch couriers with speeches made here against what that conference was about to do. Round robins were prepared, Senators' signatures were procured, ultimatums were issued in the effort to destroy the influence of the American delegation at Paris. How did the minority in this body and in the other House act while the great disarmament conference was in session here in Washington?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARRIS. In connection with the reference of the Senator concerning the embarrassment caused by leaders of the majority party in the Senate during the deliberations at the Paris peace conference, I desire to say, if the Senator will allow me, that I happened to be in Paris for several weeks during that conference, and the newspapers daily quoted Republican Senators and others in prominent position in that party in criticism of the action of the American delegation to such an extent that I did not believe it; I thought it was propaganda and gave an interview to the Paris papers stating that it was not true. Not until I returned to the United States did I believe, or would I believe, that men in responsible positions had gone so far in embarrassing the President of the United States who was trying to formulate a treaty by which peace would be brought about between this country and the German Empire. I had hoped that such bitter partisanship was a thing of the past.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, Mr. President. Throughout the conference at Paris the American delegation were hampered; they were embarrassed in every imaginable way. Senators in the majority in this Chamber defeated the treaty. Whether it will ever be an issue in America again I do not know; but I do know that the Republican majority has found themselves constantly in a very bad predicament since the 4th day of March, when they went into office, because they did not ratify the treaty when it was submitted. I know also that even though we were promised by President Harding some kind of an association or an arrangement—call it league or what not—to preserve the peace of the world, we have been waiting for almost 15 months and the plan is not yet born. The Disarmament Conference was the outgrowth of the League of Nations covenant included in the treaty of Versailles. So this administration can not claim it as an achievement.

We have heard a great deal said about foreign entanglements, and yet the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], who has harped more against foreign entanglements than anyone here, yesterday rose and advocated the four-power pact. The administration have been observing what has been going on across the water; they are afraid even to participate in conferences over there. They sent George Harvey over to Cannes, but the administration has not decided as yet whether or not we are going to be represented at the Genoa conference. How long it takes the head of this administration to fix upon a policy! How long it takes him to decide just what he is going to do!

The same tardiness, the same indecision, that has marked the President's course in other matters is attending it now in connection with the so-called soldiers' bonus; but he has sympathy from the majority party in Congress on that; they do not know what to do either; the Republican Party have promised so many different things about the bonus that they do not know exactly "where they are at."

Let us hope, Mr. President, that this isolated policy, this do-nothing program of the administration, will spur itself up, so that we may begin to take our part and our responsibility in

world affairs. Let it be hoped that a decision will very soon be reached that a delegation from this Government shall go to Genoa, there to help solve the great economic problems that are pressing upon the world; and if we should send a delegation there, let us hope that it will be composed of men of high caliber and not of some fellows of whom the country never heard. Let it be a delegation such as represented the American Government at the Disarmament Conference recently held in Washington.

The people are tired of observing. I never admired a spy in my life; I never trusted one at all, and history has revealed that spies are a very bad lot of fellows; yet this administration insists on sending to conferences abroad not participants to act but observers to spy on the proceedings and let us know what they are doing.

Mr. President, in the speeches delivered yesterday by the two distinguished leaders of the Republican Party when they said that Congress has passed more beneficial legislation during this Congress than during any other 20 years in the history of the Government they failed to specify what legislation was passed or what they were talking about; and so I submit that the country is not fooled at all.

It was well and good that the Senator from Massachusetts should have apologized in his speech last night for the revenue bill, because, if the majority leaders have been quoted correctly, very soon they will bring in a supplemental revenue bill. Why did not the two Senators on yesterday, in preparing this campaign textbook, tell about the failure to pass the tariff bill that you said was going to help the industries of the country?

Three years we have waited for the passage of that legislation, and still the bill sleeps in the Finance Committee of the Senate. No one knows when it will pass. No one knows what kind of a bill it will be when it comes out. There is dissension over there, a lack of policy, a dearth of program. So I am wondering, when these distinguished spokesmen of the party tell about the "achievements of the administration," why they do not specify the legislation they have in mind.

You can not fool the American people. They know that you are frittering away time here, that you are not able or competent to meet the great problems that are confronting this Congress; and yet the distinguished leader on the other side on last night at Boston said in his speech that—

The Democrats, by every artifice of delay and time wasting, have done their best to make this Congress a "do-nothing body."

Cite one instance when the Democratic minority in this body have failed to cooperate with you in any effort to expedite the passage of wholesome legislation here. Of course you do not stay in the Chamber, while this side is always crowded with its Members, and we have to help you do it; but we have never delayed you. We have never frittered away time. We have tried to help you solve these problems; and I do not know what you would have done if some of the suggestions that have come from this side had not been accepted by the other side. If you would listen to us more and follow our suggestions more often, you would get along better. The only piece of legislation that can be claimed by this Congress as one of a constructive nature is the amendment to the War Finance Corporation act, and yet that was passed not because of this administration, but in spite of the opposition of this administration.

Why, your leaders opposed it at first. Senator NORRIS in his first endeavor to arouse your interest was only rebuked by you, and in the end two Democratic Senators and one Republican composed the subcommittee that wrote the bill that passed. And if we had not fought here, day in and day out, to force it upon you, you never would have passed that piece of legislation. So I hope it never again will be said that the Democrats are trying to delay anything.

The same policy, so far as the minority is concerned, will govern its action touching legislation resulting from the Disarmament Conference. It will be discussed fully, and before it passes we will know everything that happened behind the closed doors of the Disarmament Conference; but we want to expedite the matter. We want the country to know where it is "at." We are going to assist you to write your record so that in the next campaign the very first chance the folks get at you we are sure they will condemn you.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to defend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. He is perfectly able to take care of himself; nor is it my purpose to defend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. For the sake of accuracy, however, I want to state for the Record what the records of the Appropriations Committee and of Congress show in regard to appropriations and in regard to deficiencies.

I have just sent out for the statement of the Senator from Mississippi in regard to the deficiency appropriations. It has not been sent in yet; but my recollection is that the Senator

said that only a few thousand dollars had been appropriated for deficiencies during the time the Democrats were in power.

Mr. HARRISON. No; I said that the largest deficiency bill I recalled that the Democrats had passed before the war was \$35,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me call the Senator's attention to two or three.

In 1915 the deficiency bill was \$27,000,000.

In 1916 it was \$12,000,000.

Before that the deficiencies were smaller, and they kept growing during the war.

The last year before the war the deficiencies amounted to \$68,000,000.

In 1918 they jumped to \$8,000,000,000.

In 1919 they amounted to \$4,000,000,000, giving the round numbers.

Then in 1920 they dropped to \$1,141,000,000.

In 1921 they dropped to \$486,000,000.

I just want the Record to show these figures, so that the Senator may know that he has been giving figures here without any regard to what the facts show.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not think there is any difference between the Senator and myself. I stated that the deficiency appropriations were larger than ever before since the Republicans came in, and that before the war the Democrats, so far as I recall, had never in any one bill appropriated over \$35,000,000 for deficiencies. The Senator has given certain figures. According to his figures, the most that was carried in any one bill was \$16,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Sixty-eight million dollars.

Mr. HARRISON. Sixty-eight million dollars was the total, as I understand the Senator. I said in any one bill there was not over \$35,000,000. The Senator says it was \$68,000,000 at one Congress. That was in all of the bills. Three hundred and fifty million dollars has already been appropriated by this Congress in deficiencies.

Mr. CURTIS. Every deficiency appropriation that has been passed by this Congress and the last came about as the result of the management of the offices by the Democratic administration. Not one of them is traceable to this administration yet. This administration has been in control for only a year.

Mr. HARRISON. You have about ruined things in that time.

Mr. CURTIS. The country, under the policy adopted by the Republican Party, will be in better condition than it ever has been before.

Mr. HARRISON. Let us hope so.

Mr. CURTIS. To-day the shut-down mills, the idle workmen, can charge it all to the Democratic Party. The Simmons-Underwood tariff bill has done more to close the mills in this country than anything else that has happened in many, many years, and if it had not been for the war—

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

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Underwood-Simmons bill wrought these great injuries, and the Senator's party have had control of both Houses of Congress for three years, why in the name of common sense have they not done something to remedy the situation?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Mississippi knows well that until the 4th of last March a Democratic President was in office and that he would have vetoed any tariff bill sent to him. He also knows that the emergency tariff bill that was passed by the Republican Congress to help out the then emergency situation was vetoed by President Wilson. All this talk about "two years" is nonsense, and the Senator from Mississippi knows it.

Now, let us see what is the reduction in appropriations below the estimates.

For 1922 the records show that there was appropriated \$1,484,217,465 below the estimates. I judge that that is what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said; and when the Senator from Mississippi gets the corrected remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts he probably will find out that what was printed in the paper was not accurate.

As I say, I did not get up to reply to the political harangue of the Senator from Mississippi. The records will speak for themselves; and I submit that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that the Senators on the other side of the aisle have taken up much more time in useless and unnecessary discussion than has been taken up on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, my good friend the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] speaks about "political harangues" coming from this side. This is supposed to be a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. We determine by political discussions who shall occupy seats in this body—that is, we used to do that. We have had a sample, recently, of a precedent that money shall decide who shall sit in this body, when seats shall be bartered to the highest bidder; but by political discussions we educate the people of the country as to what the situation is with regard to the Government, and the policies that should control the Government, and the policies that do control the Government.

I am not astonished that Senators on the other side should undertake to suppress political discussions in this body. They must be weary of having their attention called to the miserable conduct of Congress under the leadership of the Republican Party. If my party had conducted the Government as it has been conducted for the last 10 months under Republican rule, I should not want to hear the opposition discuss the political issues.

Mr. President, it is plain now that this campaign is to be conducted by the other side along camouflaging lines. Smoke screens are to be thrown up, deceptive situations are to be created, in order to deceive the American people as to what is really going on here at the Nation's Capital.

Republican leaders will go out and make a speech to the effect that an estimate was made of so many billions, and they cut that down and saved a billion or two billions. It is very easy to whisper into the ear of a Republican officeholder a suggestion that it will not do any harm for him to make a large estimate, so that when they get ready to appropriate they will cut down some of that estimate, which never was intended in fact to be enacted into law, and go to the country with a flourish of trumpets and say, "Behold, we have saved a billion dollars! That is what the Republican Party has accomplished in 12 months' time!"

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. Let me ask the Senator if the estimates to which allusion has been made were not the estimates transmitted to Congress by Democratic Secretaries of the Treasury under the last administration?

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not so understand it. I have not seen that estimate. I did not hear the part of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi in which he referred to that; but I am speaking about what is going on now under Republican leadership and control. Estimates for expenses in war times were much larger, of course, than they should be in peace times.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to suggest, we have now the Budget submitted by the President, and the estimates are no longer transmitted by the Secretaries.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has pointed out that by an economic administration of the affairs of this Government over \$400,000,000 could be saved other than that which you have provided for in appropriation even under the Budget system.

But I was starting out to say that it is plain to my mind, and it is plain to everyone, that the Republican Party intends to conduct the next campaign along camouflaging lines. They want to go and say: "We have done this and we have done that. Sound your trumpets; unfurl your campaign banners; on with the march. Behold the printed stories about what we say we have done." The substance of the thing will not be there. What has it done? It has done nothing. The only bill of any consequence that Congress has passed which has benefited any considerable number of people was the bill reviving the War Finance Corporation, the passage of which was brought about purely and wholly by a combination of southern Democrats and western Republicans. I suggested to a western Senator that if the western Republican Senators would join with the Democratic Senators from the South we could pass the bill reviving the War Finance Corporation.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, in that connection let me remind the Senator that months ago I offered a resolution in the Senate, and had it referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, requesting the President of the United States to remove Gov. W. P. G. Harding from the Federal Reserve Board, and the Republican Committee on Banking and Currency refuses to take any action one way or the other.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is a sample of what is going on here. Here a Senator from a great sovereign State of this Union comes and levels charges against the head of the Reserve Board, who

has been thoroughly discredited long since, the man in charge of the money supply and the credit of a hundred million people, and a committee of the Senate, which is controlled by the Republican Party, refuses even to consider a resolution to take from the leadership of that board a man whose conduct has shown him to be the subservient tool of Wall Street.

The Republicans will not get very far with this camouflaging business. We may not have the newspapers, but we will go out amongst the people and storm every stronghold in the Republic before the fall election. The people shall know the truth.

The Federal Reserve Board here in Washington with its large publicity fund gets busy whenever a Senator rises and assails its deflation policy, and it carries on a propaganda to counteract the influence of what he says when he was fighting to save his Nation from the dangers which threaten it.

The people are entitled to know these things. The press is largely in the hands of the big moneyed interests. It is a pitiable condition we have to face. Seven million people are out of employment, and the Republican Party comes in with the camouflaging statement, "We have reduced the number to 6,000,000, we have reduced it to 5,000,000." Where are they who tramp the streets of this great Republic of the West, crying out for work that they may live?

They say they have reduced the number; that they now have employment. Where are they employed? Around the corner, it is said. When you go around the corner, they are not there. They take a poor, unfortunate man who has been out of employment for weeks and weeks and give him a day's work this week and a day's work next week and say they are now giving him employment. They have done nothing of the kind. Those men are still out of employment. Six or seven millions of people who want work can not find employment.

Many factories are standing still. Labor is unemployed. Agriculture is prone upon the ground, under the blighting touch of the Republican administration. Yet they stand up here in the face of the dreadful conditions that are upon the country and boast of what they say they are doing for the American people.

Mr. President, no bill of any consequence to the masses of the people can get through this body unless it is O. K'd by Wall Street. That is the situation, and we might just as well tell the truth about it. No bill which affects the control of the money supply of this country, when the South and the West are prostrate, can get through this Chamber without the O. K. of Wall Street.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama will suspend while the Senate receives a message from the President of the United States.

[A message from the President of the United States was transmitted to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.]

Mr. HEFLIN. These messages are refreshing. It is very pleasing to receive them, but we want some proof now that something is going to be done for the benefit of the American people. We can not get a fair settlement for the soldiers who carried the flag to victory; we can not get any help for agriculture, which is the corner stone of all other industries; we can not get any money in circulation for the business needs of the land—and still we love to hear from the President. We love to have these messages. If this message had come on yesterday, I would have known it was a valentine.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that no bill could pass unless O. K'd by Wall Street.

Mr. HEFLIN. I mean any bill in the interest of the masses.

Mr. BURSUM. I also understood the Senator to say that the War Finance Corporation bill was a good bill. I desire to ask the Senator if that bill was O. K'd by Wall Street?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not at all.

Mr. BURSUM. Then there are some exceptions.

Mr. HEFLIN. There are exceptions; because the Democrats and the western Republicans got together and forced the passage of that bill. I am talking about the Republican part of the Senate. It is impossible for a bill which affects the people of this country to pass the Republican Congress, the Republican part of it, which is not O. K'd by the big moneyed interests of this country whose headquarters are located in Wall Street.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HEFLIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator has called attention to the passage of the War Finance Corporation bill. I know the Senator from Alabama will remember that the leader of the majority [Mr. LODGE] moved to adjourn early in the summer, and if that motion had not been defeated by those who did not agree with him, there would have been none of this legislation which the Senator from New Mexico and others are bragging about.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is absolutely true; and we would have adjourned had it not been for the Democratic votes cast in this body, as the RECORD will show. So that Congress would have gone, the Senate would have adjourned, but for the little handful of Democrats who, Spartan like, fought the time-serving leaders of the other side to the death, and who are going to continue to do that, and who are going to drive them out of the House this fall.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, do Democrats cast more than one vote each in this body?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; they do not.

Mr. BURSUM. There are only 36 Democratic Senators. Do they cast more than 36 votes?

Mr. HEFLIN. Our tribe will be increased this fall.

Mr. BURSUM. There are 96 votes in the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. BURSUM. Is 36 a majority of 96?

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator fails to tell the Senate and the country that there are always 25 or 30 Republican Senators absent. There are 25 or 30 Senators on the other side always away. They are not here now. They are drawing their salaries, but they are attending to their private business at home. Some of them are down in Florida now, fanning themselves as they stroll upon the snow-white sands on the Florida beach.

Mr. BURSUM. Perhaps there are a few of them here. The roll calls and the record votes will not bear out the statement of the Senator, however. In relation to the War Finance Corporation bill, which the Senator so heartily approved, in which I agree with him, permit me to call the attention of the Senator—

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not yield for a speech.

Mr. BURSUM. To the fact that it was upon this rostrum that President Harding appeared and requested the passage of the War Finance Corporation bill, and shortly thereafter the bill was passed and became a law. Was that brought about by the influence of the Democratic Party?

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not yield to the Senator to make a speech. I do not blame him for wanting to say something when this awful indictment is read against the bosses of his party, but I assert again that the War Finance Corporation would never have been revived but for a coalition between the southern Democrats and western Republicans.

Mr. CARAWAY. Not including the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEFLIN. And I do not believe the Senator from New Mexico was a party to that arrangement.

I said a little while ago that there were always 25 or 30 Republican Senators absent. I challenge the Senator to take the roll calls for two weeks back and show me over 50 or 51 Senators answering to their names, and there are 96 Members of this body.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, let me remind the Senator from Alabama that more than once when an important bill was on its passage here Senators who were absent from the other side had to be telegraphed for, and a request was made from the other side to this for us to vote as soon as possible so that they could get away again.

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly, Mr. President. This jack-o'-my-lantern business that is being carried on down here is going to be carried to the people.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator is not really complaining because the Senators on the other side are absent. I think it is in the aid of good Government for them to go to Florida.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not fall out with my friend about that.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, that would be all right if, after we release them and they go away, they stay away.

Mr. HEFLIN. We are going to fix it so that some of them can stay away after the next fall election.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I am delighted to yield, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the only paper we can talk for which goes amongst the people and in which they can read what we say.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator think of any real, constructive, beneficial piece of legislation, beneficial to the people of this country, except such as the revival of the War Finance Corporation and the Senate amendments to the present revenue act regarding surtaxes? This legislation was passed by cooperation between the Democrats and that element in the Republican Party which we characterize either as progressive or constituting what is known as the agricultural bloc.

I will ask the Senator, further, if this particular piece of legislation, which he says is doing so much good in the country now—the War Finance Corporation act—a piece of legislation which has helped toward saving the agricultural industry in this country from ruin and absolute bankruptcy, could possibly have been passed but for the votes of the Democratic Party, supplemented by the insurgent vote of the Republican Party?

Mr. HEFLIN. It would not have been possible, Mr. President.

Mr. SIMMONS. I believe the Senator has referred to the fact that we have had no legislation in the interest of the farmer, although we had been in session five or six months, although the friends of the farmers in this body were pressing for legislation, and we were about to adjourn and go home for a solid month, with the statement that when we got back the time would be barely sufficient to pass the revenue and the tariff bills which it was proposed to pass during the extraordinary session, and in that situation, if the real friends of the people of this country on both sides of the Chamber, on this side and on the other side alike, had not combined and fought against and defeated that proposition of adjournment for one month, would we have passed the legislation establishing the War Finance Corporation?

Mr. HEFLIN. I agree with the Senator entirely that we would not.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator knows, if he will pardon me, that the leader on the other side of the Chamber had arranged for an adjournment, the stage was set, and it was supposed that the plan was going through without any serious opposition; but right at the time when it was proposed to adjourn, Senators upon this side of the Chamber led in a fight to hold Congress in session until something had been done for agriculture, and they were joined by a sufficient number on the other side of the Chamber, who felt the same deep interest in the farmer that we felt, to keep Congress here. As the result of that action, we have this beneficial legislation.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is true, Mr. President.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I merely wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM], who so valiantly defended his party, has evidently packed his bag and gone also.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; and I think we will thin them out considerably this fall. Senators who go home and stay at home while the Senate is in session, unless detained by sickness, ought to be permitted to stay there permanently. They ought not to be bothered by having to come back here. I remember the other day when you had up the proposition to take away from the American Congress the right to handle the indebtedness of foreign countries owing this Government about \$11,000,000,000, principal and interest, and the Senate was trying to determine what it would do about collecting that debt, and a great many of us were insisting that we proceed to collect some of it until we could at least be just to the soldiers who saved the Nation, we saw the Republican Party, under the whip and spur of their leadership, bring in a measure to take it away from the people's Congress and turn it over to five commissioners to be named by the President, to take the whole thing over and postpone the interest down through the future years and postpone the payment of that foreign indebtedness in order that Wall Street might collect the \$5,000,000,000 due from these same countries. I saw you bring in those same Senators. They came in and seated themselves for a while and, when their names were called, voted to take this matter out of the hands of Congress and turn it over to a commission, just as Wall Street wanted it done.

And now they are gone again. Of course, you can get them here whenever a measure comes in that affects the big interests. They come and they vote as the big bosses suggest, and then they return to their native habitat. That is what we see going on here. If a measure comes up like putting a farmer on the Federal Reserve Board, you bring them in. All of the forces are marshaled then.

They caused you to strike the word "farmer" from the amendment, with the promise from the President that he would put a farmer upon the board; and yet you permitted it to state in the law that two bankers should be on the board. Why this discrimination against the farmers of America? Why not write it in the law that one shall be a farmer? Is the farmer to be an outcast, and stand like an outpost of winter, shunned and scorned by the Republican administration? This man with the hoe, upon whose back is the burden of the world; this man who produces that which feeds and clothes the world—why is he not entitled by the administration to have his name written

into the law, so that he could sit in judgment upon the matter of controlling the money supply and credits of the country when it is up for consideration?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I beg to remind the Senator from Alabama that the man who will probably have more influence than any other in the extension of this enormous foreign debt is holding his office in violation of a law passed by the very first Congress that ever assembled. Mr. Secretary Mellon, who will act on that commission, is holding his office in violation of law, and could on any day that we saw fit be impeached, and could on any day that anybody swore out a warrant against him be arrested and sent to the penitentiary.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I did not know that. The Secretary of the Treasury is a very, very wealthy man. I am not falling out with any man for having wealth. I like to see a man acquire a fair share of this world's goods. I like to see him enterprising and industrious, but I do not like to see the governmental machinery of my country operated to the advantage of the few and to the hurt and injury of the many.

I have seen the farmers of my country go out and work harder than ever to make the biggest crop they ever produced and then sell it for less than they got for a crop half its size. That is not encouraging industry and enterprise in the citizen. That is putting a penalty upon industry and enterprise. Yet, if a man serves special interests and gains favor with the Republican Party, the Government is used to turn money into his coffers, and the many are fleeced in order that the few may flourish.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I think the Senator from Alabama was present when I referred to the law of 1789 as it appears now in section 243 of the Revised Statutes, which declares in substance that no man shall be Secretary of the Treasury of the United States or Comptroller of the Currency who is engaged in any commerce or business. Upon that very clause President Grant withdrew the name of A. T. Stewart, whom he had appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury without knowing that this law was in existence. Mr. Mellon is disqualified to hold the office of Secretary of the Treasury, and he violates this penal law every day that he does hold it.

Mr. HEFLIN. We are slowly but surely disclosing the situation. I think before the fall elections come we will be able to reach the people with a good many things that they never would know from reading the big, camouflaged headlines of subsidized newspapers.

The power of the purse is a wonderful power in politics, and it has been recognized by the Republican Party recently. You have openly invited its poisonous participation in politics. It makes barter of the ballot, and yet the Republican Senate just a few days ago indorsed the sale of a seat in this body. What more do the corrupt money interests want than to have you confirm the sale of seats that they buy? They want to control this body permanently. What do they care about who controls the House if they have a majority in this body that will do their bidding? They have a majority here to-day that will do it. You have 169 majority in the House and 24 majority in the Senate, and yet the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], or some other Senator on the other side of the aisle, stands up and talks about the Democrats killing time. If we did not call attention to what is going on here, we would be unfaithful, we would not be worthy to occupy seats in this body.

Why should I keep silent when I see forces put into operation that mean the ruin of my country? Why should I keep quiet when I see policies pursued that bring distress and disaster to business amongst the common masses? Why should I remain silent and let this machinery work on and on when I know that it means ruin to legitimate business in my country? It is my duty to talk about it. I am as much of a soldier in this body as the soldier on the firing line in France. There were great issues at stake there. There are great issues at stake here.

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and it is the duty of those who have taken the oath at the altar place of this Chamber to be faithful and to point out the evils that exist, and to make suggestions as to remedies. It is our duty to do it, and as long as I am able to talk I am going to battle upon this floor for the principles of right and justice and do my duty as

I see it. I am trying to do something of value for the people whose Government this is. I do not propose to recognize the right of Wall Street to dictate the policies of Congress. I do not propose to say that Wall Street is right when she wants the Government of a hundred million people to postpone the payment of \$11,000,000,000 due to it while Wall Street collects a private debt of \$5,000,000,000. I do not propose to sanction the policy that denies to the soldiers who wore the uniform to save my country's life in the hour of its peril a fair and just settlement at the hands of the Government they love.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. The law to which I have referred is one of the oldest on the statute books, one of the first ever passed by the American Congress. It was indeed the First Congress under President Washington that enacted the law. Whenever that bill is found, approved by the President, it will bear the name of President George Washington. Here is a Secretary of the Treasury who is violating the law every day of his life, thereby incurring the penalty of a fine or imprisonment, and of being forever afterwards incapacitated to hold office.

I would like to have the Senator from Alabama express himself as to what the people will think as to the way our Government is being run, when a criminal, unconvicted but disobeying the penal law, openly and notoriously committing a crime, is left in charge of the national funds and the refunding of a foreign debt of \$11,000,000,000?

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, Mr. President, it deserves to be condemned by Congress. You have men in the Federal Reserve Board most thoroughly discredited. As I have said here repeatedly and say again, they have lost the confidence of the honest business men of the whole country, and now for a Secretary of the Treasury to be appointed on this high commission when he violates the law as plainly as has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia is, of course, wrong. It is time that we should speak out, and Senators on the other side of the Chamber must be patient while we call attention to these things. The people may not, I repeat, get to read in the newspapers what is going on here, but those who peruse the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will see that somebody was on guard and somebody was pointing out these evils at the time they took place.

This camouflage business that I spoke of reminds me of the story of the wall that had a large crack in it. It was a big wall 20 feet high. The people who had to pass along by it constantly said, "That wall ought to be fixed; it is going to fall down on somebody." The mayor of the little town went down there and pasted some paper over the crack. The paper had beautiful pictures on it, and when anyone looked for the crack in the wall he could not see anything but the pictures on the paper. The crack in the wall had not been fixed, but the mayor's clever tactics simply hid it from view. The painful wounds and ugly scars that your ruinous policies have inflicted upon the once robust body of American business are still there, and inspired newspaper fiction will neither hide them or heal them. We are calling attention to your efforts to deceive the American people. We are warning the people to be on the lookout for campaign fiction.

Mr. CARAWAY. And prosperity is just around the corner.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; prosperity is just around the corner, as my friend from Arkansas suggests.

And when you get around the corner you do not find it. You call up the local banker and ask, "Are you being supplied with funds sufficient to serve the needs of business in your locality?" and he says, "No, sir; but do not tell the Federal Reserve Board that I said that. If you do they will make it hard for me." You ask the merchant, "Are you being taken care of? Is your business prosperous?" He says, "No; I am practically broke and I am doing nothing." Well, then, how about the farmer? "How are you getting along, you to whom we looked for food for our Nation and the allied nations during the great World War? Where is the farm that you cultivated when Wilson was President and the Democrats were in power?" And he answers, "It is gone." "Where are the stock which you had around the premises when all was well with you and a happy family in the dear little home?" "Gone," he says, "we have moved away; the stock have been sold or sacrificed; the farm has gone to make a payment on a debt incurred when my debt-paying power and purchasing power was equal to the price of the things I had to buy." "Where are you who wore the uniform of the country?" And the ex-soldiers, thousands of them say, "I have not anything to do; I am out of employment and hungry." "Where are the millions of the happy and well-paid wage earners of the country when the Democrats were in



power and there were no idle men and women?" The sad answer comes, "We are out of employment; we are not permitted to earn a living for ourselves and families."

Then I ask Senators, Who is it that is having prosperity? Where is it? Let us get down to brass tacks. Who is it under your party's régime that is enjoying prosperity?

Mr. CARAWAY. Will Hays, who has gone into the movies. Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the bankers of Wall Street are flourishing. They get all the money they want; they never lack for a dollar; they can get every day in the year every dollar they want for speculative purposes; they can acquire all the credit they need for any project. But the South can not get it; the West can not get it. Still Senators on the other side of the Chamber are talking about prosperity. Where is it, pray tell me?

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a little poem which has just been handed to me by my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], which is entitled "We wanted a change." Mr. President, if the millions of men and women who went up to the ballot box shouting "Hurrah for Harding!" and "Hurrah for normalcy!" could withdraw those little ballots, the Republicans would have to run them all down with a search warrant and take them by force in order to ever get them back again. You never could again marshal them for the present régime.

They wanted a change. They were deceived by this camouflage stuff that you carried on, discrediting the greatest administration since the Government was established. I except none. There never was a time in the history of this Republic when labor was so fully employed, when industry was running so regularly, when the mass of the people had so much money in their pockets, and when prosperity was so general. Why, the average man and woman had a little bank account under the Democratic administration.

Nobody has a bank account now of any consequence except the big bankers of Wall Street. They have accumulated the money supply of the country; they have drawn it in; and they let it out, little by little, as they wish to do through the Federal Reserve Board's policy. That is what is going on. Let me remind you again that an old farmer out in Kansas the other day, when he was asked how he liked this Republican crowd, said, "To thunder with your Republican normalcy; I want to get back to Democratic prosperity."

Oh, Mr. President, you know there are people in this country who believe that the mass of the people constitute legitimate prey for their greed and avarice, just as a hawk views chickens and thinks that he has got a right to swoop down and pluck them and pick them and eat them whenever he chooses. These heartless and arrogant interests feel that they have a right to have the use of the Government for that purpose. They get in with the controlling power; they say "Institute this policy," and down they swoop upon the people and take their substance. That is what is being done under the reign of the Republican Party to-day.

But let me read the poem:

WE WANTED A CHANGE.

We were getting a dollar six bits for our corn,  
We could sell every hide from the hoof to the horn—  
We wanted a change and we got it.

Now we're getting a quarter for corn. It's so cheap  
That we burn it for fuel, our toes warm to keep.  
We can't sell the hides so we bury them deep—  
But we wanted a change and we got it.

The skilled workman pulled down eight bucks a day,  
Now he's darned glad to work for any old pay—  
But he wanted a change and he got it.

There was work and a plenty for every man's son,  
And warm food and shelter when that work was done;  
Now millions are idle, heretofore there was none—  
But we wanted a change and we got it.

Mr. Wilson spent quite a long time "over there"  
For peace he was fighting, but what did we care—  
We wanted a change and we got it.

Now all that we read is of golf and vacations,  
Gay week ends at summer resorts and plantations;  
Not what we expect from the head of a Nation—  
But we wanted a change and we got it.

We were prosperous and happy, well fed, and gay,  
Now millions of children go hungry each day—  
We wanted a change and we got it.

Meanwhile we hear this: "It was certain to come—  
Reaction from war time," and war three years done.  
If we wanted a lemon we sure did pick one—  
But we wanted a change and we got it.

(Omaha World-Herald.)

When the Democrats were in power we, the people, were writing poems about happy homes, about the laboring man and the strength of his mighty arm; we were describing happiness upon the farm and telling how, when the cows came home in the evening, the calves would bleat a deep-mouthed welcome; and

how we used to see the rich yellow butter upon the table and round, fine biscuit and ham sliced and swimming in red gravy and chickens galore, and all of the good things to eat. That was under the rule of the Democratic Party, but now we are writing about empty pails and unemployment and people in distress and panics and bankruptcies. They "wanted a change, and they got it." Mr. President, I have talked to hundreds and all of them that I have seen say they are ready and anxious now for a change. I heard of a prognosticator of politics who told me that a gentleman out in Ohio who occasionally polled the passengers on trains polled the passengers in a car in the fall of 1920 in which there were 25 people, 19 of whom were Republicans and the other 6 Democrats. He asked them at that time whom they favored for President, and all of them said they were going to vote for Harding. In the same territory two weeks ago there were 25 or 30 on the train, two-thirds of them being Republicans and about one-third Democrats, and he asked, "If you all had it to do over again, how many of you would vote for Harding now?" And not one hand went up. The situation has so completely changed in 11 months' time. The Republican Party has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. You may have your yachts and your week-end vacations, but the American people want a change, and they are going to have it this fall.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am wondering if President Harding will beat Mr. Taft out of a position which he occupies. It was said that more people voted to make Mr. Taft an ex-President than any other man ever commanded, but I am almost sure that Mr. Harding is fixing to beat him out of that position.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, as I have remarked here once before, somebody has said that Mr. Taft went in by a million majority and went out by unanimous consent. The present President is going to run him a mighty close race.

The President is a good grand-stand player and a gracious smiler; but the time has come for action; the American people are demanding a delivery of the goods, and they have got a right to make that demand. Whose Government is this anyhow? Does it belong to the pompous purse-proud millionaires of Wall Street or does it belong to the American people who when its life is imperiled rush to its rescue and pour out their blood in order to save it and perpetuate it? Now it is the duty of Senators to fight here in the homeland for these people in time of peace, and to see that their rights are safeguarded.

I wish to say to you, Senators, that when the money supply and credits of this country are so manipulated that they will not serve the needs of the laboring man and will not serve the needs of the farmer and will not meet the needs of the merchant and the local bankers something is radically wrong. What is money? It is the lifeblood of business, and when a few selfish and sordid people control it they control the life-giving force of the business life of the Republic. That is what is going on to-day. Yet the President sits there smiling constantly, bowing graciously, while the Federal Reserve Board right under his nose, not a hundred yards from where he sits, strikes down the legitimate business of the country.

The President can remove that board. He should remove it. If Gov. Harding had done as much for the Democratic ticket as he did for the Republican ticket, does anybody doubt that his resignation would have been asked for? Since President Harding has not taken action along those lines, what does it mean? It means that he indorses the deflation policy of that board; it means that the board has done what it was ordered to do. I charge to-day that the deflation policy that has brought ruin to the country was invited and started by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] when he had passed through the Republican Senate on the 17th day of May his resolution calling on the board to know what they were doing about deflation, and so forth.

As I told you last Thursday, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] saw it. He arose and told you that it meant deflation. He said it was an invitation for deflation; and Gov. Harding was enthusiastic in his reply. He wrote back to the Senate that he would employ every power at his command to carry out the suggestions contained in the deflation resolution.

What did that mean? That meant that the deflation policy was on. Who was in control? The Republicans were in control of the House and the Senate. Who introduced the resolution? A Republican Senator. Who is Gov. Harding? He supported the Republican ticket in the fall election, and he is holding his place and retaining his power under a Republican President, and the work of destruction goes on; and the President of the United States and the Republican Congress can not

escape responsibility for the ruin that was wrought under that inexcusable and indefensible deflation policy.

Mr. President, I did not intend to speak more than 5 or 10 minutes. I want to remind the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM], the Senate, and the country that when we did revive the War Finance Corporation, as I said here in a lengthy speech last Thursday, we had section 2 in that joint resolution, and section 2 provided that the Federal Reserve Board was directed to see to it that financial aid was extended to the farmers of the country at as reasonable a rate of interest as possible in keeping with sound banking.

Mr. President, what did that mean? That was calling upon the forces in control of the currency and credits of the country to go to the aid of American farmers in dire distress. That was inviting Congress to tell the board to go and do the thing that would carry relief to the great agricultural army of the South and West. What happened to it? You refused to pass it. Wall Street did not want it. The Federal Reserve Board did not want it. A Republican Congress killed it. We got through the War Finance Corporation revival part of the resolution, but a Republican Congress killed the part which commanded that money should go to the farmers and aid them in holding their farm products off the market until the price will yield a living profit.

Who caused that resolution to be killed? I made the statement in the outset that no bill that affected the interests of the money changers could go through this Congress without the sanction of Wall Street. Who can deny it? The part of the resolution that you killed went to the very root of the evil. That suggested a remedy, to go to the rescue of farmers in distress, and a Republican Congress said, "No; we will not instruct the board to do that," and they killed that part of the joint resolution.

How are you going to escape responsibility for that? That is a plain proposition. The joint resolution said in substance, "Congress directs the Federal Reserve Board to go to the aid of the farmers with credits and currency at the lowest rate of interest possible in keeping with sound banking," and you killed that part of it. You struck it out.

How are you going to defend your position and claim that you are not responsible for that failure to lend a helping hand to millions of farmers in distress? I say again that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMACK], a Republican, offered the resolution that started deflation, and then in the fall time, when we tried to get you to pass a resolution to instruct your Federal Reserve Board to aid the farmer, you killed that part of the resolution.

What do you suppose the farmers of the West will do when they realize this fall that we presented to you a resolution calling on the Federal Reserve Board to go to their rescue and to see that credits and currency were extended to them, and you would not permit it to pass? Do you think they will vote as they voted in 1920? No, sir! Because they have seen and suffered enough since you have been in power. You have had control of the House and Senate for three years, and what have you done? You have marked time. You used to criticize us for indulging in "watchful waiting," and you have been waiting with your eyes shut. You have just been lumbering along in the dark obeying your master's voice.

Look out yonder on the South and see those people coming out of the little lanes, and see their vehicles trailing each other as they come down the public highways. You say: "What means all this?" They say: "We are coming out of the farming communities of the county." "Where are they going?" "They are going down to the cotton factories to put to work in the mills those boys and girls that ought to be in school. When the father could make a living on his farm, they were in school. They were happy out there; but those little homes are broken up now." They are going to the factories and the presence of an oversupply of labor will reduce the wages of those already there.

That is what is going on under your party's control. Nothing except the work of the gambler grafter seems to flourish under your reign. Show me one legitimate business that is flourishing under the reign of the Republican Party—one; just one! I pause for a reply from any Republican upon this floor. Name me one legitimate industry in all the confines of the country that is in a prosperous condition to-day. I get no answer. There is not one. The gambling Monte Carlo of Wall Street is flourishing. Call money revels in rank luxuriance. All the places that feed upon the substance of honest toil and legitimate business are doing well; but legitimate business dies under the withering touch of the Republican Party in power.

Mr. President, what is the Republic for? Are we going to sustain this country and make it the glorious thing that the

fathers intended that it should be—a Government established for the welfare of the citizen? That is the whole end and aim of constitutional government. What are we doing to-day? The citizen has his mood injuriously affected, his morale broken, his property swept away, his means of livelihood taken from him, and you are creating an army of bolsheviks and anarchists. You are sowing the seeds of hate in men who offered their lives for their country.

Senators, the time has come to talk plainly about this thing, because he who sees danger and has not the courage to point it out in this Chamber is himself a cringing coward.

Oh, Mr. President, I would that conditions were different. I would rejoice to see conditions improved; and no Senator in this body can charge that I ever voted against a measure here that sought the common weal. And while I believe that my party holds the right solution for all the questions that pertain to the government of man—partisan Democrat that I am—I have voted for and advocated in this body measures offered by some Republicans from the West because I thought they were good measures and would do good. I place at all times the welfare of my country above partisan success. Why should not all of us do so? Life is short at best, and we go this way but once. It is a question of the measure of service that we give while we are in this Chamber. This place was intended to be a place of faithful service to the American people.

It was intended to be filled with men who would always look to the welfare of the country, who would enact laws that would bless and benefit the mass of the people, and who would not legislate for a favored few, to the hurt and injury of the many.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] upon the able and splendid speech that he made. He arraigned the Republican Party and pointed out its shortcomings and showed wherein it had undertaken to deceive the people. That is legitimate. If we fall short of our duty we are failing in the work that we were sent here to do, because, Mr. President, no Senator ever ought to reach the time in this body when his own comfort is of more concern to him than the welfare of his country. He never ought to reach the time when he is afraid to challenge the forces of injustice and wrong.

He ought never to reach the time when he seeks to move against the lines of least resistance. He ought to be ready at all times to fight, if need be, any unrighteous cause which puts up its head in this body. We ought to point the way to a better day, when the masses of the people in the main will enjoy the fruits of the prosperity to which this country is entitled 24 hours in every day and 52 weeks in every year of its history.

In this country, with its mighty resources, there is no excuse for anybody being out of employment. There is no excuse for any farm being deserted. There is no excuse for shutting down the industries of our land, and a country as rich and resourceful as ours is should not hoard the Nation's lifeblood, the money and credits of the country, but it should see to it that these life-giving forces should circulate and restore prosperity in every nook and corner of the country.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. Mr. President, when the refunding bill was on its passage through the Senate I called the attention of those who had charge of that measure to the law of 1789, which declares that no man engaged in business or commerce shall be eligible to hold the office of Secretary of the Treasury.

I called their attention to the fact that this was a penal law, and any man who violated the law was subject to prosecution, and upon conviction should be punished by a fine, by imprisonment, and by incapacity thereafter to hold office.

I instanced the case of President Grant, who, not being a lawyer, was not aware of the statute of 1789, and who appointed A. T. Stewart, the merchant prince of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury. In Mr. Blaine's Twenty Years of Congress, volume 2, page 425, we find this statement:

Alexander T. Stewart, the well-known merchant of New York, was named for Secretary of the Treasury; and Adolph E. Borie, of Philadelphia, long known in that city as a man of probity and wealth, was named for Secretary of the Navy. No new nomination was made for Secretary of War, and the hope with many was that Gen. Schofield might be continued in a place whose duties he had so faithfully and so successfully discharged.

The President was very anxious to have Mr. Stewart in his Cabinet, and was therefore surprised and chagrined to find, after he had been nominated, that under the law he was not eligible to the office of Secretary of the Treasury. In the act establishing the Treasury Department, passed at the first session of the First Congress under the Federal Government, it was provided that no person could be appointed Secretary, Assistant Secretary, comptroller, auditor, Treasurer, or register who was "directly or indirectly concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce." It was further provided that any person violating this act should be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and upon conviction fined \$3,000, removed from office, and forever thereafter rendered incapable of holding any position under the Government of the United States. Gen. Grant frankly informed the Senate that he had ascertained Mr. Stewart's disability after the

nomination and suggested that "in view of these provisions of law and the fact that Mr. Stewart has been unanimously confirmed by the Senate he be exempted, by joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress, from the operation of the law."

The Senate had actually confirmed Mr. Stewart, and President Grant requested the Senate to change that law so that Mr. Stewart could qualify and take the office. What followed? I read again from Mr. Blaine:

As soon as the President's message was read, Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, asked "unanimous consent to introduce a bill repealing so much of the act of September 2, 1789, as prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury from being concerned in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, and providing instead that in no case shall he act on any matter, claim, or account in which he is personally interested." Mr. Sumner objected to the introduction of the bill, suggesting that it ought to be "most profoundly considered before it is acted upon by the Senate." These proceedings were on Saturday, March 6. On Monday Mr. Sherman did not call up the bill, it having been ascertained in private conferences that the Senate was unwilling to pass it. On Tuesday Gen. Grant withdrew the request, Mr. Stewart resigned, and Hon. George S. Boutwell was nominated and confirmed as Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, the proofs were put in the record during the debate on the refunding bill, that Mr. Mellon is engaged most extensively in trade and commerce, being one of the most colossal business men on this continent or abroad; just as ineligible to hold the office of Secretary of the Treasury as would be J. P. Morgan, or as is John D. Rockefeller, or as is a member of the firm of Sears, Roebuck & Co., if you please.

In my hand I hold the act, in the Revised Statutes, which was passed at the first session of the First Congress. It is numbered in the book as section 243, and it provides just as Mr. Blaine quotes in his book, and I therefore will not read it again; but in order that the country may have no doubt about it, I ask unanimous consent that the statute may appear as a part of my remarks.

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

SEC. 243. No person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury, or First Comptroller, or First Auditor, or Treasurer, or Register, shall, directly or indirectly, be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be owner in whole or in part of any sea vessel, or purchase by himself, or another in trust for him, any public lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State or of the United States, or take or apply to his own use any emolument or gain for negotiating or transacting any business in the Treasury Department, other than what shall be allowed by law; and every person who offends against any of the prohibitions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor and forfeit to the United States the penalty of \$3,000, and shall, upon conviction, be removed from office and forever thereafter be incapable of holding any office under the United States; and if any other person than a public prosecutor shall give information of any such offense, upon which a prosecution and conviction shall be had, one-half the aforesaid penalty of \$3,000, when recovered, shall be for the use of the person giving such information.

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. It is a serious thing, it seems to me, when any officer of the Government, but especially the Secretary of the Treasury, charged at this time with the handling of the greatest sum of money that ever was put into the hands of one man to handle, is violating the law every day of his life, is, according to the record, an impudent criminal, whom anybody could have arrested on swearing out a warrant, and who would have to stand and confess his guilt, if his business connections be what they appear to have been at the time that proof was put in the record.

We ourselves are sworn officers. The Constitution leaves us no discretion. As honorable men we are bound to do what we can to have the law properly administered.

Admitting that neither Mr. Mellon nor President Harding knew of this law at the time the nomination was made; admitting that the attention of the Senate was not called to it at the time of the confirmation, the President knows it now, Mr. Mellon knows it now, and there is not a lawyer here who can say one word in defense of either the President or the Secretary. If so, I want him to rise and say it.

How can any man defend it? We are to go before the people in a few months to render an account of our stewardship. What will the people think of us if we have continued from day to day to let this man exercise the highest financial power in the world when he is openly, audaciously, unscrupulously violating a law that has on it the sanction of George Washington's name?

Is any man in this country above the law? Is the Chief Executive above the law? What is the law of impeachment for?

On the night of the debate on the refunding bill I asked the Republican Senators to consider this matter, especially in connection with giving Mr. Mellon discretionary powers over the refunding of \$11,000,000,000 of indebtedness due to us by European countries. No Senator said a word. They did not consider it. They will consider it when they go before the people for reelection.

Republican Members of the other House will have to answer for it. The people will say, "Is that the law?" The people

will say, "Are you violating it?" The people will say, "How dare you do that and put yourselves above the law? How dare you ask us to obey the law when you will not do it? How dare you prosecute men for trivial offenses, petty larcenies, lesser crimes, when this law is being violated every day by a member of the Cabinet?"

If Gen. Grant receded before that law and respected it, why should not President Harding show an equal respect for the statutes of his country? If Mr. Stewart had to resign, why should not Mr. Mellon resign?

Senators, this will be a millstone around your Republican necks in the future. You have been put on notice. The country knows you have been put on notice. What are you going to do about it? You had better do something about it.

I do not believe the American people will stand for an open and insolent violation of the law by a member of the Cabinet. I believe the storm of public indignation which can reach Mr. Mellon will reach those who should have reached Mr. Mellon and put him on notice. That man should resign. If he does not willingly resign, the President should demand his resignation and thus set the people an example of respect for the law.

#### RETIREMENT OF DISABLED ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that as soon as the unfinished business now before the Senate has been disposed of I intend to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1565) making eligible for retirement under the same conditions as now provided for officers of the Regular Army all officers of the United States Army during the World War who have incurred physical disability in line of duty.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 16, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15, 1922.*

#### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John W. Scott, of California, to be receiver of public moneys at El Centro, Calif., vice Burre H. Lien, whose term will expire February 17, 1922.

#### PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

##### VETERINARY CORPS.

##### To be lieutenant colonel.

Maj. William Proctor Hill, Veterinary Corps, from February 4, 1922.

#### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

##### AIR SERVICE.

Capt. Garth Bly Haddock, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

Capt. Edmund Walton Hill, Infantry, with rank from July 1, 1920.

First Lieut. Benjamin Ransom McBride, Infantry, with rank from October 13, 1919.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Walter M. Hunt to be a captain in the Navy from the 20th day of December, 1921.

Commander Zachariah H. Madison to be a captain in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1921:

Charles H. Shaw.

Eldred B. Armstrong.

Lieut. Commander Arthur W. Sears to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1921.

Lieut. Commander Walter B. Decker to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of October, 1921.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921:

Randolph P. Scudder.

Albert S. Rees.

James P. Olding.

William B. Howe.

Claude A. Bonvillian.

George H. Bowdley.

George A. Alexander.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1922:

Garret L. Schuyler.

Alfred W. Brown, jr.

Lieut. Edward H. Connor to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 11th day of February, 1921.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1921:

James D. Maloney.	John H. S. Dessez.
James S. Spore.	George W. Hewlett.
Frank Slingluff, jr.	John M. Ashley.
Mervyn S. Bennion.	Herbert W. Underwood.
Frank H. Kelley, jr.	Lorain Anderson.
Miles P. Refo, jr.	Edgar M. Williams.

Lieut. Howard A. Flanigan to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 25th day of June, 1921.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1921:

Marc A. Mitscher.	Clarkson J. Bright.
Earle W. Spencer, jr.	William D. Kilduff.
George L. Weyler.	

Lieut. Joseph F. Crowell, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of September, 1921.

Lieut. Charlton E. Battle, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1921.

Lieut. Herbert A. Ellis to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 12th day of October, 1921.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Adolph V. S. Pickhardt to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert D. Kirkpatrick to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1919.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stanley L. Wilson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1920.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Forrest B. Royal.	Horace E. Burks.
Nelson N. Gates.	George W. McIver, jr.
William E. O'Connor.	John N. Whelan.
George O. Etheredge.	Gordon B. Woolley.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 30th day of December, 1920:

Fred M. Byers.  
Stanley C. Norton.

Ensign Nelson N. Gates to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1919.

Ensign George W. McIver, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 30th day of March, 1920.

Ensign William E. O'Connor to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 28th day of June, 1920.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of June, 1920:

John N. Whelan.  
George O. Etheredge.  
Gordon B. Woolley.

Ensign Stanley C. Norton to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1920.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Thomas J. Griffin.  
Morton T. Seligman.  
Dorrance K. Day.

Surg. Isaac S. K. Reeves to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 10th day of November, 1921.

Surg. George L. Wickes to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 24th day of January, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. John J. O'Malley to be a surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 4th day of March, 1921, to correct error in name as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 4th day of March, 1921:

Frederick Ceres.  
Walter C. Espach.  
Howard A. Tribou.

Asst. Surg. Horace R. Boone to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 6th day of June, 1920.

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 4th day of March, 1921:

Anson F. McCreary.  
Hugh T. Meyers.

Passed Asst. Dental Surg. Franklin L. Morey to be a dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 3d day of June, 1921.

Asst. Dental Surg. James C. Lough to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 6th day of June, 1920.

Asst. Dental Surg. Armin T. Fellows to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Paymaster Edward T. Hoopes to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 7th day of July, 1921.

Paymaster Elijah H. Cope to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 11th day of November, 1921.

Passed Asst. Paymaster Robert W. Clark to be a paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant commander from the 4th day of March, 1921.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Tucker C. Gibbs.  
Louis H. Huebner.  
Thomas S. Wully.

Chaplain Herbert Dumstreya to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1920, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Acting Chaplain Thomas F. Regan to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 12th day of May, 1920.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 6th day of February, 1922:

Lewis B. McBride.  
Clayton M. Simmers.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 31st day of December, 1921:

Robert B. Hilliard.	Lee S. Border.
James O. Gawne.	Alva B. Court.
Allan J. Chantry, jr.	Lew M. Atkins.
Philip G. Lauman.	Ralph T. Hanson.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 6th day of February, 1922:

Ralph D. Weyerbacher.  
Henry E. Rossell.

Lieut. John B. Lawrence, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be a lieutenant in the Navy, to rank from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Cecil F. Harper, United States Naval Reserve Force, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from July 1, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Ensign August Rettig to be an ensign in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1919, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named officers for temporary service to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1919, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Frederick J. Legere.  
William F. Skyles.

The following-named officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920:

Frederick H. Ottaway.  
William B. Gwin.

Passed Asst. Surg. Henry P. Merrill, for temporary service, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Passed Asst. Surg. William F. Crouse, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Chaplain Henry G. Gatlin, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 3d day of November, 1920, in accordance with

a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Asst. Naval Constructor William F. Twitchell, for temporary service, to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 1st day of July, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Chief Gunner Chesley Jones, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be a chief gunner in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 5th day of August, 1920, in accordance with a provision contained in the act of Congress approved June 4, 1920.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Albert S. Marley, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Ensign Albert S. Marley, jr., to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of June, 1920.

The following-named naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 6th day of February, 1922:

Edmund R. Norton.

Thomas B. Richey.

Commander Austin Kautz to be a captain in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1921.

Lieut. Commander Charles F. Russell to be a commander in the Navy from the 2d day of January, 1922.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ALABAMA.

Walter R. Warrick to be postmaster at Marbury, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

##### ARIZONA.

Charles A. Narramore to be postmaster at Buckeye, Ariz. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

##### CALIFORNIA.

Harry R. Borden to be postmaster at Angels Camp, Calif., in place of R. E. Walsh. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1920.

John Z. Shelton to be postmaster at Oroville, Calif., in place of F. N. Paxton, resigned.

##### COLORADO.

Albert Neuman to be postmaster at Elbert, Colo. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

##### CONNECTICUT.

James E. Usher to be postmaster at Plainville, Conn., in place of P. J. Prior. Incumbent's commission expired July 1, 1921.

##### FLORIDA.

Elmer J. Roux to be postmaster at Fernandina, Fla., in place of E. J. Roux. Incumbent's commission expired August 1, 1921.

##### GEORGIA.

Herbert I. King to be postmaster at Dexter, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

##### ILLINOIS.

Charles L. Smith to be postmaster at Cutler, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Hamil E. Veach to be postmaster at Clayton, Ill., in place of G. L. Hough. Incumbent's commission expired August 30, 1920.

James C. Moore to be postmaster at Maple Park, Ill., in place of F. L. O'Brien, resigned.

##### KANSAS.

Isabel Brown to be postmaster at Lansing, Kans., in place of C. M. Swan, appointee declined.

##### KENTUCKY.

Charles W. Robinson, jr., to be postmaster at Pewee Valley, Ky. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Quay C. Quigg to be postmaster at Livermore, Ky., in place of E. F. Thomasson. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

John S. Marksbury to be postmaster at Williamstown, Ky., in place of W. G. O'Hara. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

##### MAINE.

Eugene H. Lowe to be postmaster at Gray, Me. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

##### MASSACHUSETTS.

Elba M. Harrington to be postmaster at Jefferson, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Carl E. Brown to be postmaster at Lunenburg, Mass. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Otis E. Hager to be postmaster at North Dana, Mass. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Katherine T. Loftus to be postmaster at Thorndike, Mass. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Osgood L. Small to be postmaster at Sagamore, Mass., in place of O. L. Small. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

##### MICHIGAN.

E. Harold Ormes to be postmaster at Marenisco, Mich. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

##### MINNESOTA.

Pearl M. Hall to be postmaster at Ah-gwah-ching (late State Sanatorium), Minn., in place of P. M. Hall, name of office changed.

##### MISSISSIPPI.

Preston C. Lewis to be postmaster at Aberdeen, Miss., in place of M. E. Tubb. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Richard K. Haxton to be postmaster at Greenville, Miss., in place of J. H. Robb, deceased.

Edward A. Kernaghan to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, Miss., in place of T. M. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Elizabeth Connelly to be postmaster at Lexington, Miss., in place of W. L. Walton, resigned.

##### MISSOURI.

Louis E. Meyer to be postmaster at Bowling Green, Mo., in place of J. H. Bueter. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1921.

Charles B. Genz to be postmaster at Louisiana, Mo., in place of R. H. Williams, deceased.

##### NEBRASKA.

Donald D. Price to be postmaster at Gothenburg, Nebr., in place of J. H. O'Kane, deceased.

##### NEVADA.

Theodore B. Voog to be postmaster at Ruth, Nev., in place of Sam Tidball, resigned.

##### NEW YORK.

John Common to be postmaster at Andover, N. Y., in place of W. F. O'Connell. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Charles B. Hugg to be postmaster at Cazenovia, N. Y., in place of A. E. Fitch. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Lewis O. Wilson to be postmaster at Long Beach, N. Y., in place of L. O. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1922.

##### NORTH DAKOTA.

Olaf O. Bjarke to be postmaster at Abercrombie, N. Dak. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Irwin E. Walton to be postmaster at Bantry, N. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Estelle A. Kingery to be postmaster at Forbes, N. Dak., in place of W. M. Moore, resigned.

##### OHIO.

Myrtle M. McCreery to be postmaster at Brecksville, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Benjamin S. Dillehay to be postmaster at Waterford, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Helen M. Roley to be postmaster at Basil, Ohio, in place of J. C. Grube. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Edwin E. Cook to be postmaster at Huron, Ohio, in place of Charles Warnke. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

##### OREGON.

Logan E. Anderson to be postmaster at Cove, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Thomas Thompson to be postmaster at Pendleton, Oreg., in place of T. J. Tweedy, deceased.

##### PENNSYLVANIA.

Claudia B. Aurand to be postmaster at Beaver Springs, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

James D. Scott to be postmaster at Coatesville, Pa., in place of J. G. Downward, jr. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1921.

Dewey W. Sechler to be postmaster at Fairchance, Pa., in place of W. K. Ashton, resigned.

James Hewett to be postmaster at Pen Argyl, Pa., in place of S. J. Myers, removed.

Theodore E. Sweeney to be postmaster at Sewickley, Pa., in place of Clarence Reisinger, removed.

##### TENNESSEE.

William J. Whitsett to be postmaster at Lewisburg, Tenn., in place of R. G. Loyd, resigned.

## TEXAS.

Mamie Dyer to be postmaster at Tolar, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1920.

Tom Hargrove to be postmaster at Woodsboro, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Floyd S. Worth to be postmaster at San Benito, Tex., in place of J. L. Crawford, resigned.

## UTAH.

Frank M. Shafer to be postmaster at Moab, Utah, in place of F. M. Shafer. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1921.

## VIRGINIA.

Thaddeus Y. Price to be postmaster at Green Bay, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Samuel McCrary to be postmaster at Ivanhoe, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Robert E. Fugate to be postmaster at Nickelsville, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Bruce L. Showalter to be postmaster at Weyers Cave, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Harry Fulwiler to be postmaster at Buchanan, Va., in place of R. H. Latane. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Byrd E. Carper to be postmaster at Newcastle, Va., in place of H. B. Ferrel. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Boyd McKeever to be postmaster at Wardensville, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

## WISCONSIN.

Edward Hemphill to be postmaster at Belmont, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

William T. Hoyt to be postmaster at Rosendale, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Kate C. Conrad to be postmaster at Hammond, Wis., in place of Dennis Deneen. Incumbent's commission expired September 8, 1921.

Bogue S. Burnett to be postmaster at Mosinee, Wis., in place of E. F. Butler, resigned.

## WYOMING.

Frank N. Stuart to be postmaster at Parkerton, Wyo. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Owen T. Gebhart to be postmaster at Basin, Wyo., in place of A. W. Coons, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15, 1922.*

## RECORDER OF DEEDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Arthur G. Froe to be recorder of deeds, District of Columbia.

## REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Edward P. Gorman to be register of the land office, Wausau, Wis.

## POSTMASTERS.

## ALABAMA.

Henry H. Farrar, Blocton.

## ARIZONA.

James E. Harris, Mayer.

## INDIANA.

Charles E. Combs, Bloomfield.

Elisha A. McGinnis, Clayton.

Maude E. Mitchell, Ellettsville.

Lorinda Guy, Etna Green.

Moody L. Katter, Huntingburg.

Ben H. Sink, Jasonville.

Arthur F. Saylor, New Paris.

## IOWA.

Raymond W. Rhoades, Glenwood.

Harold H. Hubbard, Rockford.

Christa A. Hendrix, Silver City.

Ira S. Hogate, Tracy.

Walter H. Vance, Winterset.

## KANSAS.

E. Ervin Townsden, Hugoton.

Elmer E. Haynes, Madison.

## KENTUCKY.

Iley G. Nance, Slaughters.

Austin R. Edwards, Walton.

## MICHIGAN.

Clyde C. Buttrick, Ada.  
Herbert O'Connor, Holton.

## MISSOURI.

Charles T. Wright, Stoutsville.

## MONTANA.

Philip Daniels, Anaconda.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

John A. Gleason, Dublin.

## NEW MEXICO.

Charles C. Lee, Las Cruces.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

William P. Lee, Benson.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Elbert L. Marljar, Fountain Inn.

Thomas J. Bolin, Neeses.

De Witt T. Wellborn, Williamson.

Loring Terry, Yemassee.

## VERMONT.

Charles F. Thurber, Fairlee.

Arthur G. Folsom, Tunbridge.

## WISCONSIN.

Lester B. West, Barron.

Emma V. Clark, Black Earth.

Charles J. Anderson, Clayton.

John W. Crandall, Deerbrook.

Eugene B. Williams, Hurley.

Mabel A. Coates, Juda.

Mamie Bader, Kennan.

Frank E. Munroe, Ladysmith.

Charles H. Lake, Marshall.

Verner A. Nelson, Ogema.

Monroe V. Frazier, Readstown.

Charles A. Arnot, South Wayne.

Ole S. Torgeson, Stoughton.

David E. Lamon, Three Lakes.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 15, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

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

Our Father in heaven, Thou art ever present, truest Friend, Day unto day Thy providence uttereth speech. Thou dost throw open the doors of every morning and breathe Thy life and spread Thy light. O do Thou accept the gratitude of all our hearts. May the constancy of such divine care make urgent appeal to our moral obligation, strengthen our affections, and deepen our sympathies. Direct us how to employ all those standards of duty that inspire strength and courage and determine wise and intelligent government. Help any who may be against the sharp edges of care and affliction and at last may we have refuge in the folds of Thy arms. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

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

## NO QUORUM—CALL OF THE HOUSE.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is quite clear that there is no quorum present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

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

Anson	Brinson	Chandler, Okla.	Coughlin
Appleby	Britten	Cockran	Crowther
Barkley	Brooks, Pa.	Codd	Curry
Beedy	Burke	Cole, Ohio	Deal
Bird	Burton	Connally, Tex.	Driver
Bland, Ind.	Butler	Connolly, Pa.	Dunbar
Bond	Cannon	Cooper, Ohio	Dupré
Brennan	Cantrill	Cooper, Wis.	Dyer