

establishment of foreign industrial zones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2121. Also, petition of W. M. Marble, of San Francisco, Calif., indorsing Senate bill 1252 and House bill 7, known as the Towner-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Education.

2122. By Mr. REECE: Petition of G. T. Copenhagen, president of the Hamilton-Bacon-Hamilton Co. (Inc.), of Bristol, Va.-Tenn., opposing the proposed tariff duty on grass seed and clover as contained in the Fordney tariff bill (H. R. 7456); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2123. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition of numerous citizens of Van Wert, Ohio, in favor of the Towner-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Education.

2124. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Black Silk Stove Polish Works, of Sterling, Ill., opposing a 10 per cent duty on graphite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2125. Also, petition of American Flyer Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., urging tariff on toys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2126. Also, petition of Mr. J. G. Everest, of Chicago, Ill., opposing any duty to be placed on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2127. Also, petition of Millers' National Federation, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the admission of foreign wheat, duty free, to be ground in bond or under a liberal drawback arrangement, provided the entire identical product shall be exported; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2128. Also, petition of Mary E. Smith, of Evanston, Ill., protesting against the Fordney bill, increasing duties on imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2129. Also, petition of goat and cabrette leather division of the Tanners' Council, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against duty of 15 per cent on raw goat and kid skins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2130. Also, petition of the A. D. Jackson Saddlery Co., of Benton, Ill., urging tariff of 35 per cent on harness and saddlery goods brought into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2131. Also, petition of Mr. Charles W. La Porte, of Peoria, Ill., urging an increase in the force and salaries in the Patent Office; to the Committee on Patents.

2132. Also, petition of Central Commercial Co., of Chicago, Ill., urging passing of Harrison naval stores' bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2133. Also, petition of R. J. Ogle, salesman for Patton-Pitcairn division of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., urging passage of House bill 5632, the bill supplemental to the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2134. Also, petition of the American Farm Bureau Federation, of Chicago, Ill., urging an increase of the loan limit of the Federal land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 22, 1921.

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

Our Father, we would again renew our confidence in Thee, believing Thou art true to Thy word and will ever remember the trustful soul. We humbly beseech of Thee this morning that along the line of duty we may recognize the hand that is guiding and fulfill Thy good pleasure. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary, George A. Sanderson, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1921.

TO THE SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President Pro Tempore.

Mr. CURTIS thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, July 20, 1921, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McCumber	Sheppard
Ball	Harrison	McKellar	Shortridge
Brandegee	Heflin	McLean	Simmons
Broussard	Hitchcock	McNary	Smoot
Bursum	Johnson	Moses	Spencer
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sterling
Capper	Kellogg	New	Swanson
Caraway	Kendrick	Nicholson	Townsend
Culberson	Kenyon	Norbeck	Trammell
Curtis	Keyes	Norris	Underwood
Dial	King	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Ernst	Knox	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Ladd	Poindexter	Watson, Ga.
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Gerry	Lenroot	Reed	Willis
Glass	Lodge	Robinson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska submits a request for unanimous consent, which will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] asks unanimous consent that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, July 26, 1921, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition, and that after the hour of 12 o'clock noon on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon the bill or more than once or longer than five minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the morning hour or the day taken up in the discussion of a matter of this kind. If the Senator will present the request after the bill to be voted on to-day is disposed of, I shall be glad to give it consideration then. I do not want to discuss or settle this question when we have a bill of great importance to vote on at 4 o'clock. For those reasons I object.

Mr. NORRIS. In view of the statement of the Senator from Missouri, I give notice that when the voting is concluded on the special order of the day I shall resubmit the request.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6611) to establish in the Treasury Department a veterans' bureau and to improve the facilities and service of such bureau, and further to amend and modify the war risk insurance act; had agreed to the conference requested by the Senate; and that Mr. WINSLOW, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, Mr. SWEET, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. RAYBURN were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7208. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.; and

H. R. 7456. An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

PROPOSED TARIFF ON COTTON.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that immediately after the disposal of the maternity and infancy bill I shall submit some observations to the Senate respecting the cotton schedule of the tariff bill that has just come over from the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from a number of prominent officials and citizens of the State of Washington that Congress take immediate action to prevent the impending disaster in Armenia.

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

OLYMPIA, WASH., July 16, 1921.

Senator MILES POINDEXTER,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned do earnestly beg that Congress take immediate action to prevent the present impending disaster in Armenia.

J. Grant Hinkle, secretary of state; C. L. Babcock, State treasurer; H. B. Fultz, secretary chamber of commerce; H. O. Fishback, insurance commissioner; C. H. Younger, State supervisor of industrial relations; C. V. Savidge, commissioner of public lands; Millard Lemon, president Security Bank; W. A. Salter, county treasurer; W. E. Steel, M. D., chairman Near East relief; W. C. Burrell.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have read the telegram which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

CONCORD, N. H., July 18, 1921.

Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As the delegate to American Medical Association meeting in Boston last month, I contributed to decisive majority vote against all congressional measures tending toward paternalistic legislation. Strongly urge you to subscribe to this resolution, unanimously adopted May 26:

Resolved, That the Medical Society of New Hampshire is emphatically opposed to State medicine and to any scheme for health centers, group medicine, and diagnostic clinics, either wholly or partly controlled, operated, or subsidized by the State or National Government. We ask your voice and vote against the Sheppard-Towner bill.

D. E. SULLIVAN, M. D.,
Secretary of the Society.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I present petitions numerous signed by over 2,000 farmers of the State of Iowa, praying for a reduction of freight rates. I ask that the body of one of the petitions may be printed in the RECORD and that they may be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and one was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the names attached, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

The Farmers' Union of the State of Iowa demand a reduction in freight rates, and declare that the present scale of freight rates is destructive of the agriculture of the State. The following facts indicate where reductions are possible and should be made:

The Railroad Labor Board has ordered a reduction in wages that will amount to approximately \$400,000,000, and freights should be reduced by a like amount.

The total value of the railroads as fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission is over \$5,000,000,000 in excess of the market value of all the stocks and bonds of all the railroads, and the rates charged on this excess of valuations costs the country over \$300,000,000 per year. This "watered" capitalization should be prohibited by law and the freight rates reduced accordingly.

The waste of competition is costing the country over \$400,000,000 per year, and its elimination would reduce rates correspondingly.

Interlocking directorates of supply companies, mismanagement, and inefficiency are making an annual expense of over \$600,000,000 per year. This loss should be prevented and rates reduced accordingly.

We, therefore, demand that freight rates be reduced sufficiently to put agriculture back to normal conditions of transportation.

Mr. SPENCER presented petitions of Michael Gleason and 29 others, Stephen Miller and 29 others, Michael Dolan and 29 others, G. A. Hellmann and 29 others, Mrs. Mary Crossen and 29 others, Patrick Hughes and 29 others, Mary A. Mooney and 29 others, Cornelius Corcoran and 29 others; Harry Washington and 29 others, P. H. Hackett and 29 others, John Saderstin and 29 others, Thomas J. Kenny and 29 others, Winfred A. Murnane and 30 others, Mary McIvor and 29 others, Timothy O'Keeffe and 29 others, S. B. Sweeney and 29 others, James A. Haffarnan and 29 others, Mary I. Rabbitt and 29 others, Patrick S. Moynihan and 29 others, and Matthew Fitz Gibbon and others, all of St. Louis, Mo., praying that the United States recognize the republic of Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented a resolution of the Common Council, of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the calling of an international disarmament conference by the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented seven memorials of sundry citizens of Watertown, Crandon, Gresham, Stoughton, Camp Douglas, Bethel, Weyeville, Oakdale, Richland, Yuba, Wonewoc, Hub City, Rockbridge, Bloom City, Tomah, Byron, and Shennington, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making stringent regulations for the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry members of the Ethan Allen Council, of Garnett, Kans., favoring the recognition of the republic of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation making stringent regulations for the observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McLEAN presented 94 petitions of sundry citizens of Hartford, Ansonia, Derby, New Britain, Kensington, Berlin, Rockwell, Springfield, New London, Glenbrook, Stamford, Fairfield, Bridgeport, Woodland, Windsor, and Shelton, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the recognition of the republic of Ireland by the Government of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions of Leo XIII Council, No. 1090, Knights of Columbus, of Terryville; sundry members of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Waterbury; and Commodore Jack Barry Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of New Britain, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring the recognition of the republic of Ireland by the Government of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented letters in the nature of petitions and resolutions of sundry citizens of Bridgeport; the Methodist Church School of Westville; the congregation of the Plymouth Congregational Church, of Milford; the pastor and congregation of Park Street Congregational Church, of Bridgeport; Relief Lodge, No. 86, I. O. O. F., of New Haven; the pastor and congregation of the First Congregational Church, of Norwich; sundry members of the Boosters' Lunch Club, of Danbury; S. Turner Foster, pastor of the Benedict Memorial Presbyterian Church, of New Haven; sundry citizens of Hartford; the pastor and congregation of the First Congregational Church, of Danbury; the congregation of the Congregational Church of Somersville, all in the State of Connecticut, praying that the United States afford protection and relief to the suffering peoples of the Near East, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions of the Ladies' Benevolent Society of the Congregational Church, of Woodstock; the congregation of the Congregational Church of Somersville; the pastor and congregation of the First Congregational Church, of Waterbury; the pastor and sundry members of the Olivet Congregational Church, of Bridgeport; the congregation of the Second Church of Christ Scientist, of Hartford; and sundry citizens of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring the calling of an international disarmament conference by the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions of Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians; Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians; Division No. 3, Ancient Order of Hibernians; Fraternal Order of Eagles; Lodge No. 1204, Loyal Order of Moose; and Nathan Hale Council, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, all of Ansonia; also the State secretary of American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Bridgeport; American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, of Ansonia; and Division No. 9, Ladies' Auxiliary, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Ansonia, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring the passage of the so-called La Follette and Norris resolutions relative to Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution of the Columbus Republican Club of New England, Meriden (Conn.) branch, favoring the enactment of legislation making Columbus Day—October 12—a national holiday, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a letter in the nature of a memorial from members of Orford Parish Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of South Manchester, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 274 for the erection and maintenance of a dam across the Yellowstone River, in the State of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented letters, telegrams, and resolutions of the League of Women Voters, of Haddam; Republican Woman's Association, of Rockville; Roger Sherman Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of New Milford; League of Women Voters, of Norwalk; League of Women Voters, of New Milford; Connecticut League of Women Voters, of East Hampton; League of Women Voters, of South Norwalk; Women's Republican Town Committee, of Trumbull; Mary Stillman Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Bridgeport; and the Consumers' League of Connecticut (Inc.), of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, favoring the enactment of legislation for the public protection of maternity and infancy, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a meeting in Buenos Aires on July 6, 1920, of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America in the Argentine Republic, favoring the enactment of legislation to render immune from income and excess-profits taxes all American citizens and business firms resident and operating abroad, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry hat manufacturing companies of Danbury, Conn., remonstrating against inclusion of the present dye and chemical clause in the permanent tariff bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Bridgeport, Conn., praying that American valuation be adopted for levying ad valorem import duties, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Mary B. Wilson, president Connecticut Woman's Christian Temperance Union, representing 5,000 members, praying for the enactment of legislation to further strengthen the prohibition enforcement act, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions of the Brooklyn Grange, Brooklyn; the Glastonbury Grange, of Glastonbury; Wallingford Grange, No. 33, of Wallingford; and Berlin Grange, No. 24, of Berlin, all in the State of Connecticut, opposing the enactment of a so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WILLIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Geneva and Madison, both in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of suitable tariff legislation which will adequately protect the poultry industry, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPUBLIC OF HAITI AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.

Mr. McCORMICK, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 112) submitted by him on July 19, 1921, authorizing a special committee to inquire into the occupation and administration of the territories of the Republic of Haiti and the Dominican Republic, reported it with amendments.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 2291) for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Itasca* and her master and crew; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STANLEY:

A bill (S. 2292) authorizing the appointment of John Dawson Buckner, formerly an officer of Infantry, United States Army, a captain on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 2293) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to ascertain the cost to the Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, and the amounts expended by it from December 1, 1906, to November 30, 1907, in closing and controlling the break in the Colorado River and to render judgment therefor; and

A bill (S. 2294) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to ascertain the cost to the Alaska Commercial Co., a corporation, and the amount expended by it from November 5, 1920, to April 18, 1921, in repairing and rebuilding the wharf belonging to said company at Dutch Harbor, Alaska, which wharf was damaged and partially destroyed on or about November 5, 1920, through collision therewith of the United States Navy steamship *Saturn*, and to render judgment therefor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON:

A bill (S. 2295) for the relief of James Allen, alias George Moran (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 2296) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Myers (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2297) granting an increase of pension to Ellen G. Frame (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2298) granting a pension to Carrie H. Chandler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

EXPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. STERLING submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were each read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

A bill (H. R. 7208) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (H. R. 7456) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

REAR ADMIRAL WILLIAM S. SIMS.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in my remarks on yesterday I referred to the fact that a resolution which had been adopted by the Senate on June 7, directing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inquire into the speech of Admiral Sims delivered in the city of London, is still pending before that committee. In that connection, I have in my hand a copy of the *British American*, a paper published in the city of Chicago, which prints a letter received by that paper from Admiral Sims, which I ask to have read at the desk. It is brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

[From the *British-American*, Chicago, July 16, 1921.]

REAR ADMIRAL SIMS TO THE BRITISH-AMERICAN.

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE,
Newport, R. I., July 12, 1921.

The EDITOR BRITISH-AMERICAN,
Pontiac Building, 542 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR SIR: I want to thank you most cordially for the editorial in your issue of July 2. If it is true that the American people are aroused to the extent that this editorial would indicate, I shall never cease to be glad that I committed the indiscretions for which I have been officially reprimanded. If only the American people will keep this matter in mind, I think it will have the effect of very materially decreasing the activities of some of our dangerous hyphenated citizens.

Very sincerely, yours,

WM. S. SIMS.

Rear Admiral, United States Navy.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire particularly to call attention to the reference in the letter of Admiral Sims to the hyphenated citizen, and in this connection I call attention to the fact that the letter is printed in a paper called the *British-American*.

I now send to the desk a copy of the editorial in the *British-American* referred to in the letter of Admiral Sims, and ask that it be printed in the *Record*, and that it, with the letter of Admiral Sims, be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[Editorial of July 2, referred to by Admiral Sims.]

"THE ADMIRAL'S EYE OPENER."

"Admiral Sims is back at work as president of the Naval War College at Newport, and the 'Sims incident' is closed, so far as the admiral is concerned. It is not closed so far as the general public is concerned, and will not be, let us hope, for some considerable time. Sims has confessed to tactlessness in 'spilling the beans'; he is sorry the Government has been inconvenienced, and he takes Secretary Denby's 'public reprimand' with a good grace.

"But he exhibits more amusement than penitence. Millions of his fellow citizens have assured him that his famous banquetable blunder was a blessing in disguise; that he has rendered his country a service as large and lasting as the great acts of some of our finest heroes and patriots.

"Some kind of shock or explosion was necessary to wake up the average American, who does not make a business of his politics, as does the boastful 100 per center with the Irish brogue. The latter, becoming hypnotized by Sinn Fein, had lost sight of Columbia's welfare in his enthusiasm for Erin's. He was assisted in this by a host of small politicians who would as soon boost a republic for Timbuctoo as for Hibernia, if there were ballots in that sort of a boom.

"Sims, with his blunt jackass speech, stabbed the conservative, safe, and sane American into vital and vivid thinking. Chicago papers reflected only a little of this awakening, because Chicago is largely a Sinn Fein stronghold, and the best of our journalists are influenced by the green-tinged atmosphere. But the important dailies of scores of cities in other States echoed the big thought and conviction that had come to Uncle Sam as a direct result of the Sims oratorical blunder.

"Intelligent Americans now realize that Sinn Fein propaganda is more than a nuisance—that it is a vicious menace to this Republic at a critical period of history. The point is not so much justice for Ireland as justice for America; not so much freedom's cause there as freedom's cause here.

"More than anything else in the world America needs the friendship of Britain; without it our future is black indeed. Can we afford to lose it for the sake of an Irish faction whose chief interest in these United States is selfish and sordid—who, when this country was in danger, backed the foe that planned to crush her?"

"Seeing this truth, the rank and file of our people, who have no more interest in Ireland than in England, have made their united voice heard where a hearing counts.

"They have Admiral Sims to thank for opening their eyes."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senate has devoted a vast deal of attention to this man Sims, who claims to be an expert on jackasses, and Sims appears to be doing all the braying.

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

Mr. McLEAN. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and ask that it may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The reading clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 115), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to investigate the administration of the Federal reserve system and of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and to report its findings to the Senate, with such recommendations as it deems proper. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ such stenographic and clerical assistance, to meet at such times and places and to sit during the session and recesses of the present Congress, to have such printing and binding done, to make such expenditures for traveling, and to make such other expenditures as it deems necessary. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is further authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths and affirmations, and to take testimony. The President of the Senate is authorized, upon the request of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, to issue subpoenas for such purposes, and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is directed to serve such subpoenas. Any person who willfully refuses to obey any such subpoena and any witness guilty of contumacy shall be liable to penalties provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. All expenses of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, incurred under this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers authorized by the committee signed by the chairman thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut what is the purpose of the resolution, whether or not it has been reported by his committee, and how far he intends, in an investigation of the character proposed, to go back into past history?

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that the resolution has not been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am merely now introducing it. Otherwise I should ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, as it simply provides for an investigation, which, I will say to the Senator from Alabama, is requested by the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, the Senator from Connecticut introduces the resolution at the instance of the Federal Reserve Board, as they themselves desire the investigation?

Mr. McLEAN. As the Senator from Alabama knows, there has been considerable criticism of the Federal Reserve Board, and the members are very anxious to have a committee, either of the House or of the Senate, make a thorough investigation.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Connecticut if the investigation which is proposed by the resolution submitted by him is the investigation to which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] referred the other day?

Mr. GLASS. I was unable to hear the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to know if the investigation proposed by the resolution now submitted by the Senator from Connecticut is the investigation to which the Senator from Virginia referred in the course of a colloquy which took place here the other day?

Mr. GLASS. As I understand, the resolution is submitted in response to a request from the Federal Reserve Board for an investigation into certain accusations which have been made against the policies of that board.

Mr. MOSES. Then it covers the subject to which the Senator from Virginia the other day referred in the course of the colloquy which took place between him and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and myself?

Mr. GLASS. I so understand.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask if a resolution providing for an investigation similar to the one proposed by the resolution now introduced by the Senator from Connecticut has not already been passed by the House of Representatives?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not think such resolution has been passed by the House, though a similar resolution has been introduced in that body.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then such a resolution has been introduced but not passed?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not understand that it has been passed. Mr. FLETCHER. I know nothing about the matter other than what I have learned from the newspapers.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Florida may be correct, but I do not understand that such a resolution has been adopted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FLETCHER. The question that occurs to me is whether the resolution ought not to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency before action is taken upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the resolution will have first to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as it proposes to take money out of the contingent fund. The resolution must under the statute first go to that committee.

Mr. NORRIS. The resolution should first be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, should it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the resolution should first go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply desire to suggest to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who offers the resolution, the expediency and wisdom, as it seems to me, of having the resolution provide for a joint investigation by the House of Representatives and the Senate. I am sure a similar resolution has been introduced in the other House, and I think it would be rather unfortunate to have committees of both bodies making the same investigation. The matter is of such extreme importance that I think it would be better to have the investigation conducted by a joint committee. Certainly, in view of the statement made in the report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1920, and the speech recently made by him in Georgia, as well as the speech delivered by him in this city, with reference to the action of the Federal Reserve Board, it is a subject that ought to be most thoroughly investigated. If the charges made be true, the country is entitled to know it; if they are not true, the country is also entitled to know it.

I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that I had myself prepared a similar resolution which I had expected to have ready to-day. I trust the Senator will adopt the suggestion which I make and will change his resolution so as to provide for an investigation by a joint committee of the House and Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McLEAN. If the Senator from Mississippi will defer his remarks for a moment, I should like to say a word in reply to the suggestion which has just been made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. The suggestion was made that the committee to investigate this matter should be a joint committee, but, as we all know, the history of such committees is that investigations so made are not as satisfactory as are investigations which are made by a committee of one House or the other.

Frequently the meetings of such joint committees are not fully attended; and this is a matter that whoever undertakes it should be willing to give the time that is necessary to make a thorough investigation. On consultation it seemed to be more advisable to have the investigation conducted by a Senate committee. I think that would be the feeling of the House, although I am not definitely informed in regard to that. I will say to the Senator that if the resolution is referred to the committee and if it is thought advisable an amendment can be recommended by the committee to provide for the creation of a joint committee to investigate the subject instead of having the investigation conducted by a Senate committee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with the suggestion made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], for the reason that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House gave out a statement two days ago, I think, saying that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House intended to carry on an investigation immediately touching the charges made by John Skelton Williams. It seems to me that it would be useless for the House to have an investigation and for the Senate to conduct a similar investigation at the same time. So, if the Senate is going to do anything along that line, it would seem to me that the investigation should be conducted by a joint committee.

However, what I rose more particularly to say was that recently the Senate and the House passed what was known as the Lenroot resolution, providing for an investigation into every phase of agricultural conditions. The charges that were made by Mr. Williams, touching agricultural credits, for instance, aroused the curiosity as well as the interest of the committee and of the country, and members of the commission under the Lenroot resolution, who are now holding hearings every day, have had numerous letters from people in various parts of the country asking that that commission take up the investigation of those charges and ascertain whether there was anything in them. So, on yesterday morning, I think it was, the commission, under the Lenroot resolution, had a meeting in executive session, and after an hour of consideration decided to call Mr. Williams before the commission immediately. The chairman of the commission got in touch with Mr. Williams, and I understand he will appear before that commission on Tuesday. We expect to go into the matter thoroughly, so far as the charges affect agricultural credits and within the scope of the resolution.

I merely wanted to advise the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency about that, so that he will know that one commission, representing both the House and the Senate, are going into the situation and will report.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit me merely to make an inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut why he has included in the resolution an investigation of the comptroller's office?

Mr. McLEAN. That was done at the suggestion of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Federal Reserve Board wants the comptroller's office investigated? There are no charges against that office, as I understand.

Mr. McLEAN. I am not aware that there is any objection to it. I think it will develop that it is a wise provision.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. KING called for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. The presentation of concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

Mr. McCORMICK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 115) directing an investigation of the administration of the Federal reserve system and of the office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall object for the present, Mr. President.

Mr. McLEAN. Do I understand the Senator from Alabama to object?

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand that the Rules Committee of the House this morning met to consider a like resolution, and because the joint committee appointed by the Senate and the House to look into agricultural matters are going to investigate this subject, they decided that they would not do so. I see no necessity for the Senate going into this matter when the joint committee of the House and Senate are going to begin an investigation on next Tuesday, and for the present I should like to have the resolution lie over, and I should like to look into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL PROHIBITION ACT.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, is morning business closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, morning business is closed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, is there any unfinished business that comes up automatically?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. REED. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator yield for a motion?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 216, being the bill H. R. 7294, supplemental to the national prohibition act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WATSON of Georgia. I object.

Mr. STERLING. I put it in the form of a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

SEVERAL SENATORS. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on taking up a bill, the title of which the Secretary will state.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 7294) supplemental to the national prohibition act.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, is it in order to make a motion to substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not.

Mr. REED. The maternity bill is up to-day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. In his absence, being unable to obtain a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. In his absence, I am obliged to withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I first transfer my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who is unavoidably absent from the Chamber, to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DIAL. I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] and withhold my vote.

Mr. McLEAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CARAWAY. I wish to inquire if the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois, and am unable to get a transfer, and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. RANSELL. I have a pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have a general pair with that Senator, and unless I can get a transfer I shall have to withdraw my vote. I am informed that I am unable to procure a transfer, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Ashurst	Capper	Elkins	Harrison
Borah	Culberson	Fletcher	Hefflin
Bursum	Curtis	Harris	Jones, Wash.

Kellogg
Kenyon
Ladd
Lenroot
McCumber

McKellar
McNary
Nelson
New
Nicholson

Norbeck
Norris
Poindexter
Sheppard
Simmons

Spencer
Sterling
Swanson
Townsend
Willis

NAYS—24.

Ball
Brandege
Broussard
Calder
Ernst
Gerry

Hitchcock
Johnson
Keyes
King
Knox
La Follette

Lodge
Moses
Oddie
Pomerene
Reed
Shortridge

Smoot
Stanley
Underwood
Walsh, Mass.
Watson, Ga.
Williams

NOT VOTING—39.

Cameron
Caraway
Colt
Cummins
Dial
Dillingham
Edge
Fernald
France
Frelinghuysen

Glass
Gooding
Hale
Harrel
Jones, N. Mex.
Kendrick
McCormick
McKinley
McLean
Myers

Newberry
Overman
Owen
Page
Penrose
Phipps
Pittman
Ransdell
Robinson
Shields

Smith
Stanfield
Sutherland
Trammell
Wadsworth
Walsh, Mont.
Warren
Watson, Ind.
Weller

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7294) supplemental to the national prohibition act.

Mr. REED obtained the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just two or three minutes?

Mr. REED. Yes; I yield. I do not desire to lose the floor, but I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would not interrupt the Senator at this time, but what I wish to say is pertinent to the vote that has just been cast.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the consideration of the bill that has just been laid before the Senate. A large number of the Senators desire to act on it, and I think they should have their opportunity to do so. I do not desire to see any filibuster that will prevent its consideration. Therefore, I am not talking about that bill; but I think the habit of the Senate recently of taking up one bill and making a general order in reference to it, and then taking up another bill and considering it, and then bringing before the Senate another bill for consideration, and having the debate run on three or four bills at the same time, preventing Senators from offering amendments and having them considered at the critical time of legislation, is a very bad practice. I do not like to object to requests for the consideration of bills or for unanimous-consent agreements, because I prefer to occupy the attitude of being helpful toward giving the Senate an opportunity to transact its business; but the legislative situation of the Senate now illustrates the condition.

Everybody knows that the prohibition bill will not be voted upon before the order in reference to the maternity bill becomes effective this evening, and that we will be compelled to vote on it; yet the Senate, because there is an order fixing a time for a vote on the maternity bill, and the time limit is running against it, deliberately forces another bill in its way, and no opportunity is to be offered for real consideration of the maternity bill. I think it is an outrage on legislative procedure. I have no desire whatever to object to orders for the consideration of legislation, but when consent is given for a special order for the consideration of a bill and the order is made, if the procedure of the Senate is to permit a block being thrown in the way of legitimate consideration of the bill that is to be voted on, I shall in the future be liberal in my objections to unanimous-consent orders.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. I would like to yield, and I will yield briefly; but the clock admonishes me that in 2 hours and 15 minutes general debate must close on Senate bill 1039.

Mr. SMOOT. All I want to observe is that I voted against taking up the prohibition bill, because I do not think the vote on the motion shows good faith on the part of those who voted to take up the bill, considering the unanimous-consent agreement in effect to-day.

I also desire to say that never again will I join in a unanimous-consent agreement similar to the one that was entered into in regard to the maternity bill.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, because I am interested and because it was on my motion that the bill was laid before the Senate just now, I simply want to say that I think the Senator from Utah has struck at the root of the matter. It is the unanimous-consent agreement we entered into on the maternity bill, rather than any fault in bringing the prohibition bill before the Senate, that gives rise to this situation. We have had the prohibition bill before the Senate on three several

days, and nothing else was discussed during the time it was before the Senate on those days. In view of the pendency of the agricultural bill, which has been before the Senate as the unfinished business, the morning hour was the only time when I could bring the prohibition bill before the Senate for discussion. I have had occasion to say before that I was gratified because of the fact that the discussion had been devoted entirely to that bill. I hoped that we might have an hour this morning, but, of course, there is nothing to preclude a discussion of the maternity bill, the Senator from Missouri having gotten the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I make no complaint about what has transpired this morning, but I do say that unanimous-consent agreements in the future will have to contain a provision that the bill shall be made the regular business before the Senate at some given time, and kept before the Senate, if the agreement gains my consent.

PROTECTION OF MATERNITY AND INFANCY.

Mr. REED resumed his speech in opposition to the bill (S. 1039) for the public protection of maternity and infancy, providing a method of cooperation between the Government and the several States. After having spoken for some time,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering Senate bill 1039, the maternity bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and lays Senate bill 1039 before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) for the public protection of maternity and infancy and providing a method of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the several States.

[Mr. REED addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. KENYON and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I am very willing to enter into an agreement with the Senator from Utah, if he wishes to speak on the bill, to divide the remainder of the time. I would prefer that the Senator should speak first and let me close the discussion.

Mr. KING. It would be impossible in the limited time at the disposal of Senators to have an elaborate discussion of the measure.

Mr. KENYON. I realize that.

Mr. KING. I had intended to speak at considerable length dealing with the bill and with various aspects of it and had accumulated considerable data in relation to the measure. I do not wish to preclude the Senator from Iowa, however.

Mr. KENYON. I should be perfectly willing to agree with the Senator if he would allow me 20 minutes, that he take the remainder of the time.

Mr. KING. Of course, I shall assent to that. Indeed, I may not, in view of the limited time, occupy that much time, because it is impossible to enter upon a general discussion of the measure.

Mr. KENYON. I did not understand the Senator from Utah whether or not he assented to my proposition.

Mr. KING. I assent to that.

Mr. KENYON. So that the Senator will occupy the time until 20 minutes to 3.

[Mr. KING addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STANFIELD in the chair). The Secretary will read the bill.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, on page 1, line 3, after the word "there," to strike out "is" and insert "are," so as to read:

That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I inquire when amendments may be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I feel something of the same embarrassment that the Senator from Utah expressed in attempting to cover in a short space of time the various phases of this measure and some of the suggestions presented by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I am afraid that in the years to come if the able, distinguished, and large-hearted Senator from Missouri reflects about the speech he made here yesterday and to-day, he will be sorry. A master of invective and sarcasm, able to a degree seldom seen in this body, he has apparently enjoyed assailing women who have no opportunity to reply for themselves. I am sorry. I think he will be.

Mr. President, if the Senator's viewpoint of this bill is correct, it ought to be defeated. If it means what he by his genius has construed it to mean, it ought not to be supported. If it means what he has tried with his wonderful ability to place before the Senate as to its meaning, I would not vote for it. If, on the other hand, it does not do as the Senator from Missouri pictures; if it is merely an attempt not to enter homes, not to invade any private rights, not to direct people how to raise their families or how to act, not to separate mothers from their babies, but to keep mothers with their babies, then the Senator ought to join with us and help pass the bill and make it unanimous.

I do not think, upon reflection, the Senator from Missouri will be entirely satisfied with charging the supporters of this measure with being bolshevists, socialists, almost anarchists. I sometimes wonder what would become of the Constitution and the Government if it were not for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. They have no more hatred for the institutions of bolshevism than some of the rest of us who do not say so much about it. It has become very popular now, if you do not like a measure, to speak of it as driving this country to Russianism, bolshevism. It used to be popular to apply the term "pro-Germanism" to that kind of a proposition; but now, if anybody differs with you, if anybody has a measure you do not believe in, call them bolshevists, and urge that the measure is driving us to bolshevism, and urge it with loud voice, as if you really believed it.

Who were the men who formulated this measure? As I have sat here and listened to the wonderful satire, humor, and shafts of irony, I have wondered about the men who fathered this measure. It is not my bill, though I am glad to stand here and champion it, for I believe in it. It is the bill of the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. Is he a bolshevist? Is he trying to tear mothers away from babies and babies away from mothers? He has more babies to exhibit than either the Senator from Missouri or myself. He has stood for everything that is good in public and private life. He has not a diseased brain, evolving bolshevistic ideas.

How about the joint author of the bill in the House, Judge TOWNSE, from my State? He is one of the ablest, most conservative, and careful men in public life, and one of the best men. He was a lecturer on constitutional law in the State University of Iowa, a man with a family. He is not a bolshevist. He has not one of these diseased brains that the Senator from Missouri is talking about.

These are the men who father this bill. They are not in favor of invading the homes, of telling people how to raise their babies, of tearing babies from the breasts of mothers that we heard so eloquently described here. They have a little humanity in them—so has the Senator from Missouri—and they believe that there is some province of government in trying to help save the mothers of the country who die in childbirth, and help save the babies; and whenever you do save the mother from dying in childbirth you do not take the baby from her, as is done if she dies, but you keep them together.

The Senator has erected a wonderful straw man here, and he has pounded it all around the Chamber until you could not recognize the poor old straw man; and he has erected a woman, an old-maid woman, and he has led that old-maid woman in a merry chase around this Chamber. The old maids and the spinsters have had wonderful days, yesterday and to-day. They have learned what a crime it is to be an old maid or to be a spinster, looking for a husband to support them, as he says, and people in the galleries laughed, and it was very wonderful and satisfying to the Senator from Missouri.

The Senator from Missouri said they have sought the ballot, now they are in the turmoil, and they are going to get it, or words to that effect; and they did get it. I hope the old maids are going to be charitable with the Senator from Missouri. I like him so much, admire him so much, that I hope the old-maid brigade in Missouri will not be a large one at election time. But I would not blame the old maids for having a little resentment, and the old maids are voting now. But what is the crime in being an old maid, anyhow? Some of them can not help it, as he suggests. Others pursue that life through choice. But by the time this bill is passed a lot of them might not be old maids, if we had more hours and days for the Sena-

tor from Missouri to discuss it. Here are some women, some of them old maids, some of them spinsters, in the Children's Bureau. I understand the difference is that an old maid never had a chance to get married and a spinster had. They are not all old maids. Some are maiden ladies, perhaps. One is the daughter of a prominent Senator in this body. They are women devoting their lives to trying to help the children of this country. I do not know why that is not rather a worthy kind of a motive.

The chief one to receive the shafts of the Senator's venom is Miss Lathrop—Julia Lathrop. He says when we want a doctor we will run around and see what Julia says about it. Julia will go and get the doctor. That sounds good to some of the gallery habitues. It wins the smiles of some childless society belles scattered here and there in the galleries. But it is not a very courageous thing to attack women who can not respond, to make fun of them when they are engaged in trying to do good work, and when the Senator knows Julia Lathrop—as I hope he may some time—and knows her life work, she will have no abler defender than he is.

It is easy to talk about shriveled-up spinsters. The term was so pleasant that the Senator used it at least 40 times in his speech—"shriveled-up spinsters" with spectacles on the ends of their noses, with big noses and big chins, looking over the rolls of maternity to see who is going to have a baby, and then rushing down and saying, "We will take charge of the baby." That is not a picture of Julia Lathrop. I say without any hesitation, and knowing the woman and knowing her work, that there is no woman in all the world who has done more for humanity than Julia Lathrop. Ten years a member of the State board of charities of Illinois, she is responsible for the first juvenile court law in this country. She did more than anyone else in the establishment of the juvenile court in Chicago and the Juvenile Protective Association. She was employed to assist in working out plans for the betterment of insane asylums in the State of Illinois.

She was called over by the Czechoslovakian Government to help in some plans in that country to work out the problems of children in Czechoslovakia. The story of her life is one long story of helping the poor and the unfortunate wherever she had the opportunity. It is perhaps true that she is not as young as she once was; her life has not been the easy one; she may not be as handsome as she once was; she does not figure in the society columns of the newspapers, but in every home in this country her name is honored, revered, and loved, and she is known to be the guardian of the children of this country, and when the great roll is written over yonder of accomplishments, of service to humanity, if there have been any mistakes in her life, the recording angel, looking over her feats of accomplishment, will blot them out with his tears of joy that such a woman has lived.

Julia Lathrop needs no defense to people who know her life work, and I could call on Senators from the great State of Illinois here, if we had the time, to justify that statement. She is the one to take this bureau and use it for socialism and bolshevism! Where do you get that idea?

Let me by one illustration show the ingenuity of the Senator from Missouri—and it is splendid. He calls attention to a lot of documents sent out. Many of them I do not defend. There is a lot of nonsense in many of them. There is a lot of nonsense, too, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which goes out to the people of the country. Because now and then there are foolish things in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are Senators responsible for it? I have heard a statement on this floor about taking the printing presses and putting them to work making money to make prosperity for the country. Is the Senator from Missouri responsible for that, or am I? If you can find any more foolishness in the pamphlets issued by the Children's Bureau than you find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, then it will be time to talk about it.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KENYON. I have only a little time.

Mr. McCORMICK. I beg the Senator to spare the blushes of his colleagues.

Mr. KENYON. Is the Senator blushing?

Mr. McCORMICK. He is.

Mr. KENYON. I did not know he was capable of doing that. Here is the argument. Here is a book entitled "Standards of Child Welfare." But I want to use the other one first. Here is one called "Maternity Benefit Systems in Foreign Countries." This is the book that proves we are going to put the execution of this law into the hands of bolshevists and com-

munists. Julia Lathrop writes the letter of transmittal to the Secretary of the Department of Labor. "Maternity Benefit Systems in Foreign Countries" is gotten up by Dr. William J. Harris, Chief of the Document Division of the Library of Congress, and in the letter of transmittal written by Miss Lathrop she says:

The section on Russia is now of historical interest only.

In publishing a pamphlet showing the maternity systems of the world, would she not put in Russia? Dr. Harris does that, and refers in his article on Russia to the fact that the material was furnished by Dr. Alzor, whoever he is, and refers to a certain Russian lady who since that time has apparently become a bolshevist, Madam A. Kollontai, and her treatise, and because of the mention of this lady, and a statement by Dr. Harris as to her work, we have the amazing argument worked out that Julia Lathrop is a side partner of Lenin. That would do for a justice of the peace court, but not for the Senate.

Now, as to what this bureau is going to do, as to how they are going into the homes, as to how they are going to take mothers away from their babies and babies from their mothers, and how we are not going to have the good old-fashioned mother any more to raise the children. I wish to God we could have the good old-fashioned mother for every child. The Senator can not go any further than we can in tribute to the motherhood and the mothers of the country. Here is how it is worked out. They have a conference at Washington, a Children's Bureau conference. There never was a conference on the face of this earth composed of 50 or 60 people where there were not some "nuts."

The only place on earth where you can get together a body of men who have absolutely no imperfections is the Congress of the United States. You can take the Senate; nothing ever transpires here that can be criticized. But here this doctor, making this speech at this conference, Dr. ———, I will not use his name, uses the language to which the Senator refers:

That the first step in such a campaign for the improvement of obstetrical conditions must consist in compulsory registration of pregnancy.

And so he says that that is what these people are going to do.

I denounce that statement just as much as the Senator from Missouri does. It is nonsense. But the book has other good addresses in it, and the fact that that one thing appears in it is no evidence that it was approved by Julia Lathrop.

Mr. REED. Why did she print it and send it out?

Mr. KENYON. Why do we send out the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. REED. Why is that book circulated if it is the fulmination of a nut?

Mr. KENYON. Why do you send out the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Why do you not blue pencil the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have a lot of things taken out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD? Why do we not do that with the proceedings of any conference?

Mr. REED. I do not want to interrupt the Senator—

Mr. KENYON. I have not time to permit an interruption.

Mr. REED. But let me remark that the man who makes a statement on the floor of the Senate and sends it out is responsible for it, and if Senators are publishing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and sending it out and it contains the fulminations of a nut, to use the Senator's expression, he could not complain if the Senate was held responsible for it.

Mr. KENYON. There are no nuts in the Senate.

Mr. REED. I do not know.

Mr. KENYON. Nobody can put me in the position of saying that.

Mr. REED. I do not know that the statement is absolutely correct, but I know that the Senator from Iowa and myself will not voluntarily include ourselves in that classification.

Mr. KENYON. We will not. The Senator from Missouri and I are like the old Quaker, always right, except sometimes I think he is wrong.

That is the kind of argument that has been presented by the Senator to substantiate his idea. This bill was indorsed by the Democratic national convention at San Francisco. Does not that carry weight with the Senator?

Mr. REED. This bill?

Mr. KENYON. The proposition contained in this bill; yes.

Mr. REED. Oh, that is different.

Mr. KENYON. They did not have this exact bill; but I would not quote the platform of the Democratic convention to the Senator.

Mr. REED. No; you can not shake your gory locks at me on that.

Mr. KENYON. No; the Senator is not guilty. But the convention declared in favor of the proposition in this bill. The Republican convention did not do so, but the Republican leader, the candidate for President, declared for it in his speeches and declared for it in his first message to the Congress.

Mr. President, what does it do? I wish I had time to refer to some of the testimony taken before the committee and the reasons for the bill. It does not take away any rights from the States. It does not impose any burden upon a State unless the State voluntarily takes it. The State does not have to go into it. The only thing that it is intended is instruction on these questions in maternity centers, by lectures, and matters of that kind. That is all it does. The bill has been misconstrued more than any bill I have ever known of.

Is it necessary? There are over 200,000 babies in this country dying every year in childbirth. There are around 20,000 mothers who die every year in childbirth. Is it bolshevism to try to save them?

Here is the testimony of a Senator's wife—Mrs. Keyes—before the committee. She lives up in New Hampshire. She stated:

I lived in New Hampshire, in the Connecticut Valley, and where they are not rich villagers, still they are not poor, and we have in ordinary times enough doctors; but in this instance I was sent for to go to a woman who had a baby, because apparently there was no one else to go, and there was no doctor. There were four little children in the family, all down with German measles, and the mother had also German measles, and there was not a particle of food in the house. There was not a towel or a sheet or a pillow case, and there was not a rag as big as a piece of paper with which we could wash the baby's eyes, and when it was over, which we managed as best we could, the mother was taken to a hospital 30 miles away for a serious surgical operation which would not have been necessary if she could have had a real nurse, and we immediately went to work to get a district nurse, and we got one there; but that aid was just a drop in the bucket. There were there little groups of women and they are through the various organizations and the D. A. R. trying to chip in and support a district nurse.

Then, Mr. President, the proof of the pudding is the eating thereof. What has happened where they have had these consultation centers? The city of New York to its credit is ahead of any State in the Union, and Dr. Baker, who is in charge of the work there and has been for 10 years of these consultation centers, testified before the committee that they had reduced the death rate of babies from 17,000 to 11,000 per year in 10 years. That would mean an actual saving through the great work of the city of New York of over 60,000 babies. Oh, you can laugh at it, you can sneer and talk about old maids and spinsters, but there is the fact.

I wish to read a little from Dr. Baker's testimony:

The United States as a whole is very backward in regard to this subject. It shows that the statement that it is seventeenth in the list is not only true but it is also a crime against civilization that the mothers of this country should be allowed to die in the manner that they have. It shows that the number of the mothers who died in childbirth during 18 months of the war almost exactly equals the number of soldiers that were lost and killed in battle. In other words, for every soldier killed a mother died in childbirth, and for every soldier killed six babies died at childbirth, and all because the social and economical conditions are so poor. It is deplorable for us to realize that, especially when you take into consideration the fact that the remedy is so easily obtained, and also the fact that this is because of a lack of understanding of the subject.

This is from the person carrying on the work of these centers in New York City. She said further:

There has been a steady decrease in the baby death rate with the result that in the last 10 years the death rate has been 11,000 as compared with 17,000 of 10 years ago.

Oh, Mr. President, the woman from the splendid home who can get into her automobile and go to the magnificent hospital and pay the nurses and pay the doctor's fees may not need this and this may not help her; but it will help the poor woman in the rural districts and in the places where poverty reigns.

Of the women that we have had under care during the prenatal period, the death rate among the mothers has been one-half of those not supervised, and the death rate of the babies during the first month of their existence is one-half of what it was.

That is not a dream; that is not a fiction; that is not the product of a diseased brain. That is a statement of fact.

We have 135,000 babies in New York every year, and the total population of New York is 6,000,000 people, which is larger than the population of the State of Massachusetts.

We asked her as to mothers coming voluntarily. That is all the bill provides. They can not put themselves into any home. It is entirely voluntary. In reply to that question she said:

We do not ask the mothers to come to us. They come to us of their own volition and they come in overwhelming numbers. We have 60,000 babies under our care each year, and they come to us voluntarily. They want to come. There is no compulsory condition imposed at all, but they are anxious to come and get this information

and to get our help. Now, if this help can be given to them in New York City there is no question whatsoever that that same reduction should obtain wherever the provisions of this bill are put into effect. We have not enough doctors and nurses to meet the demand, it is so great.

Asked if the people resent the work they do at all, Dr. Baker replied:

On the contrary, they welcome it and they ask for it, more than we can give them. Our greatest limitation is that we have not enough people to take care of those who want it. * * * It is absolutely free to all classes, and all classes may have it. There are no restrictions whatever so far as the work is concerned. Naturally we get a great many more people below a poverty line than we do of those above it.

She said they have 68 consultation centers with doctors and nurses in attendance in the city of New York.

I asked her the question whether or not they need the bill so far as that city is concerned, and Dr. Baker replied:

No; we do not, but we do think that a baby in South Carolina is worth as much as a baby in who lives in New York City.

There is no question about it that the position of the United States at the present time is extremely humiliating. There is not a person now who comes to visit this country who knows anything about the conditions who has not remarked about the present curious position of the United States in this behalf.

I have already stated, I believe, that the United States is seventeenth among the nations of the world as to maternal mortality and seventh or eighth as to infant mortality. My time has expired. I regret that, as there are many more things I would like to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, after 4 o'clock there will be no chance to speak upon the bill or any amendment to the same. Therefore, I am going to take a moment now to call attention, first, to an amendment which I am quite sure the Senator from Iowa, in charge of the bill, will approve.

On page 2, line 11, when the time comes I desire to offer an amendment to the bill to strike out the word "permanently." I think the word is used inadvertently there and means nothing. That amendment I shall offer. If there is any reason for stating why, I would take the time to do that now, but I do not believe there is, and I think the Senator from Iowa is perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. KENYON. I think there can be no objection to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand there is to be an amendment offered striking out the words "Children's Bureau, Department of Labor," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Public Health Service." I hope that amendment will not be agreed to. There are so many reasons why I am opposed to such an amendment that I could not go over them in the two or three minutes left at my disposal. If we are going to have any benefit from the bill whatsoever, the Children's Bureau, under the Department of Labor, ought to direct the work. As far as I am concerned, I would prefer a childless woman at the head of the bureau to a childless man, who would direct the affairs if it were under the Public Health Service.

Another thing: If the matter goes to the Children's Bureau, those employed by that bureau will have a direct interest in the children, if anyone will have. If it goes to the Public Health Service, seven-eighths of the time there will be spent by those who have it in charge looking and working for promotions in that service. They demand military and naval promotions in rank, with commutation of quarters, longevity pay, and retirement privileges. This is always uppermost in their thoughts.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator think the Public Health Service has broken down and has failed?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Public Health Service is breaking down just as fast as it possibly can, and for reasons I have just stated.

Mr. REED. How long has it been breaking down?

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say another thing, that if we ever secure what Congress anticipated when the Public Health Service was created we have got to make the service a civil organization.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I understood that the committee recently investigating the Sweet bill, or at least some subcommittee of the Committee on Finance, purpose reporting a measure which would take away the military aspect of the Public Health Service and place it under the civil service or make it a civilian organization rather than a military body. May I inquire whether that can be done?

Mr. SMOOT. Nothing definite has been decided in regard to that matter. I know that it is quite generally spoken of, and

in a favorable way, by the Senators with whom I have discussed the matter.

Mr. KING. I hope it will be done. I think it can be made a serviceable organization. We must have a Public Health Service because there are certain duties to be performed by the Federal Government, such as quarantine, sanitation, and so forth, but that organization placed in a civil capacity can do a vast amount of good.

Mr. SMOOT. I think so myself. I do not say that Congress is going to do that, but I do say that I am going to try to have Congress do it. Therefore, I trust when the amendment is offered to which I have referred, to transfer this bureau to the Public Health Service, that the Senate of the United States will think well before it votes for such a thing. It will be out of place—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to spend five minutes talking on the bill and five minutes on the pending amendment.

Mr. KENYON. What is the pending amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 1 of the bill, line 5, the Committee on Education and Labor report to strike out the word "authorized" and insert the word "specified."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to say just one word in reply to my friend from Iowa. I made no attack upon the women who conduct the Children's Bureau. I distinctly said that I did not do so. I attacked the absurdity of putting in charge of a question of maternity and child rearing a band of women who have never had any experience and who have chosen to remain in a condition of single blessedness, for it seems to me they are the last people in the world to whom a question of that kind ought to be consigned. I did attack as twaddle some of this literature sent out, and the Senator admits it to be twaddle.

Mr. KENYON. Some of it is twaddle.

Mr. REED. Just a further word. The Senator from Iowa states that there is an institution in the city of New York that has done great good in looking after women who were too poor to employ doctors. Mr. President, of course, that is true. In nearly every enlightened community there is some institution that undertakes that work, but the man who was in charge of that—I think the Senator read his name—is a physician, and he testified that they did not need any Government help in New York; that they were doing this work themselves, but he added that the children of South Carolina, I believe it was, needed the same care they got in New York.

I will trust the people of South Carolina or any other State to take care of their affairs quite as well as the people of the city of New York. The statement argues the case out of court, because it demonstrates that in the proper and legitimate assistance of women in childbirth who appealed for it, State and local organizations can be organized and are organized to take care of that business.

I would not wish to be understood as attacking the work of Miss Lathrop, although I never heard of her until very recently, or of any of these other women who are trying to benefit humanity. But the monstrous absurdity is, I repeat, putting the charge of this particular kind of business in those who can not be qualified, taking it from physicians, trained nurses, and the mothers themselves.

The Senator stated that my logic was unfair when I read from this book that had been sent out. The book does contain the indorsement of Miss Lathrop. It is sent out for instruction. It contains these speeches. If they were the speeches of nuts and foolish people, why was it sent out for instruction? It is not like the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to which the Senator very adroitly referred. If a man makes a statement upon this floor that is in the opinion of anybody else foolish, he is responsible for it, but the rest of the body is not, because his words have to be printed. If, however, I am trying to educate the people, and I call together a number of men and women, and if among them there are crazy people—"nuts" the Senator calls them—am I warranted in sending out the fulmination of a "nut" with an introduction by myself practically commending the book or the fulmination or the speech to the people?

And that is not all, sir. You may read the articles prepared by all of these people, and there is scarcely one of them in this book that does not shadow forth the same doctrines that were more plainly expressed by the individual whom the Senator calls a "nut"—and I think he was; and there are a good many of them trying to take charge of public affairs.

Mr. President, just a word or two further. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] had started to read a list of the books that have been printed by the Public Health Service, and I called attention as he went along to one or two which have been printed by the Children's Bureau bearing the same titles as those which have been printed by the Public Health Service. Here [indicating] are only a part of the publications which the Children's Bureau have gotten out—I think about one-third of them—and I undertake to say that they parallel in every instance the matter prepared and sent out by the Public Health Service.

The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] objected to putting this matter in the hands of the existing board because, in substance, he says that that board is broken down and is worthless. That, Mr. President, is the history of all these activities. They break down; they become worthless; but if we are going to spend this money let us expend it under an existing organization whose personnel embraces some physicians.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, opportunity may not be given after considering all the amendments which have been reported by the committee and those which may be offered from the floor to call attention to other matters to which I should like the attention of the Senate. May I inquire of the Senator from Iowa, in view of the fact that this proposed legislation is experimental, if this foolish bill should pass, whether he would consent to limit its operations for three years? I have suggested, and I shall suggest by way of amendment at a later time, that we amend the bill, on page 2, after the word "each," in line 13, by adding the words "of the fiscal years of 1922, 1923, and 1924," so that it will read:

The sum of \$4,800,000 for each year of the fiscal years 1922, 1923, and 1924.

It seems to me that it would be unwise to commit Congress to a permanent appropriation for an indefinite period for this purpose; and I hope that the Senator from Iowa—I shall not have time to discuss it later, and I have not time to discuss it now—will accept the amendment which I shall offer at the appropriate time. It does seem to me that if this bill has any merit—and I prophesy that it will have none—at the end of three years it will have so demonstrated its merit as to command at the hands of Congress legislation for its perpetuity.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. The bill has been placed in a form so that the appropriation is authorized, but the matter will be entirely in the hands of the Appropriations Committee. If the proposed legislation is not a success, they can end it.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator that the construction placed upon similar legislation, as I understand the action of Congress, always has been that a general statute which commits Congress to an appropriation is construed by the Appropriations Committee as requiring that it shall report the appropriation. May I inquire of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] if he would not construe this bill, should it become a law, as requiring the Committee on Appropriations to attach to the appropriation bill reported by the committee a provision carrying this appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's inquiry, I will say that as the bill is now worded I should not consider the appropriation as a permanent appropriation or as extending beyond one year. My judgment, however, is that the committee in considering the matter would accept the estimates from the department as to the continuance of the appropriation, if it were recommended that any further appropriation should be made.

Mr. REED. But the item will come in regularly estimated for under this clause, will it not?

Mr. WARREN. I should hardly care to venture an opinion as to that proposition. The estimate need not necessarily come in.

Mr. REED. Would it not be included in the category of those appropriations which are regularly estimated for as continuing appropriations?

Mr. WARREN. It would probably be so considered by those who make up the estimates.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call the Senator's attention to a few words in lines 13 and 14, on page 2. I hope the Senator will notice them, for we do not want any misunderstanding about the future appropriations. On page 2, beginning in line 12, the bill reads:

The sum of \$480,000 for each year, \$10,000 of which shall be paid annually to each State.

I think so far as those appropriations are concerned the intention of the proposed law is that that sum is to be appropriated each year.

Mr. KENYON. It is "authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. But I will say, just as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] has said, that if the Appropriations Committee failed to report the appropriation and it was not made by Congress, the bureau could not proceed with the work any further than the end of the fiscal year for which the appropriations were made.

Mr. KING. I concede that, but it seems to me it is absurd to attach the language "authorized to be appropriated," if it is meaningless. The bill reads:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, an additional sum of \$1,000,000, and annually thereafter a sum not to exceed \$1,480,000.

It is absurd, it seems to me, to argue that that does not compel the Committee on Appropriations to insert in the general appropriation bill the amount which is specified in this measure.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not wish to consume the Senator's time, but if I may, in my own time, I wish to say a few words: First, I gave my idea of this kind of legislation to some extent here when a similar bill first came before the Senate. I was opposed to it then and I am opposed to it now. This bill, however, is less objectionable than was the first bill on the same subject. I adhere to the idea, which I have already expressed, that there is nothing obligatory upon the Appropriations Committee to report this appropriation, though they may do so upon estimates which may come to them or upon their own volition.

As I understand, under the budget system which is now in operation, action on the part of the committee becomes more mandatory as to observance of official estimates, but it has less authority to insert what it may choose to insert unless the items come from the Executive head of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that the words in lines 18 and 19, "and annually thereafter a sum not to exceed \$1,000,000," commit the Government by statutory enactment to that appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. But that is restricted by the word "authorized," which precedes it.

I am a member of the committee which reported this measure. I did not submit a minority report, because the objections to it can be stated in a few words.

In the first place, the Treasury of the United States is to-day a sick patient. We shall either have to put an end to these miscellaneous new fad appropriations, which, like the camel's nose under the tent, seem small and unimportant in the first view we take of them, but which crowd upon us with every succeeding year until they help to place us under a taxation burden that is wringing the withers of every taxpayer—individual, partnership, or corporation—or else we shall have to submit to an appreciable increase of the burden. Indeed, the shadow of increased taxation is before us now, and unless we can check these numerous new appropriations, some small, but most of them very extravagant, we are just as sure to have to tax burden our people further as we are sure that they are now suffering extreme exhaustion under the burden they are at present carrying.

In the second place, this matter, control of which is proposed to be taken by the Federal Government under this bill, is a matter for the States and ought not to be meddled with by the United States Government, in my opinion. It is a species of paternalism into which we are drifting that will exhaust our Treasury and will have bad effects rather than good effects upon the common welfare, even were it not a drain upon the Treasury.

The intention of those who propose the measure is that the bureau shall have this appropriation every year, and doubtless they will desire to increase it every year, as has been our uniform experience under similar circumstances. We might as well understand now that, if we place this additional work upon the National Government, the committee will every year be confronted with propaganda similar to that which has already surrounded us in the consideration of this measure, as well as in connection with many other measures which have swamped the Capitol and burdened the mails to the extent that every Senator receives daily many communications by telegraph and letter, which can not be considered as anything but propaganda, from men and women all over the country. Such men and women, when you write back to them and inquire why they have written or wired support of some measure and to give reasons for their support, reply that they do not know any-

thing about it except that somebody asked them to write or telegraph in support of that particular measure.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "sums," to strike out "authorized" and insert "specified"; in line 7, after the word "with," to strike out "the States" and insert "them"; and in line 8, after the word "infancy," to strike out "in the several States;" to provide instruction in the hygiene of maternity and infancy, and the sum authorized in section 5 for the use of the Children's Bureau, for the promotion of maternal and infant hygiene, for the administration of this act, and for the purpose of making such studies, investigations, and reports as will further the efficient administration of this act," and insert "as hereinafter provided," so as to make the section read:

That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sums specified in section 2 of this act, to be paid to the several States for the purpose of cooperating with them in promoting the care of maternity and infancy as hereinafter provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 15, after the word "hereby," to insert "authorized to be," so as to read:

SEC. 2. That for the purpose of paying the expenses of said cooperative work in providing the services and facilities specified in this act, and the necessary printing and distribution of information in connection with the same, there is permanently authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$480,000 for each year, \$10,000 of which shall be paid annually to each State, in the manner hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, etc.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to the word "permanently" found on page 2, line 11.

Mr. KENYON. I have agreed, so far as it is within my power to agree, with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] that he shall make a motion to strike out that word. To that motion I think there will be no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask unanimous consent that I may make that motion now, as I think there will be no objection to it. I therefore move that the word "permanently," on line 11, on page 2, be stricken out.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if we can proceed in that way, in order to clear up the same matter, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to move, in line 13, that the words "for each year" be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCORMICK. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator object to my making the motion now, or does he object to those words being stricken out?

Mr. McCORMICK. If I withdraw the objection, inasmuch as I object to the motion, we shall have to interrupt the proceedings by having a vote.

Mr. REED. We are considering committee amendments now, but I have made the request in order that the amendment suggested may be considered while the committee amendments are being considered.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think we are going to get into a great deal of difficulty if we vary the ordinary procedure.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. KENYON. There is no objection to the word "permanent" being stricken out; but I am going to object to taking up any other amendment out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the consideration of committee amendments under the unanimous-consent agreement. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 15, after the word "hereby," it is proposed to insert the words "authorized to be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed" to strike out "\$1,480,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000," so as to read:

Provided, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, an additional sum of \$1,000,000, and annually thereafter a sum not to exceed \$1,000,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out "\$1,000,000" and inserting "\$500,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri to the committee amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out "\$1,000,000," the sum proposed to be inserted by the committee, and in lieu thereof to insert "\$500,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I need hardly say that I consider it very desirable and vital to the bill that this amendment be defeated. We have consented to pruning down the bill as far as we could consistently with the preservation of its vitality and significance; and I want to take this opportunity to emphasize the fact that these consultation centers are to be conducted under the supervision of qualified physicians and qualified public-health nurses. There is nothing whatever in the objection that unqualified persons, or persons without technical qualifications, who are merely seeking political positions, will engage in this work. The main object of the bill is to establish centers of information available to all, but compulsory on none. Whosoever will may come, but none is compelled to come. There is no compulsion on anybody, and no invasion of the home.

I feel that we have consented to amendments so far as we ought to consent to them, and I trust that this amendment will be defeated.

Let me add, Mr. President, that the mothers of America desire this measure. Witness the following telegram from Mrs. Fred K. Schoff, president of the National Congress of Mothers and chairman of the child welfare department of the National Council of Women:

DR. ANNA E. RUDE,
Director of Hygiene, United States Department of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Previous important engagement prevents being at hearing. Representing 31 national organizations, including National Congress of Mothers and Parent Teachers' Association, on their behalf I urge passage of maternity and infancy bill.

MRS. FRED K. SCHOFF,
President National Congress of Mothers and
Chairman Child Welfare Department, National Council of Women.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this organization and the different State organizations can not be created within the next 12 months and spend more than a half million dollars. Even if a million dollars should be necessary hereafter, the organization is yet to be created, and it is a mere waste of money to expend a million dollars at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator's amendment to mean that we shall strike out the "\$1,480,000" and insert "\$500,000"?

Mr. REED. "Five hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. SMOOT. That will mean, then, that \$480,000 of the amount will go to the States and only \$20,000 will be left for other purposes. If the Senator wants to do what I think he intends to do, his amendment ought to apply to the \$1,000,000 on line 18.

Mr. KING. Yes; on line 18.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, that would be \$500,000 additional over what is appropriated to the States. If the amendment that the Senator has offered should be agreed to, of course, there would be only \$20,000 left after paying the \$480,000 to the States.

Mr. REED. That is all that ought to be left.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], which I transfer to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I am reliably informed that if he were present he would vote for the pending bill and against all amendments proposed to it.

I therefore consider myself at liberty to vote upon this bill and the amendments. I ask that that statement shall answer for future requirements. In this particular case I vote against the pending amendment. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I do not see him in the Chamber. I therefore transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. ROBINSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. I understand that he would vote as I have voted, and I will therefore permit my vote to stand.

Mr. DIAL. I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I am unable to get a transfer, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. Understanding that if he were present he would vote as I have voted, I will let my vote stand.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]. If present, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON. I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE. I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and that if the Senator from Maine were present he would vote against this amendment.

I also announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. WATSON].

I also announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and that if present the Senator from Maine would vote against the pending amendment.

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—6.			
Borah	King	Reed	Warren
Broussard	Moses		
NAYS—61.			
Ashurst	Johnson	McNary	Simmons
Ball	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Smoot
Brandeggee	Kellogg	New	Spencer
Bursum	Kendrick	Nicholson	Stanfield
Calder	Kenyon	Norbeck	Stanley
Cameron	Keyes	Norris	Sterling
Capper	Knox	Oddie	Swanson
Caraway	Ladd	Overman	Townsend
Curtis	La Follette	Penrose	Trammell
Ernst	Lenroot	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Lodge	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	McCormack	Pomerene	Williams
Harris	McCumber	Ransdell	Willis
Harrison	McKellar	Robinson	
Heflin	McKinley	Sheppard	
Hitchcock	McLean	Shortridge	
NOT VOTING—28.			
Colt	Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	Smith
Culberson	France	Myers	Sutherland
Cummins	Frelinghuysen	Newberry	Underwood
Dial	Glass	Owen	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Gooding	Page	Watson, Ga.
Edge	Hale	Phipps	Watson, Ind.
Elkins	Harrel	Shields	Weller

So Mr. REED's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

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

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand that we are proceeding now under the 10-minute rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 5-minute rule.

Mr. BORAH. So much the better. Necessarily, Mr. President, within that time I would not undertake to discuss the merits or demerits of this measure, but I wish to say a word in explanation of the vote I shall cast.

Whatever the merits of the measure may be, I think it is one of those measures which under present economic conditions in this country and the condition of the Treasury can wait; and for that reason I am going to cast my vote against the measure. We can no longer be indifferent to the situation and we can not change things for the better if we continue to vote for measures not absolutely demanded.

We were advised in an interview yesterday by the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. PENROSE] that the taxpayers of

this country need not look forward to any decrease in their taxes. Perhaps if that is true it was just as well to say it, but it seems too bad to be true. It is a situation, however, which confronts us, and I know of no way to relieve the situation except to adopt the rule of cutting all appropriations where there is not an absolute necessity for the appropriations. Whatever the merits of this bill may be, it is one of those things which in my judgment might well be deferred until we can see daylight with reference to the tax condition which now confronts the country. We must stop somewhere. If each Senator approaches the Treasury for what he may want, there will be no cessation of these appropriations. If each association or enterprise, thinking its cause particularly worthy, demands an appropriation, where can we find relief? We must make up our minds to give up things we want until we are able to have what we want and be content with those things which necessity alone requires.

We have been advised by the press in the last few days that we have made, by a stupendous effort, a saving of \$112,000,000. At least we have secured a promise from the departments that they will cut their expenses to that extent. The saving of \$112,000,000, while to be commended as a very laudable thing, will never in its effect reach the taxpayers at all. Within 24 hours after we were advised that we had saved \$112,000,000 we were advised that there was to be a demand upon Congress for \$300,000,000 to take up the deficit in the Shipping Board, a deficit representing either gross incompetency or that which is only a little worse, so far as the taxpayer is concerned, crookedness. If we continue, in other words, Mr. President, to increase three times as fast as Gen. Dawes cuts, instead of the taxpayer being benefited he is going to be greatly injured at the close of the year by our action.

A few days ago we voted to recommit what is known as the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill. The principal and controlling reason for that recommitment, as I was advised by the debates here and by the message of the President, was an economic one, want of money, the condition of the Treasury. Certainly, Mr. President, we ought to be consistent. It is really ludicrous to refuse the soldiers on the grounds of economy and then pass such measures as this. Without consistency and determination, we shall not relieve the people in the slightest, and unless we do relieve them such measures as these will be poor compensation for a depleted Treasury, an immense deficit, and an increase of their taxes.

However unpleasant, therefore, it may be, from time to time, I propose to adopt as my rule, as I have undertaken to do heretofore, to vote for the protection of the Treasury when I think there is not an absolute necessity to have the appropriation for the running of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRANDEGEE in the chair). The question is on the committee amendment on page 2, line 19, where it is proposed to strike out "\$1,480,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 8, on page 3.

Mr. KENYON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. I understood an agreement was reached, by unanimous consent, to read the bill for action on the committee amendments. I do not suppose anybody wants to have the bill read in its entirety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the agreement was that the formal reading of the bill should be dispensed with, and that the bill should be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered. So that course is being pursued.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 21, after the word "hereby," to strike out the word "authorized" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "directed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, on page 4, line 20, to strike out the word "may" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "shall"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "which," to insert the words "has not made provision for acceptance of this act or which"; on line 4, to strike out the numerals "1921" and to insert in lieu thereof the numerals "1922"; and on line 6, to strike out the word "shall" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "may," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations authorized in section 2 of this act, any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, accept the provisions of this act and designate or authorize the creation of a State agency with which the Children's Bureau shall have all necessary powers to cooperate as herein provided in the administration of the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That in any State having a child welfare or child hygiene division in its State agency of health, the said State agency of health shall administer the provisions of this act through such divisions. The Chil-

dren's Bureau shall recommend to the State agencies cooperating under this act the appointment of advisory committees, both State and local, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act; the members of such advisory committees shall be selected by the State agencies, and at least half of such members shall be women, all of the members of which advisory committee shall serve without compensation. If in any State, the legislature of which has not made provision for acceptance of this act or which does not meet in 1922, the governor of that State, so far as he is authorized to do so, may, under the provisions of law, accept the provisions of this act and designate or create a State agency to act in cooperation with the Children's Bureau, the said Children's Bureau shall then recognize such State agency for the purposes of this act until the legislature of such State meets in due course and has been in session 60 days.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 5, line 12, before the words "per centum," to strike out the numeral "5" and to insert in lieu thereof the numeral "3."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out the numeral "3" and inserting in lieu thereof the numeral "2," so as to limit the appropriation.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, on page 5, line 13, to strike out the word "amount" and insert in lieu thereof the words "additional appropriations," and on line 14, before the words "this act," to insert the words "section 2 of," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 5. That so much, not to exceed 3 per cent, of the additional appropriations authorized for any fiscal year under section 2 of this act, as the Children's Bureau may estimate to be necessary for administering the provisions of this act, shall be deducted for that purpose, to be available until expended. Within 60 days after the close of each fiscal year the said Children's Bureau shall determine what part, if any, of the sums theretofore deducted for administering the provisions of this act will not be needed for that purpose, and apportion such part, if any, for the fiscal year then current in the same manner and on the same basis, and certify it to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the several State agencies described in section 4, in the same way as other amounts authorized by this act to be apportioned among the several States for such current fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued. The next amendment was, in section 8, on page 7, line 1, to strike out the word "the" and insert the word "and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 4, after the word "methods," to strike out the comma and the word "if" and insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no plans of the States under this act shall provide for any official, or agent, or representative entering any home over the objection of the parents, or either of them, or the person standing in loco parentis, nor shall any employees of the Children's Bureau by virtue of this act have any right to enter any home over the objection of the parents, or either of them, or the person standing in loco parentis. If

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will accept this amendment to the amendment. I move to insert the words "or laws," after the word "plans," in the first line of the proviso.

Mr. KENYON. So that it will read "that no plans or laws of the States"?

Mr. REED. "That no plans or laws of the States."

Mr. KENYON. I shall have no objection to that, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, line 4, after the word "plans" in the committee amendment, the Senator from Missouri proposes to insert the words "or laws," so that it will read:

That no plans or laws of the States, etc.

Mr. KENYON. That raises the question, Have we any right to say what the laws of the States shall be?

Mr. REED. We have a right to say whether we will give them the money or not.

Mr. KENYON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. I call attention to the fact that this is in the nature of a proviso which provides for the adoption of certain plans of the States, and the words "or laws" would have no relevancy in this respect, because the laws are not to be adopted by the Federal Government, but certain plans, which make the payment of the money permissible.

Mr. REED. As I understand it, the committee thought it was necessary to put in a provision so that this money should not be expended or turned over to any State which had plans which would permit the invasion of the home. The word "plans" is not broad enough; it ought to cover the question of laws. I discussed that question earlier. Let the amendment to the amendment be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Chair understand the Senator from Wisconsin to object?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes, Mr. President. The Senator from Missouri offered this amendment, as I understood.

Mr. REED. I did offer it.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator is through, I would like to say a word with reference to the amendment to the amendment.

We can not provide what laws a State may enact with reference to this or any other subject. All that Congress can do is to provide that the plans, which may or may not be embodied in the laws of the State, shall conform to the conditions that we make upon which an appropriation is made; and so the word "plans" fully covers the subject, in so far as Congress is empowered to deal with it at all, whether it be by law or by administrative action. Under this proviso the plans must not permit the entering of the homes under these circumstances; but for Congress to undertake to say to a State that it shall not pass a law would be transcending our power, it seems to me. I would suppose that the Senator from Missouri would be one of the first to oppose any action of Congress of that kind—undertaking to dictate to a State as to what kind of a law it should pass. I hope the amendment to the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. BORAH. If the Congress has nothing to say with reference to the kind of a law a State may pass, it can have nothing to say with reference to the kind of a plan which the State may adopt, because the plan may be incorporated in the law.

Mr. LENROOT. But the plan will not be adopted unless it is in conformity with this provision.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me perfectly clear that if we are to give them money we can make our own conditions.

Mr. BORAH. If we can make a condition with reference to a plan, we can make it with reference to a law.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly, we can make it with reference to a law.

Mr. BORAH. It must necessarily grow out of a statute. They can not have a plan unless they have enacted some rule or scheme by which to create a plan. It is a law upon which it is based; and if we can withhold our appropriation until every plan suits us, we can withhold the appropriation until every law suits us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I move to amend, in line 6, by inserting after the word "home" the words "or taking charge of any child," so that it would read:

That no plans or laws of the States under this act shall provide for any official, or agent, or representative entering any home or taking charge of any child over the objection of the parents—

And so forth.

Mr. KENYON. I have no objection to that amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Now, I offer the same amendment after the word "home" in line 9, so as to make it conform with the previous amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Missouri proposes to amend by inserting, after the word "home," on line 9, the words "or take charge of any child."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. I suggest to my colleague that in line 11 there ought to be added the words "or laws," to conform with the amendment which he has now provided in line 4.

Mr. REED. I think the suggestion is correct, and I will offer it at this time, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is in the text; it is not a part of the committee amendment.

Mr. REED. Very well; I will offer it later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was in section 8, page 7, line 13, after the word "purposes" to strike out the period and the word "Due," and to insert a comma and the word "due," so as to make the sentence read:

If these plans shall be in conformity with the provisions of this act and reasonably appropriate and adequate to carry out its purposes, due notice of approval shall be sent to the State agency by the Chief of the Children's Bureau.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, page 7, line 16, to strike out the words "popular, nontechnical"; in line 17, after the word "States," to strike out the comma and the words "particularly to those to whom such facilities are not accessible"; in line 19 to strike out the words "subject of the"; and on the same line, after the word "infancy," to strike out the comma and the words "hygiene of" and to insert the word "and"; and in line 20 to strike out the words "and related subjects," so as to make the section read:

Sec. 9. That in order to provide instruction to the residents of the various States on the hygiene of infancy and maternity, the State agency described in section 4 is authorized to arrange with any educational institution for the provision of extension courses by qualified lecturers: *Provided*, That not more than 25 per cent of the sums granted by the United States to a State under this act may be used for this purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments are completed.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment as a substitute for section 14. I prepared the amendment after consulting with a number of Senators, especially the leader on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Iowa proposes to amend on page 9, line 6, by striking out everything after the words "Section 14" and inserting the following:

That the Children's Bureau shall perform the duties assigned to it by this act under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Labor, and he shall include in his annual report to Congress a full account of the administration of this act and expenditures of the moneys herein authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. I would like to have the amendment just adopted stated again. There was some language in it I could not understand from the hurried reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report it again.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Amend, on page 9, line 6, by striking out everything after the words "Section 14" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

That the Children's Bureau shall perform the duties assigned to it by this act under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Labor, and he shall include in his annual report to Congress a full account of the administration of this act and expenditures of the moneys herein authorized.

Mr. REED. Does not that entirely change the authority as now written in the bill?

Mr. KENYON. No; it prevents the Chief of the Children's Bureau from certifying the amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury. This was a suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I suggested the amendment which has been presented and agreed to, because under the provisions of the bill as it stood the Children's Bureau and the head of the Children's Bureau were responsible to no one. They could spend the money as they pleased; they were not responsible to the President or the head of the department or anybody else. I never saw such a bill before, and I thought there should be a provision making them responsible to some one. The Senator from Iowa agreed with me and prepared the amendment, which I think is a very important and suitable change.

Mr. REED. Unless we go further and amend section 3 we shall have two conflicting sections, in my opinion, based on a very hasty examination. Section 3 provides that—

The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor shall be charged with the carrying out of the provisions of this act, and the Chief of the Children's Bureau shall be the executive officer.

That places the carrying out of the provisions of the bill entirely in the Children's Bureau.

Mr. KENYON. But this amendment makes it subject to the direction of the Secretary of Labor. Instead of changing the bill all through, the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and I thought this would cover it and save all such amendments to the bill.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator has a very awkward bill.

Mr. KENYON. It may be. I know the Senator thinks so.

Mr. REED. It is provided that they shall perform this work under the authority of the Secretary of Labor and under his direction, and then it is said that they shall have an advisory board in addition to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, further debate is not in order under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to introduce one or two amendments to clarify the text.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. For a question only. I wish to ask if the amendment suggested by the Senator, on page 7, line 11, has been offered and voted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. On page 2, line 7, before the word "paying," I move to insert the words "aiding in."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 7, the Senator from Iowa moves to amend by inserting the words "aiding in" before the word "paying," so that it will read:

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of aiding in paying the expenses of said cooperative work in providing the services and facilities specified in this act, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. On page 3, line 19, after the word "act" and before the word "and," I move to insert the words "as herein provided."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, line 19, after the word "act," insert the words "as herein provided," so as to read:

Sec. 3. The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor shall be charged with the carrying out of the provisions of this act as herein provided, and the Chief of the Children's Bureau shall be the executive officer.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. On page 5, line 16, after the word "act," I move to amend by inserting the words "as herein provided."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 5, line 16, after the word "act," insert the words "as herein provided," so as to read:

Sec. 5. That so much, not to exceed 3 per cent of the additional appropriations authorized for any fiscal year under section 2 of this act, as the Children's Bureau may estimate to be necessary for administering the provisions of this act as herein provided, shall be deducted for that purpose, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. In section 6, page 6, line 3, after the word "under," I move to insert the words "section 5 of."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 6, line 3, after the word "under" insert "section 5 of," so as to read:

Sec. 6. That out of the amounts authorized under section 5 of this act the Children's Bureau is authorized to employ, to be taken from the eligible list of the Civil Service Commission, such assistants, clerks, and other persons, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. In section 7, page 6, line 17, I move to strike out "1921" and insert in lieu thereof "1922."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 6, line 17, strike out "1921" and insert "1922," so as to read:

And the sum which it has apportioned to each State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. In section 8, page 6, line 25, I move to strike out the words "include the provisions to be made in the State," and insert in lieu thereof the words "provide solely."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 6, line 25, strike out the words "include the provisions to be made in the State," and insert in lieu thereof the words "provide solely," so as to read:

These plans shall provide solely for the administration of the act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. On page 7, in line 1, after the word "act," I move to insert the words "in the State."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, line 1, after the word "act" insert the words "in the State," so as to read:

These plans shall provide solely for the administration of the act in the State.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. In section 9, page 7, line 21, after the word "institution," I move to insert the words "approved for these purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, line 21, after the word "institution," insert the words "approved for these purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education," so that it will read:

Sec. 9. That in order to provide instructions to the residents of the various States on the hygiene of infancy and maternity, the State agency described in section 4 is authorized to arrange with any educational institution approved for these purposes by the United States Commissioner of Education for the provision of extension courses by qualified lecturers.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KENYON. Under the unanimous-consent agreement there is no chance for an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There can be no debate, of course, but the Chair does not know for what purpose the Senator from Utah addressed the Chair.

Mr. KING. I rose for the purpose of offering an amendment to the amendment. I move to strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education" and to insert in lieu thereof "the governors of the respective States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Strike out the words "United States Commissioner of Education" and insert in lieu thereof the words "governors of the respective States," so that it will read:

That in order to provide instruction to the residents of the various States on the hygiene of infancy and maternity, the State agency described in section 4 is authorized to arrange with any educational institution approved for these purposes by the governors of the respective States for the provision of extension courses by qualified lecturers.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected, there being, on a division, yeas 17, nays 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa—

Mr. KENYON. I do not think the Senator can do it under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be debate. The Senator can present a parliamentary inquiry under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. It was not important.

Mr. KENYON. In section 12, page 8, line 21, I move to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert in lieu thereof the words "President of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 8, line 21, strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert the words "President of the United States," so as to read:

If any allotment is withheld from any State, the State agency of such State may appeal to the President of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENYON. On page 8, line 22, I move to strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and to insert the word "President."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 8, line 22, strike out the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert the word "President," so it will read:

If any allotment is withheld from any State, the State agency of such State may appeal to the President of the United States; and if the President shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I offer the several amendments which I send to the desk, and on their adoption I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 3, lines 17 and 18, strike out "the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor" and insert "the United States Public Health Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

Page 3, line 19, strike out "Chief of the Children's Bureau" and insert "Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service."

Page 3, strike out all after the period in line 20.

Page 4, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

Page 4, line 14, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "United States Public Health Service."

Page 4, line 20, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "United States Public Health Service."

Page 5, line 8, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "United States Public Health Service."

Page 5, line 9, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 5, lines 14 and 15, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 5, lines 18 and 19, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 6, line 4, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 6, line 12, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 6, line 14, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 7, line 8, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 7, lines 14 and 15, strike out "Chief of the Children's Bureau" and insert "Surgeon General of the Public Health Service."

Page 8, line 4, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 8, line 8, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 8, line 15, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 8, line 16, strike out "Children's Bureau" and insert "Public Health Service."

Page 8, line 21, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury."

Page 8, line 22, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury."

Page 9, line 6, strike out "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Chair putting the question as one amendment? Without objection, the amendments will be voted on as one amendment.

Mr. KENYON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). Announcing as before my pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay," but I am paired with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], who is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. So I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as on the last vote and its transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote, and I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to my colleague [Mr. MYERS], I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I did on this question, and I will therefore let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—9.			
Borah	Cameron	Lodge	*Overman
Brandegee	King	Moses	Reed
Broussard			
NAYS—61.			
Ashurst	Curtis	Hitchcock	Knox
Ball	Ernst	Johnson	Ladd
Bursum	Fletcher	Jones, Wash.	La Follette
Calder	Gerry	Kellogg	Lenroot
Capper	Harris	Kendrick	McCormick
Caraway	Harrison	Kenyon	McCumber
Cuberson	Heflin	Keyes	McKellar

McKinley	Penrose	Smoot	Walsh, Mass.
McLean	Pittman	Spencer	Walsh, Mont.
McNary	Poindexter	Stanfield	Warren
Nelson	Pomerene	Stanley	Weller
New	Ransdell	Sterling	Williams
Nicholson	Robinson	Swanson	Willis
Norbeck	Sheppard	Townsend	
Norris	Shortridge	Trammell	
Oddie	Simmons	Underwood	

NOT VOTING—25.

Colt	France	Myers	Sutherland
Cummins	Frelinghuysen	Newberry	Wadsworth
Dial	Glass	Owen	Watson, Ga.
Dillingham	Gooding	Page	Watson, Ind.
Edge	Hale	Phipps	
Elkins	Harreld	Shields	
Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	Smith	

So Mr. MOSES's amendments were rejected.
 Mr. KING. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk as a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,480,000 to be apportioned among the several States of the Union in proportion to population, according to the Federal census of 1920, for the purpose of aiding the States in the care of maternity and infancy.

SEC. 2. That the money appropriated by this act shall be paid to the several States upon the certificate of the governor of each State that the State has an existing agency which is adapted for the administration of and expenditure of funds for the dissemination of useful knowledge concerning the care of mothers and infants and for the protection of maternity and of child life, and that the State accepts such money for such purposes.

SEC. 3. That the moneys appropriated to the several States by this act shall be disbursed according to appropriations made by the legislatures of the several States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. KING. A parliamentary inquiry. There was some discussion about amending the bill on page 2, lines 18 and 19, by striking out the words "and annually thereafter a sum not to exceed \$1,480,000." The parliamentary inquiry is whether or not that amendment was accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary informs the Chair that the committee amendment in line 19, on page 2, was agreed to, and that no changes were made in line 18, but that the appropriation stands at \$1,000,000.

Mr. KING. In lines 18 and 19, on page 2, I move to strike out the words "and annually thereafter a sum not to exceed \$1,000,000," so that it would read:

Provided, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, an additional sum of \$1,000,000.

I move this amendment in order that the language of the bill may conform to the interpretation placed upon it by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. On page 7, line 11, after the word "plans," I move to insert the words "and laws," in order to make the bill conform with the amendment which has already been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. KENYON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I am not able to obtain a transfer of that pair and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr.

ELKINS]. If he were present I understand he would vote as I intend to vote. I therefore feel at liberty to vote and vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I shall, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Announcing my pair and its transfer as on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as previously in regard to my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I transfer my pair heretofore announced to my colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]. If the Senator from Oklahoma were present he would vote "yea."

I also desire to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. If the Senator from New Mexico were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY], but I have been informed that I would be at liberty to vote upon this bill, and I have accordingly voted. I make that explanation so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CUMMINS]. Were he present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CAPPER. The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is unavoidably absent. He has asked me to state that if he were present he would vote "yea" on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] are necessarily absent. If present, both Senators would vote for the passage of the bill.

I desire further to announce that if the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] were present he would vote for the bill. He is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

I also desire to announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], who are necessarily absent, are paired on this question. The Senator from New York would vote against the bill and the Senator from Indiana would vote for the bill.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] has a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES]. I understand that both Senators would vote for the bill if present.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—63.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	McLean	Shortridge
Ball	Johnson	McNary	Simmons
Brandege	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Spencer
Bursum	Kellogg	New	Stanfield
Calder	Kendrick	Nicholson	Stanley
Cameron	Kenyon	Norbeck	Sterling
Capper	Keyes	Norris	Swanson
Caraway	Knox	Oddie	Townsend
Culberson	Ladd	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	La Follette	Penrose	Underwood
Ernst	Lenroot	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Lodge	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	McCormick	Pomerene	Weller
Harris	McCumber	Ransdell	Williams
Harrison	McKellar	Robinson	Willis
Heffley	McKinley	Sheppard	

NAYS—7.

Borah	King	Reed	Watson, Ga.
Broussard	Moses	Warren	

NOT VOTING—25.

Colt	France	Myers	Smoot
Cummins	Frelinghuysen	Newberry	Sutherland
Dial	Glass	Owen	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Gooding	Page	Watson, Ind.
Edge	Hale	Phipps	
Elkins	Harreld	Shields	
Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	Smith	

So the bill was passed.

Mr. REED. I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment to the title, which will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In lieu of the title as printed it is proposed to insert the following:

A bill to authorize a board of spinsters to control maternity and teach the mothers of the United States how to rear babies.

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the title.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment to the title was rejected.

EXPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. ASHURST obtained the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. Pursuant to the notice that I gave when I attempted to secure unanimous consent—

Mr. ASHURST. I do not yield for a motion. I notified the Senate this morning that I wished for a few minutes to address the Senate on the tariff bill.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that what I am trying to do is to get a unanimous-consent agreement fixing a time for a vote on the unfinished business.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield for the presentation of the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona holds the floor. The Senator from Nebraska presents a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, July 26, 1921, the Senate will proceed to vote without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products, etc., through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition; and that after the hour of 12 o'clock noon on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than five minutes upon the bill, or more than once or longer than five minutes upon any amendment offered thereto.

Mr. KING and Mr. LODGE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senators who are objecting if it would be agreeable to them if the time were put over later than the time proposed in the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I shall object to this unanimous-consent agreement, and for the present to any unanimous-consent agreement. This is a bill of very great importance. It carries with it an enormous sum of money to be expended from the Treasury of the United States. There are many Senators who have given me notice that they desire to speak. There are others who have given notice to me that they have amendments which they wish to offer and discuss. The bill has been debated very little so far in comparison with its importance, and I am not ready at this time to consent to a vote upon it.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, Mr. President, with that statement there is not any use in modifying the proposed agreement further; but before the Senator from Arizona proceeds I ask the Chair to lay formally before the Senate the unfinished business, so that there may be no question about its status.

Mr. ASHURST. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business having been temporarily laid aside, it is now laid before the Senate again.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to provide for the purchase of farm products in the United States, to sell the same in foreign countries, and for other purposes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me just a moment further?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senate and to those who favor the bill now pending as the unfinished business that if it is the disposition of those who oppose it to object to any time for the ending of debate, I shall do my best to ask the Senate to recess from day to day, and to stay in session longer than we have been doing, in order that we may reach some conclusion on the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator and to the Senate that I have no intention whatever of doing anything toward delaying the bill unduly, but I do think it is too soon to make a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on it. I realize that we must have action on the bill, but I do not think we have had an opportunity for fair and reasonable debate upon it. Of course, the Senator is entirely justified in pressing his bill. I assure him that I shall not disturb him with another speech on it.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not finding fault particularly with the objection that is made, although I put off the date, I thought, for quite a while, and I would be willing to put it off further. We must ultimately, however, come to some decision on the measure.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield for a moment.

Mr. STERLING. I present an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed to the pending bill, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I regret to detain the Senate at this late hour in discussing the tariff bill; but the circumstances confronting me make it imperative that at this particular time I discuss the bill which came from the House of Representatives to the Senate to-day. My speeches, as Senators, of course, know, are always deep and wide but never long, so Senators need not be apprehensive that this speech will be protracted.

I wish to confine myself to the cotton schedule of the bill. There has been so much misinformation spread—in the nature of events unavoidable—regarding what is loosely called "long-staple cotton" that I shall devote a few moments trying to make manifest what we of the Southwest mean when we speak of long-staple cotton.

Mr. President, several hundred thousand bales, possibly 1,000,000 bales, of what is loosely termed "long-staple cotton" is produced in the United States. I refer, however, to the cotton produced in Arizona and California and in the northern part of lower California, which is, of course, called "long-staple cotton," but which is in truth American-Egyptian or Sakellaridis or Pima cotton, such as the sea-island cotton, which, by the way, dwindled to 1,868 bales last year, from 111,716 bales in 1915, owing to the ravages of the boll weevil, and I refer Senators to Exhibit D, made a part hereof.

The Egyptian, Pima, or Sakellaridis cotton produced in Arizona and California has a much superior brilliancy and gloss when compared to the so-called ordinary long-staple cotton. The Arizona-California staple is very much longer than the ordinary long staple—any cotton of staple of an inch or an inch and a quarter is called long staple). The staple of which I wish to speak this afternoon is from an inch and a half to an inch and three-quarters in length, and it has remarkable tensile strength. Indeed, automobile tires are made from it; hose for the conveyance of streams of water under immense pressure—hose that requires tensile strength to hold the stream—is made from the American-Egyptian, Pima, or Sakellaridis long-staple cotton, which grows in Arizona and California. In addition to that, Mr. President, there is manufactured from this American-Egyptian cotton a superior grade of cloth. I will give the names of some of the fabrics that are made from the Arizona-Egyptian cotton. Listen to these names and then ask your wife if anything more expensive in the way of fabrics made of cotton are to be found in the dry goods stores: Sateen, pivoile, semivoile, dimity, transparent organdy, cotton mull, sheer nainsook, French lawn, batiste, chiffon mull, poplin, warp print, fine shirting poplin, fancy piqué vesting, fancy striped voile, sateen brocade, thread stripe organdy, fancy leno voile, Jacquard, clip spot lawn, fancy swivel voile. These trade names are taken from a list made up to show the kinds of fine fabrics which are manufactured from that cotton.

If a Democratic Congress were writing a tariff for revenue bill, surely the raw material to make up these high-grade fabrics would not be placed upon the free list.

Now, it will be perceived that the fabrics I have just named are comparable to silk. Indeed, a garment made from one of these fabrics tears with great difficulty. It resists wear, and its texture is so fine and glossy that it requires a skilled eye or the finger of an expert to distinguish these particular fabrics from silk.

So we perceive that the long-staple American-Egyptian, Pima, or Sakellaridis cotton, so called, and not the cotton generally referred to as "long staple," is made into the remarkably fine fabrics that I have named, is made into the automobile tires requiring great tensile strength, into balloon fabrics, and into airplane wings. It is also at times used for some other purposes, like very strong sewing thread.

Formerly, Mr. President, our country produced none of that class of cotton in the West. It was produced on the sea islands—that is, islands off the coast of Georgia and South

Carolina and along the mainland, the littorals of those States; but, as I said before, the boll weevil made its appearance some years ago, and the former production of 111,716 bales of sea-island cotton dwindled in six years until it reached 1,868 bales last year. In the meanwhile, however, the Arizona-California-Egyptian production went forward from 375 bales in 1912 to about 150,000 bales last year, until nearly one-third of all the Egyptian cotton used in the United States for purposes of war and of peace was grown in Arizona and California.

At considerable length, and I know with tediousness to the Senate, I pointed out some two months ago that it is impossible in California or in Arizona to grow long-staple Egyptian or Pima cotton under 46 cents a pound.

The freight rate from Phoenix, Ariz., to Boston is \$10 per bale. The steamship rate from Alexandria, Egypt, to Boston is \$3 per bale. So, at the very outset, the growers of the long-staple Pima or Egyptian cotton in Arizona and California are handicapped in freight rates. I repeat, the rate is \$10 per bale from Phoenix, Yuma, or from the Imperial Valley to Boston, while it is \$3 per bale from Alexandria, Egypt, to Boston. The Government of the United States within the past 15 years has spent large sums of money in testing soils, sending out experts, and urging farmers to plant the Egyptian cotton, and thousands of acres of lands have been tested and investigated by expeditions sent out, at huge expense to the Federal Government, to locate the soil where this particular cotton would grow.

After 10 years' patient work and much expense, it was ascertained by the Department of Agriculture that those particular regions that are irrigable, where the sun shines perpetually, were adapted to raising that cotton, and that, wonderful to relate, nature in her most capricious mood set into the center of the desert the very land that would grow this Egyptian cotton, and spread itself out like a blanket of snow over the face of the desert.

But our Federal Government also urged, in speeches of Senators and Representatives, speeches of Cabinet members, speeches, sir, of a President, and in ten thousand editorials and advertisements that we be not dependent upon foreign countries in time of war for that article, Egyptian cotton, that which is woven into our airplane wings and our balloon fabrics, but that we grow a sufficient supply at home and encourage its development, so that in time of war, as well as in time of peace, we would have the prime essentials for our balloon fabrics, airplanes, and our auto tires and fancy dress and shirts.

The emergency tariff bill placed an import duty of 7 cents per pound on long-staple cotton, but, as I pointed out, the disproportion in the rates of freight between California and Arizona and Boston and Alexandria and Boston is so vast that it more than absorbs the tariff rate.

Then let me again tell Senators, as I have told them before, that the American cotton grower is a citizen of the United States, he rears his children in accordance with the best traditions, his home is a fit habitation for the upstanding American, he employs labor in my State, and pays \$4, \$5, \$6, \$7, and even as high as \$8 a day for labor, and is glad to do so.

What is the situation in Egypt as to wages and ideals? Thirty cents a day was the prewar wage in Egypt for labor. It is true now that the wage is 50 cents per day, but how does the Egyptian laborer work? Does he work eight hours? What are his ideals? Mr. President, since Cambyses came in from Persia in 525 B. C., with thundering tread marched armies over the land, and, as the poet said, "overthrew Osiris, Orus, Apis, and Isis," the Egyptian fellaheen has been noted to the uttermost ends of the earth as a physical phenomenon, for the Egyptian laborer is the most remarkably efficient working machine the world had ever seen. His labor built the Pyramids, the Sphinx, the Temples of Karmack, and the Memnonium, which was a building combining a palace and a temple, the very ruins of which are remarkable for elegance of sculpture and symmetry of architecture, and even to-day when the sun strikes the statue of Memnon, and it, owing to some peculiar physical characteristic, begins to sing, sir, when the morning sun rises the Egyptian must need do likewise; so, when the sun rises, the Egyptian begins to sing and to work, and he works 12 hours, singing the while, at 50 cents a day.

Yet the tariff bill which has come to the Senate from the House of Representatives puts cotton on the free list, which means that the American grower of Egyptian cotton will be exterminated unless the schedule is corrected. Our Department of Agriculture spent 10 years urging our citizens to grow the Egyptian cotton so that we might not be required to depend upon Egypt. We spent thousands, if not millions, of dollars demonstrating that we could build up this industry in America, and then we find it is to be absolutely and remorselessly crushed

by a tariff bill which puts this cotton upon the free list, and it is crushed, too, by a political party that has always pretended it stood for upbuilding home industries and for protection.

I appeal to Senators not to destroy this Egyptian-cotton industry. Free trade will destroy it. I appeal to protection Republicans not to turn to free trade. Your party is flushed with victory; you denounced free trade. Now, I demand that you practice what you preach.

We can not compete with Egypt. It is absurd to talk about it, because, as I repeat, their wage scale and ideals are too low. It is beyond the domain of imagination even to think about competing under conditions that obtain in Egypt.

The reason I have seized this opportunity to address the Senate—and I am gratified to observe that there are so many Senators who are so kind and so patient as to honor me with their attention—is that I hope they will see to it that this injustice, this glaring defect in the tariff bill, is corrected. I ask at this juncture unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a voluminous statement prepared by Mr. C. S. Scofield, of the United States Department of Agriculture, giving all the details as to the cotton culture and combats with nature the Department of Agriculture has carried on for some years in its efforts to try to produce this cotton. [See appendix.]

I further ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a copy of a brief which was submitted by Hon. Dwight B. Heard, of Arizona, to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, pointing out the disproportion in the wage scale between the American and Egyptian laborers. [See appendix.]

Mr. President, I will now read a clipping from the Arizona Republican, a metropolitan newspaper published in Phoenix, Ariz.:

CHILDREN STARVING IN ARIZONA'S CAPITAL.

It is almost unbelievable. But it is nevertheless true. Little children are dying of starvation in Phoenix. Hundreds of older children and adults are continually hungry; have not had a filling meal in months. It is said there are not less than 2,100 persons in Phoenix and vicinity known to be affected by the food shortage. How many more there may be whose cases have not been reported to the authorities is a matter of conjecture, and some such cases are known. Most of those who are suffering are Mexicans. But there are others among the unfortunates. Something must be done about these hungry people of Phoenix. We know that the situation is one which reflects upon the town, and the longer it persists the more serious will be the reflection.

Gentlemen of the Republican Party, that is what your policy of free trade brings. Do you like the picture?

This cotton once had a selling price that enabled the grower to pay a fair wage and make an honest profit, vast tracts of land were planted in cotton, and living wages were paid to the cotton pickers. But just about the time when the cotton farmer last year was ready to gather his crop the Federal Reserve Board, which you, sir [Mr. HEFLIN], have so eloquently spoken of and against, did not issue an order of deflation—I do not want to do an injustice, they did not issue an order of deflation, but they sedulously and calmly stated that it would be well to "deflate" at this particular time, just as the farmer was about to gather his crop.

We were in the ridiculous position of having urged the farmer to plant, plant, plant, and work, work, work; and just as the time came when he would receive something for his labor, the suggestion of deflation came, and the only person deflated was the farmer, and now to deflate him further his cotton is placed upon the free list.

I do not desire to give a partisan slant to this speech, and I shall avoid doing so.

But it is said, "You are a Democrat. How may you urge a tariff on cotton?" How may I? Have I not gone about the land like a peripatetic volcano in perpetual eruption talking for equal rights to all and special privileges to none? How, then, can I, as a Democrat, be silent when the manufacturer is protected in a bill which comes here, but the farmer, the man near the soil, whose blood and whose sweat and labor are put into the soil, is left unprotected and left to compete with China, Egypt, and India?

In 1824 Henry Clay, that flaming meteor of statesmanship, whose name thrills Americans, announced his tariff policy, and I think I can fairly say that up to this time there had been no serious political contest over the tariff, because the tariff in 1789, which passed the House unanimously and was reported from the committee by James Madison and passed the Senate almost unanimously, aroused but little partisan debate. The tariff bills of 1812 and 1816 occasioned no real partisan divi-

sion. But the partisan division arose in 1824, and I have not the time this afternoon to call the roll of Democrats who voted for that bill in 1824. Andrew Jackson, that saint of Democrats, as a Senator, voted for the tariff bill of 1824. Senator Martin Van Buren, afterwards a Democratic President, voted for the same tariff bill of 1824. Senator Thomas H. Benton, "Old Bullion," voted for the same. James Buchanan, afterwards a Democratic President, voted for the bill. Richard M. Johnson, he who slew Tecumseh, was in the Senate and voted for the bill. So did Sam Houston. And I could astound Senators on this side of the Chamber if I were to call the roll of men who voted for the Clay tariff bill in 1824.

The roll call would be a roster of those who made the Democratic Party strong and helped to give it its renown and its immortality. Why did they give it immortality? Because they said that if protection is a good thing on the manufactured product it is a good thing on the raw material. If it is right to protect the products of the factory it is right to protect the products of the farm and the field and the ranch.

I plead this afternoon that the Finance Committee may take this tariff bill and see to it that if we are to have a Nation of tariffs and pretend to be in favor of a protective tariff, it shall extend its burdens, benefits, if any, upon all citizens alike.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

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

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's speech, except to corroborate the argument he is now making, to the effect that Democratic authorities have often recognized and supported the principle of a protective tariff. I call the Senator's attention to the Democratic platform of 1884, in which they used this language, adopting the same rule that is now advocated by the Republican Party:

But, in making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the customhouse have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice; all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction and taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.

The Senator from Arizona has good authority for that doctrine. The language which I just read was from the Democratic national platform of 1884, and in the Democratic platform of 1888 the same doctrine was announced. The plank relating to that in that platform reads:

Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation. On the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations.

That is peculiarly applicable to the difference which the Senator has pointed out between the wages in Egypt and those in Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

The time has now arrived in the history of this Republic when we must be less partisan and more constructive. I seek only such fair partisan advantages as politicians always naturally take. But this question is too serious a one to call for partisanship. Too many of my constituents, too many good people in California and elsewhere, are being bankrupted and are being ruined to-day for me to attempt to make any partisan capital out of such a deplorable circumstance. I remand the Republican Party to the court of honor and the forum of conscience, and say to it, "Keep your promises."

The Republicans carried Arizona last autumn. President Harding carried that Democratic State by over 7,000 majority, and my colleague [Mr. CAMERON] to-day sits here partly because you promised you would put at least 20 cents, not ad valorem, but 20 cents per pound on this cotton. I can not get any political benefit from it if you keep your promise, but those excellent people believed you and trusted you. Do not betray them. But you are, it seems, drifting away from your principles. You are protecting only the manufacturer and allowing the farmer and the ranchman and the man of the soil to compete with the cheap labor, the cheap views, and the cheap ideals of India and Egypt.

We are to-day importing cotton from India and from China, and the time will come when these splendid Senators from the South who do not agree with all my views on the tariff question will plead with me, but not in vain, to protect them against the cheap labor of India.

When the British Government carries out its wonderful plans of reclaiming the sands of Mesopotamia and of Egypt, and that cheap labor which works for 50 cents a day begins to export cotton to the United States and the price is \$3 per bale for batters, then the eloquence of Senators on this side of the aisle will join with me in pleading that you treat the raw material just like you treat the manufactured article.

There is one principle of government which John C. Calhoun uttered from which we can not escape. We may not agree with his views on nullification, we may disagree with him in his great quarrel with Andrew Jackson, but he uttered one truth that is immortal in our Government, and that is that "the benefits and the burdens of all laws must fall equally upon all the citizens."

Now, a man may be a free trader—and I have a sort of a tolerant pity for a free trader. Free traders are students of maxims and not of markets. I do not know who said that. I doubt it can be original with me. Whoever said it characterized the free trader. He is a student of maxims and not of markets. We have one free-trade country and that is of the Eskimo, but still I insist that a man may make a sensible and at least a consistent argument for free trade provided he stands up boldly and says, "I want free trade on manufactured articles and free trade on raw material." A Democrat may make a good argument on the tariff question if he says, "I am for a tariff for revenue only. I want all imports to bear their just proportions of the burdens of government and equally pay their just tolls at the customhouse."

You Republicans, if you will be true to your ancient pronouncements, may make consistent arguments for your protection. If you but say, "We stand for protection, for protection for the manufacturer, for protection for the products of the farm and factory and field alike," then you can make a consistent argument. But I do not understand that species of mental and moral strabismus which will attempt to argue for protection or revenue only on the product of the factory and say that the product of the field and ranch shall pay no customs duty.

In other words, I can not comprehend the mental, political, and moral obliquity of the man who says, "I am going to make the hat as it comes through the customhouse pay its part of the burdens of government, but I will not make the wool that goes into the hat pay its part. I will make the boots and shoes as they reach the customhouse pay their due proportion of the burdens of government, but I will not make the leather that goes into them pay its share." I am utterly unable to comprehend any such philosophy as that which says we will protect one but not the other; we will collect revenue from one but not the other.

I stand where Jackson stood, where stood Polk and Van Buren and Jefferson and Madison and Monroe and Macon and Benton and those mighty souls who laid deep and strong the foundations of the Democratic Party, and who spoke for equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Standing upon such a principle, I am not afraid to meet anyone in debate. I can stand on that ground, but I can not stand on any ground, and neither can you, which says we will levy a tariff on the manufactured goods but not upon the products of the farm and the field.

I utter to-day this solemn warning: Do not further discriminate against agriculture; "do not muzzle the ox which treads out the corn."

Agriculture has been discriminated against long enough. Since the laborers of the farm and ranch, from the very nature of the situation, can not organize themselves easily, we ought not to give them no special favors, but ought, at least, to allow them to participate in the benefits as well as the burdens of the Government and all the laws we pass.

I shall crave the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Finance to urge that they correct the schedule with respect to raw wool. It is wholly defective. My distinguished friend who honors me with his attention, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], if he will examine the wool schedule with reference to raw wool will see how faulty it is. It pretends to give the flockmaster of the West protection, but it gives none. It discriminates in favor of the manufacturer.

Mr. WARREN. I will say that that is very unacceptable to flockmasters.

Mr. ASHURST. I knew the Senator's judgment and his honesty would cause him to rise and say that very thing. That schedule ought to be corrected, and I shall urge that it be done. I do not desire to wait until you have fallen into the pit, and then rush forward to seize some political advantage. I warn you in advance that the cotton schedule must be corrected. You should in conscience put a specific duty of 20 cents per pound on cotton, and you should correct your wool schedule. I shall not take the time this afternoon to go through the various other schedules, but I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a clipping from the New York Journal of Commerce of the 14th of this month entitled "Woolgrowers see tariff bill joker."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The article referred to is as follows:

WOOLGROWERS SEE TARIFF BILL JOKER—ASSERT MEASURE PROVIDES INADEQUATE PROTECTION TO THE SHEEP-RAISING INDUSTRY—CONTENT AD VALOREM DUTY LETS DOWN THE BARS—J. F. WALKER, IN STATEMENT BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE, EXPRESSES CONCERN FOR THE FUTURE OF THOSE IN THE BUSINESS—INDUSTRY IS DEPRESSED.

[Washington Bureau of the New York Journal of Commerce.]

WASHINGTON, July 12.

The Fordney tariff bill, which was expected to give protection to the woolgrowers of the United States, in fact lets down the bars for the importation of foreign products at prices which will kill the industry here, according to statements before the Ways and Means Committee of the House to-day by J. F. Walker, chairman of the wool committee of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, and J. B. Wilson, of Wyoming, representing the Sheep and Wool Growers' Association and the National Sheep and Wool Bureau.

SEE JOKER IN MEASURE.

The farmers assert that they have found a joker in the measure which withholds the relief which they had expected. It was said that the provision limiting the duty on wools to 35 per cent ad valorem would afford protection of only 9 to 18 cents per pound on one-fourth and three-eighths blood cleaned wool, instead of 25 cents per pound specific duty which the growers expected to be incorporated.

It had been understood by the farmers that the tariff committee was in favor of a specific duty of 25 cents per pound on cleaned wool, and the growers expressed surprise that a limiting clause had been introduced which provides that in no case shall the duty exceed 35 per cent ad valorem. With the present abnormally low prices of wool and with small prospects for materially higher prices, the wool interests pointed out that 70 per cent of the wools produced in the United States will be protected only to this extent.

NO ADEQUATE PROTECTION.

In no case, according to the present tariff schedule, can the duty go above 25 cents per pound on cleaned wool, and the average price of wool in this country for a long series of years has not been sufficiently high to afford adequate protection, in the minds of the woolgrowers, on the ad valorem basis.

The great bulk of the western wools is known as one-fourth and three-eighths blood wool. South American wool of this grade is now quoted at about 11 cents per pound, it was said to-day. Under an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent they would pay a duty of 5.8 cents per pound, cleaned basis, and 3.7 cents per pound in the grease. This means, the growers stated, that the importer could bring this grease wool into the United States at a total cost, including duty, of 14.7 cents, while the same domestic wool is selling here at 24 to 26 cents. The wool imported from South America of one-fourth and three-eighths blood comprised 50 per cent of the total imports for the past five years.

"As the schedule now stands, it not only works great hardships to the producer of wool, giving him a minimum protection when he needs the maximum," stated Mr. Walker, "but it fails to pass this reduction on to the consumer, as the compensatory duty to the manufacturer is based on the 25 cents clean-content wool duty throughout, where in some instances he is securing his wools at one-fifth that value, as in the case of the South American one-fourth blood wools, and in no instance is he obliged to pay more than 25 cents per pound clean content. We believe that this is unfair and unjust to both the producer and consumer.

INDUSTRY IS DEPRESSED.

"The wool-producing industry is in no condition to be handed a joker in the form of a tariff bill. In the past 18 months enormous quantities of wool have been rushed into this country pending the enactment of the tariff bill, and we now have enough wool to take care of normal requirements for from 18 months to 2 years. But what of the future? The sheep population of the United States has decreased 28 per cent during the last 10 years, and the wool-producing industry is in the dumps.

"Let me cite the instance of the Arizona flockmaster. His condition is typical of thousands in the far West. He shipped 1,017 lambs to the Chicago market, and after paying freight, feed bills, yardage commission charges, etc., was out of his pocket \$1,446. These lambs sold for that much less than it cost to feed them and ship them. This allows him nothing whatever for the production cost of the lambs.

"I could cite numerous instances where sheep have come to market that do not sell for enough to cover feed, freight, yardage, and other marketing charges. Instances could be multiplied by the thousands where men would be glad to get out of business with a 25 per cent recovery on their investment."

Mr. ASHURST. I also ask unanimous consent at this point to include in my remarks an article dealing with the tariff bill from the Southwestern Stockman-Farmer, an agricultural paper published for 36 years in Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Southwestern Stockman-Farmer, of Phoenix, Ariz.]

THE TARIFF.

Some of us fondly cherished the hope a few years ago that the tariff had been divorced from politics. In fact, there was something of a promise to that effect, and notwithstanding that we have from time long past learned to our sorrow that political promises are not binding, we still believed that we would never again have to go through the agonies of tariff tinkering. There were those prophets grown wise in observance of the wily ways of politicians who freely predicted that the emergency tariff which became a law May 27 of this year was a mere subterfuge; in pretense it was the redeeming of a campaign pledge to the farmers to "do something," but in reality it was the excuse for cutting the tariff fence. "Once inside the tariff field, we would see," so said these prophets, "that the big interests would be favored to the exclusion of the farmers, and the people would pay, as they always have."

We didn't like to believe these gloomy pessimistic prognostications; we were tired of the tariff and its incident business upheavals, and to believe that a Congress elected by so overwhelming a vote would deliberately turn away from the people to favor the big interests was more than unbelievable; it was unthinkable. But what happened perhaps is best expressed by our own Senator ASHURST:

"The tariff bill reported to the House was prepared largely in secret sessions of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and some members of the committee were denied the right to be present or even see the bill before it was reported to the House. The manufacturing interests, and especially the textile interests, who are seeking cheap raw materials, had their way in every schedule of the bill. No bill in the tariff history of the country ever contained such glaring discriminations against the farmers as does this bill. The placing of cotton on the free list means that the spinners will buy Egyptian cotton, which can be laid down at the New England mills at 26 cents a pound, and the American cotton raiser, of course, can not compete with the low ideals and low wages of the Egyptian. * * * This tariff bill is a wild and reckless foray upon sound economics and fair dealing. The States hurt mostly by the bill are Arizona and California, and I doubt if the bill will be corrected in the House. Growers of long-staple cotton have a fighting chance in the Senate and must not surrender their rights to the monopolists who have dictated the writing of this bill. I believe that there is a sufficient number of just and fair-minded men in the Senate to correct at least part of the wrongs and gross discrimination appearing in this bill. Kindly confer with Gov. Campbell and with the citizens throughout the State, and arrange for a committee of 9 or 11 persons from all walks of life to appear before the Senate committee; but men should be chosen who are able to present the cotton, live-stock, and mining questions in their strongest light, with especial reference to cotton and fuel oils. There is no occasion for haste, as you have three weeks before the bill reaches the Senate."

Arizona has been hit hard in the proposed tariff introduced in the House, where all revenue bills originate. In hides, cattle, wool, and cotton we have been forgotten or given a tariff absurdly low as compared with manufactured products made from these commodities. The tariff on crude oil as proposed is 35 cents a barrel, which, of course, is a direct tax which the farmer who uses fuel oil for pumping, or the miner or any concern where power must be furnished and where hydro-electric power is not available must pay, a tax which to an already overtaxed people becomes a burden hard to bear, and doubly so when interests that are presumed to be making good profits are the sole beneficiaries.

The emergency tariff allowed a duty of 7 cents a pound on long-staple cotton. This, in view of the lower cost of labor in Egypt, where the standard of living is so far below that of the American farmer as to have no comparison, seemed only fair. The proposed tariff places all cotton on the free list. What will be the result of the tariff bill as proposed? Why, not a pound of cotton will be sold until the emergency tariff law expires by limitation in November of this year. No benefit whatever will accrue from the 7-cent tariff.

If it be argued that the consumer should not be required to pay more for his auto tires simply to furnish a protective tariff to the growers of long-staple cotton, what answer will be given to the consumer regarding the proposed tariff schedule which gives manufacturers of automobile fabrics a 25 per cent ad valorem? There is nothing, save the old answer that the consumer pays, pays, pays—not the workman, the farmer, the producer, but the manufacturer and the big interests.

The Fordney tariff bill is not yet a law, and before it is enacted into law it is more than probable that Congressmen and Senators will hear in no uncertain tones the voices of their constituents, voices that will be heard from the farthestmost parts of the country, and the dread of the echoes of those voices into the next election may, and let us hope will, have a sobering effect.

Mr. ASHURST. The unfinished business now before the Senate is a bill to appropriate—may I inquire how much it is?

Mr. WARREN. The bill authorizes the use of \$1,100,000,000.

Mr. ASHURST. It authorizes the use of that much.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield for an answer, since I have invited a discussion.

Mr. NORRIS. The answer of the Senator from Wyoming, I think, is misleading. There is not a dollar authorized in the bill to be given to anybody. There is an authorized borrowing of money by the corporation that is set up that would run to nearly \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. That is what I said.

Mr. ASHURST. Whatever the sum be, I here assert, although I expect to vote for the bill, that you are pouring water into a cask and then tapping the cask at both ends. Of what avail is it to take money out of the Treasury in such huge sums if a tariff bill comes to us on the same day with such gross discriminations against the farmer?

We are importing fowls and eggs from starving China. Fifty-two per cent of the people of the United States to-day are living in cities and towns of over 2,500 inhabitants.

The people are flocking to the cities for reasons that are apparent. We must frankly consider in sane, sensible ways how to get the young men and young women back to the farm. We can not do it by singing them a song, nor by preaching to them a sermon, nor by throwing upon the screen splendid pictures of the farm and farm life. We can get the men and women and boys and girls back to the farm only by making the farm profitable, and we can not make the farm profitable if you put hides on the free list and then protect boots and shoes, if you put cotton on the free list and then protect the manufactures of cotton, if you put wool on the free list or a duty so low it is tantamount to the free list and then protect the manufactures of wool. Senators, it can not be done. The agricultural interests of the Nation can not exist under a system of that sort.

Mr. President, at this point I will read from the speech delivered in the House of Representatives on the 18th instant by Representative CARL HAYDEN, from Arizona, a gentleman of superb intellect and industry, in discussing this bill, who said as follows:

"The leaders of the Republican Party in Arizona, many of them men whose word in any business transaction is as good as their bond, solemnly assured the farmers who grow this cotton in my State that the election of a Republican President and a Republican Congress would mean, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that a protective tariff law would be enacted which would equalize the cost of production between Arizona and Egypt. No one who knows the facts will deny that this promise was one of the chief causes for transferring a normally Democratic State into the Republican column. Such positive and unequivocal assurances explain in a large measure why the electoral vote of Arizona was cast for Harding and why there is a Republican United States Senator from that State at the other end of the Capitol.

"I made no such promise. I told everyone who asked me that tariff bills are pork barrel bills and that the interests with the most votes in Congress always received the most protection. I said that political expediency and not justice had framed every Republican tariff bill that had ever been written and that the cotton growers of the Southwest were not in position to demand consideration because they could count on only four votes in the Senate and two votes in the House from the States and congressional districts where cotton having a staple of 1½ inches or longer is grown.

"I predicted then, and I repeat now, that any general tariff bill written by a Republican Congress will give the manufacturers more protection than is granted to the producers of raw materials. I further stated, and time has proved it, that the Arizona cotton growers would get as much protection, and no more, than the New England spinners of tire fabrics and the Ohio tire makers would, out of charity, permit them to obtain. I do not know and do not question the motives of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, but results speak louder than words. They have presented a tariff bill to the House with cotton on the free list and every article made of cotton protected. Now comes the gentleman from West Virginia with his pitiful apology in the way of an amendment for a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem. In the name of the cotton growers of Arizona, I thank him for his good intentions. I know that his heart is right and he would do more for them if he could. But as for the Republican Party, it promised them bread; it first offers them nothing, and now it brings them a stone."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks copies of certain resolutions adopted at the joint session of the Arizona Wool Growers' Association and the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., on July 7 and 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPENDIX.

"COTTON PRODUCTION IN THE IRRIGATED SOUTHWEST IN 1920.

"[By C. S. Scofield, United States Department of Agriculture.]

"THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDUSTRY.

"Prior to 1905 cotton was practically an unknown crop on the irrigated lands of the southwestern United States. An attempt was made to produce the crop in the San Joaquin Valley in California in 1873 and 1874, but high labor costs and the low prices for the product caused the experiment to be abandoned.

"From 1905 to 1912 numerous experiments with cotton were made in the irrigated valleys of Arizona and southern Cali-

fornia, and by 1912 the crop was fairly well established in several places. In that year the first commercial quantity of cotton of the Egyptian type was grown. Varieties of the American upland type were produced in commercial quantities as early as 1909.

"From 1912 to 1920 the acreage devoted to cotton has increased rapidly, particularly in the last three years, when the stimulus of war demands and consequent high prices have been felt. It is probable that, including some 30,000 acres of upland cotton in the Pecos and Rio Grande Valleys in Texas and New Mexico, there have been not far from 500,000 acres devoted to cotton in the Southwest in 1920. This acreage includes also about 125,000 acres in Lower California, adjacent to the Imperial Valley, operated largely under American supervision, the product of which is marketed through American channels.

"Of this half million acres of cotton about one-half, or 250,000 acres, was devoted to the production of the Pima variety, which is of the type known commercially as Egyptian. This variety produces a fiber 1¼ to 1½ inches in length. For the acreage devoted to upland cotton there has been no standardization of seed supply, and there has been much varietal mixture and consequent deterioration. At first there were some fairly pure stocks of Triumph or Mebane (1-inch staple) and of Durango (1½-inch staple), but these have been intermixed and contaminated with still other varieties until there is practically no pure seed of upland cotton available for general planting in the Southwest. With the Pima variety there is an ample supply of pure planting seed available each year since 1917.

"During the last 10 years, within which the irrigated area devoted to cotton has extended from practically nothing to approximately 500,000 acres, there has been a very large extension of the area of irrigated land. In the aggregate and within the sections where cotton has been grown the increase of irrigated area has probably been nearly equal to the increase in cotton acreage. But the relatively high value of the cotton crop, and the requirements of capital, labor, and machinery for its production and marketing, and for the manufacture of its seed products, combine to make it a factor of the first importance in the agricultural complex of the irrigated Southwest.

"Because of its rapid growth and because of the profitable returns it has given in the past three years, this industry has attracted wide attention. In the matter of returns the industry has had two bad years—one in 1914, when the outbreak of the World War caused a temporary market stagnation, and the other in 1920, when a general decline in the prices of agricultural products set in late in the season, which had been conspicuous for the high costs of labor and materials required in production.

"It is still too early to determine the final effect of the present price recession on the cotton industry of this region, but it seems clear that it has, temporarily at least, reached the end of its first period of rapid expansion, and that it must from now on settle into a more stable equilibrium with its associated industries.

"THE TWO KINDS OF COTTON.

"The two kinds of cotton now being grown in the irrigated Southwest differ from each other in so many important respects—botanical, agronomic, and commercial—that they must be considered separately in order to avoid continual confusion in the discussion of the subject. It has been noted above that the upland type of cotton includes several varieties which have been hopelessly intermixed with consequent deterioration of quality and yield. The Pima cotton, on the other hand, is all of the one variety; the seed for the entire 250,000 acres grown in 1920 having come from a single plant selected in 1911. Continuing care has been exercised to prevent varietal mixture either in the field or at the gin, and thus the most important if not the only cause of varietal deterioration has been eliminated.

"Upland cotton can be matured in a shorter growing season than Pima. The latter requires a growing season of 275 to 300 days between frosts, while the former may be grown safely with 225 days. Upland cotton is ginned on saw gins, while the Pima variety is ginned on roller gins. The lint of both types is marketed in the same kind of bales, and the seed of both types is manufactured in the same way. It has been the general experience in the Southwest that upland cotton yields somewhat more lint per acre than Pima, possibly 30 per cent more, but the yields of seed cotton are approximately the same for both kinds. On the other hand, the lint of the Pima variety has the higher market value, possibly double that of upland. The production costs are about the same for both, while the harvesting costs are nearly twice as much for Pima as for upland. It is not the purpose here, however, to discuss the relative merits of the two types of cotton for the region under consideration, but rather to

point out the differences and then to discuss certain features of each branch of the industry separately.

"THE UPLAND COTTON AREA.

"Pecos Valley.

"Proceeding from east to west, cotton is found under irrigation first in the Pecos Valley in New Mexico and Texas. In this region of high altitude and short growing season only upland cotton can be grown. The 1920 crop is estimated at 7,000 bales, which probably represents about 10,000 acres, of which a small portion is presumed to be Durango and the remainder is made up of varieties of the Texas big-boll type. In 1918 the pink bollworm was reported from one section of the valley, but prompt measures have apparently been successful in checking its spread. The Mexican boll weevil has not been reported as causing damage in this section.

"Rio Grande Valley.

"In the Rio Grande Valley, both north and south of El Paso, where water from the Elephant Butte Reservoir is available, upland cotton has been grown in 1919 and 1920. In the latter season it is reported that there were about 22,000 acres devoted to the crop. Earlier experiments with Pima cotton had shown that the season was too short for this variety because of the high altitude. Late in November, 1920, two areas of pink bollworm infestation were found—one just southeast of the city of El Paso and the other up the valley close to the line of New Mexico. The quarantine measures that may be necessitated by the presence of this insect, together with the present low prices for cotton, may cause a reduction of the cotton acreage in this section for the near future. The agronomic conditions have been very favorable, and if protection from insect injury can be had, the cotton crop should find an important place in this valley.

"Yuma Valley.

"On the Yuma reclamation project conditions are favorable to the production of both upland and Pima cotton. Upland cotton was first grown there on a substantial scale in 1914, but adverse market conditions that year caused a reduction in the acreage in 1915, while from 1916 on there has been a rapid increase. In 1917 some Egyptian cotton of the Yuma variety was planted, but the returns from the upland varieties were so high that this type continued to be the more commonly grown. In 1920 special inducements were offered by several tire companies for the production of Pima cotton, so that about 10,000 acres were planted to that variety, while possibly 15,000 to 18,000 acres were planted to upland varieties.

"As early as 1912 the Department of Agriculture recommended to the farmers of the Yuma Valley that they try cotton of the Egyptian type, but without result. In 1913 some Durango seed was distributed, and in 1914 Durango was planted extensively, as was Triumph and some other Texas varieties. At the present time the seed of these upland varieties has been so badly mixed that the 1920 crop is highly unsatisfactory. The quarantine regulations, both State and National, make it difficult, if not impossible, to import new supplies of planting seed, and there are indications that the farmers may be forced to establish for themselves locally supplies of pure seed for planting. It is not yet clear which of the varieties will be adopted, nor is it clear that in the present period of low prices there will be effective action taken to provide pure planting seed.

"It has been demonstrated that very large yields of cotton can be secured in the Yuma Valley, particularly in the lower valley near Somerton and Gadsden. On some of this land cotton-root rot is serious. Some insect pests and plant diseases have been troublesome—for example, the cotton aphid, the cotton stainer, and anthracnose. There have been some cultural difficulties, such as getting good stands and irrigating properly, but, on the whole, upland cotton has done well, and in years of good prices the crop returns have been satisfactory. Up to the present time neither the pink bollworm nor the Mexican boll weevil has been in this valley nor in the adjacent irrigated valleys of California.

"Imperial Valley.

"For purposes of discussing the cotton industry the Imperial Valley may be held to include the area irrigated by the diversion from the Colorado River at Pilot Knob, just above the international boundary. This area includes something over 130,000 acres of land in the territory of Baja California, Mexico, and something less than 400,000 in Imperial County, Calif. Cotton has been produced in substantial quantities in this region since 1910. In 1920 almost the whole of the irrigated area in Baja California was planted to cotton, while about 90,000 acres of the irrigated land in Imperial County was planted to cotton, of which about 28,000 acres was planted to the Pima variety.

Prior to 1920 the Pima acreage in the Imperial Valley was so small as to be negligible, but this year the tire companies secured the planting of this variety in Imperial County by a system of contracts similar to those used in the Yuma Valley. There was very little Pima cotton planted on the Mexican side of the line.

"Except for two or three properties, all of the irrigated land in Baja California is operated under lease from the Colorado River Land Co. (successor of the California-Mexican Land & Cattle Co.). This cotton land is rented, generally for cash, first year \$2.50, second year \$5, third year \$7.50, and fourth and fifth years \$10 per acre. In addition, the renter pays the taxes, about \$1.60 per acre, and the water charge, about \$8 to \$9 per acre. This acreage has been operated in large properties with rather shiftless cultural methods. It is estimated by a man familiar with local conditions that not over 10 per cent of this cotton land has ever been plowed, almost no attempt has been made to grow other crops than cotton, possibly for the reason that the Mexican Government has maintained very high duties, either export or import, that have tended to discourage general farming. Most of the money used for growing the cotton crop on the Mexican side of the line is provided by American concerns, among which the Globe Milling Co. has been latterly one of the most important. This concern now owns most of the ginning plants in the Imperial Valley, as well as one or more oil mills. It bought out recently the properties built up by Messrs. Dale and Speer, of Fort Worth and El Paso.

"The seed cotton, cotton seed, and cotton lint produced in Baja California is all marketed in the United States. On moving across the line through the port of Mexicali it is assessed the following export duties: For baled lint or seed cotton the export tax is equivalent to \$12.54, American money, for each 1,000 kilos. For cotton seed the export tax is equivalent to \$5.825, American money, for each 1,000 kilos. The Federal Horticultural Board of the United States Department of Agriculture is represented at Calexico by Mr. O. A. Pratt, who inspects the cotton fields in Baja California, supervises all imports from Mexico or the eastern United States with a view to preventing the introduction of dangerous insect pests, and issues permits for the importation of the Mexican-grown cotton into the United States.

"In Imperial County cotton was grown in 1920 on rather less than 25 per cent of the cropped land. This proportion of the acreage in cotton would not be in excess of the limits of good farming if the crop were incorporated into a systematic rotation. Too often this is not the case. Much of the cotton is grown year after year on the same land or put on new land by renters. Prior to 1919 the whole Imperial Valley suffered a water shortage some time each summer, often at a time when the need of water was most acute for the cotton crop. As a result of these conditions, there have been many poor yields, and the crop as a whole has been scarcely profitable to the growers even during the recent years of high prices.

"Partly because of these recurring water shortages and partly because of shifting and speculative propensities of the cotton growers of the valley, the cost of credit has been relatively high. There has been a conspicuous lack of community cooperation in dealing with such problems as seed supply, labor, and markets. Cotton production has not been handled efficiently, other industries have been periodically more profitable, and, taken as a whole, the cotton situation in the Imperial Valley falls short of being satisfactory. It seems probable that if the present marketing conditions continue the acreage next season will be reduced.

"Coachella Valley.

"The Coachella Valley, which is the name applied to a north-westward extension of the same depression in which the Imperial Valley lies, has not been an important cotton-producing section. Early truck crops and dates have attracted more attention than cotton, though there are many good-sized fields of that crop in the valley this year. Previous experiments had shown that the climatic conditions were rather too severe for Pima cotton, chiefly because of strong winds in the spring and high summer temperatures. Some upland cotton has been grown with rather indifferent success for several years. In 1920 the high prices prevailing for Pima cotton in the Salt River Valley attracted the attention of farmers in the Coachella Valley and an aggregate of a few hundred acres of Pima cotton was planted. A somewhat larger acreage, probably not over 1,000 or 1,500 acres, was also planted to upland varieties, including some thought to be Durango.

"The water supply of the Coachella Valley comes from moderately deep wells which tap an underflow, fed from the mountains which surround it on the west. In the lower end of the valley, the southeastern end, these wells flow freely; at the upper end, the westward end, it is necessary to lift the water

15 to 25 feet, for which cheap hydroelectric power, supplied by the Southern Sierras Co., is used.

"At the Indio Date Gardea, of which Mr. Bruce Drummond is superintendent, two small plats of upland cotton of the Acala variety were planted in the spring of 1920. One of these plats was located on desert soil and the other on land that had been in alfalfa. Both plats were well cared for though rather a poor stand was obtained on the plat on alfalfa land. Despite the severe summer temperatures, the plants on both plats grew well and fruited abundantly. Prior to November 30 the desert-soil plat of a little over one-half acre had been picked twice and had yielded at the rate of 3,300 pounds of seed cotton per acre. The other plat had not all been picked over at the date mentioned, but so far as then picked was yielding at the rate of 3,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre. These plats were planted with fairly pure seed of the variety, and because of this fact and the high yield and attractive appearance of the crop they were attracting wide attention both in the Coachella and Imperial Valleys. It seems probable that some attempt will be made to give this variety further trial in this region and possibly also to provide for the continued production of a pure seed supply.

"It is hardly to be expected that a large acreage of cotton will be produced in the Coachella Valley, nor that the Pima variety will be grown there, but it may be that a small acreage may be devoted to the production of the Acala or some other upland variety on a pure-seed basis, with a view to selling planting seed in the Imperial Valley, or even in Texas and Oklahoma, where there is a continuing demand for pure seed of good vitality.

"San Joaquin Valley.

"In the San Joaquin Valley the first serious experiments with cotton production were begun in 1917 near Bakersfield and Fresno. In 1920 there is assumed to be something like 20,000 acres of cotton in the valley, of which about half is upland and half is Pima. Bakersfield and Fresno continue to be the chief centers, but there are several fields around different points between these towns and the Boston Land Co. west of Fresno has planted some 2,500 acres of cotton, chiefly Durango.

"Most of the planting seed for the San Joaquin upland cotton was brought from the Imperial Valley and is badly mixed. There is one lot of Acala cotton from seed sent from Oklahoma by the Department of Agriculture in the spring of 1919 that was grown on about 100 acres of land in 1920, which is still fairly pure and has made a good showing.

"Most of the cotton in the San Joaquin Valley is grown with pumped water, which is relatively expensive. On some of the higher lands the lift required is 100 feet or more. Unless the price of cotton should continue relatively high it is doubtful if upland cotton can be grown profitably on the higher lands. On the lower lands where the water lift is less and where alfalfa, barley, and rice are now the chief crops, it may be practicable to continue the production of upland cotton, particularly if pure seed of the long-staple varieties is used.

"The outstanding feature of the San Joaquin Valley is the fruitfulness of cotton. This is true both with the upland and the Pima. There is much less boll shedding than in the valleys south and east and the potential yield is correspondingly high. There is danger, however, that ripening of the late crop may be hindered by foggy weather.

"In addition to the areas enumerated above, upland cotton has been grown in a number of other localities in the irrigated Southwest, for example, in the Blythe district, the Parker Indian Reservation, and in several of the mountain valleys in southern California. In none of these has the acreage been very large. In some of them cotton may become relatively important with the development of additional water supplies.

"The preceding paragraphs may be summarized in a tabular statement as to the irrigated acreage of upland cotton in the Southwest in 1920, with the reservation that these figures are merely provisional estimates.

Upland cotton in the irrigated Southwest in 1920.

	Acres.
Pecos Valley	10,000
Upper Rio Grande Valley	22,000
Yuma Valley	18,000
Imperial Valley, Mexico	125,000
Imperial Valley, Calif	60,000
Coachella Valley	1,000
San Joaquin Valley	10,000
Other valleys	9,000
Total	255,000

"THE PRODUCTION OF PIMA COTTON.

"Prior to 1920 Pima cotton was extensively produced only in the Salt River Valley in Arizona. Experimental plantings had

been made in other localities and the variety was well known throughout the region in which its production is possible. The Egyptian type of cotton to which the Pima belongs was first produced in the Salt River Valley in 1912. From that year until 1916 the original American selection, known as the Yuma variety, was used. The Pima variety, which came from a single plant of the Yuma variety, was selected in 1911 and was carefully tested during the next four years. Its superiority had been so clearly established by 1915 that arrangements were made to substitute it for the older variety in the Salt River Valley. Accordingly, a supply of seed sufficient to plant 275 acres was furnished a group of farmers near Tempe, Ariz., in the spring of 1916 and from this acreage a supply of pure seed was produced with which to plant the entire cotton acreage of the valley in 1917. This one variety has been grown exclusively in that valley since that time. The purity of the variety has been maintained by separate ginning and careful field inspection.

"The progress of cotton production in the Salt River Valley is shown in the following table, which gives the acreage and the yield of cotton for each year since 1912. The figures for acreage are only approximate; those for yields are as given in the ginning report published by the Bureau of the Census.

Cotton acreage and yields in the Salt River Valley.

	Acres.	Bales.
1912	480	375
1913	3,800	2,135
1914	12,000	6,187
1915	2,000	1,095
1916	6,800	3,331
1917	29,000	15,966
1918	78,000	36,187
1919	85,000	42,374
1920	180,000	(²)

¹In addition to the acreage in the Salt River Valley there were 4,000 acres in the Yuma Valley and 200 acres in the Imperial Valley which contributed to this yield.

²In 1918 it is estimated that Pima cotton was grown on 3,000 acres in the Yuma Valley, 3,000 acres in the Imperial Valley, 2,000 acres in the San Joaquin Valley, and 500 acres in the Palo Verde Valley, the yield of which is included above. In 1919 there was probably as much of an acreage grown outside of the Salt River Valley.

³The complete ginning return for the 1920 crop is not available at the time of writing.

"The price at which this cotton has sold each year is obviously a difficult matter to determine. In the earlier years, when the crop was small, fairly accurate information was available, but in the later years, when the crop was larger and the marketing season extended over many months, during which price changes were sometimes very great, it was no longer possible to learn the price at which the crop left the producers' hands. The following figures are set down as the best estimate that can be made of the average price obtained by the grower each year:

Approximate selling price of cotton in the Salt River Valley from 1912 to 1919, in cents per pound.

	Cents.
1912	21
1913	18.5
1914	15.5
1915	22
1916	42
1917	80
1918	55
1919	85

"It will be observed from a comparison of the two tables above that a market increase in cotton acreage has followed promptly on a sharp advance in price. The acreage increase in 1920 was still further stimulated not only in the Salt River Valley but elsewhere in the Southwest by two factors: The price of cotton advanced rapidly throughout the marketing season from an opening around 60 cents to a final price of \$1.25, and several of the large tire manufacturing companies offered to contract with growers for the crop, with a guaranteed basis of 60 cents per pound and as much as 75 cents in some cases.

"The entire Pima acreage in the Southwest in 1920 may be provisionally estimated as follows:

	Acres.
Salt River Valley	185,000
Yuma Valley	10,000
Imperial Valley	30,000
San Joaquin Valley	10,000
Other valleys	5,000
Total	240,000

"From this acreage it would appear to be safe at the present time to estimate a crop of 120,000 bales.

"The entire acreage of irrigated cotton in the Southwest for 1920 may be estimated as follows:

	Upland.	Pima.
	Acre.	Acre.
Pecos Valley.....	10,000
Upper Rio Grande.....	22,000
Salt River Valley.....	185,000
Yuma Valley.....	18,000	10,000
Imperial Valley, Mexico.....	125,000
Imperial Valley, Calif.....	60,000	30,000
Cochella Valley.....	1,000	100
San Joaquin Valley.....	10,000	10,000
Other valleys.....	9,000	5,000
Total.....	255,000	240,000

"GINS AND GINNING.

"The production of cotton involves the installation of gins and oil mills, and the character of the control of the former at least has a very important relation to the welfare of production. The following is a list of the roller-gins operating in the Southwest in November, 1920, as furnished by Mr. S. H. Hastings and checked by Messrs. McLachlan and Camp:

Roller gins in the Southwest in 1920.

SALT RIVER VALLEY.

Southwest Cotton Co.....	180
McCall (Firestone).....	80
Atha (American Thread Co.).....	18
Tempe Exchange.....	10
Phoenix Ginning Co. (Fisk).....	20
Farmers' Gin.....	20
Scottsdale (Cooperative).....	10
Buckeye (Dunlap).....	20
Mesa (Attaway-Phelps).....	32
Total.....	390

YUMA VALLEY.

Southwest Cotton Co.....	20
McCall (Firestone).....	12
Total.....	32

IMPERIAL VALLEY.

Southwest Cotton Co.....	40
Fowler (Fisk).....	20
El Centro gin.....	6
Seeley.....	4
Total.....	70

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY.

Arvin and Shafter (Cooperative).....	20
Wasco.....	10
Bakersfield.....	18
Fresno.....	8
Total.....	56
Grand total.....	548

"These roller gins are capable of turning out 1½ to 2 bales of cotton per day if run continuously with two shifts of men. When equipped with self-feeders a 10-stand plant requires a crew of eight or nine men for its operation.

"Notwithstanding the large number of gins in the Salt River Valley in 1920, this number was not adequate to keep up with the volume of cotton being picked at the height of the season. In the latter part of November there were estimated to be 30,000 cotton pickers at work in that valley, gathering daily at least 1,000 tons of seed cotton, or the equivalent of 1,000 bales of lint. The daily ginning capacity was hardly above 700 bales per day.

"The charge made for ginning Pima cotton in 1920 is \$1.20 per hundred pounds of seed cotton, which includes the bagging and ties and an assessment of \$4 per bale for the support of the organization that imports the labor for picking. It is said, on good authority, that the actual cost of ginning is somewhat higher than this. In 1912 and 1913 the regular charge for ginning was about 50 cents per hundred pounds of seed cotton, or \$10 per bale, and the gins as then operated required the services of one man at each gin as a feeder.

"The mechanical feeders now in general use seem to be giving good satisfaction. Some new departures are being made in the covering of the rolls on the gins. Formerly the gin rolls were covered with strips of heavy leather, wound spirally on a wooden core, and glued and pegged in position. Lately a type of heavy hydraulic packing, made of rubber and cotton, has been used. At first this packing was put on in a series of disks pressed close together; later it was used in spiral strips alternating with strips of leather. Finally some rolls are being tried with the packing used alone in the spiral form just as the leather was formerly used.

"The ginning of the upland cotton crop, which is done with saw gins, is in general adequately provided for. In fact, in the Imperial Valley there were more saw gins than were needed for the volume of the crop coming off the plants at the end of November. The charge for saw ginning is this year 35 cents per hundred pounds of seed cotton, with an additional charge of \$2.25 per bale for bagging and ties.

"There are a number of oil mills in the Southwest for the manufacture of cotton seed. Prior to the war these mills paid about \$15 per ton for seed. This price was advanced during the war until in 1919 seed sold up to \$85, and possibly even as high as \$100, per ton. In 1920 the price of seed dropped back to the general level of \$15 to \$20 per ton. These prices were so disappointing that many farmers who had live stock were hauling their seed home from the gin with the intention of feeding it unless a better price could be secured.

"Up to the present time it has not been customary to compress the Pima cotton at primary shipping points. Some of the crop, moving eastward by way of Galveston, has probably been compressed for ocean shipment, but much of the crop has gone through the mills in the low-density bales turned out at the gin. The upland crop, on the other hand, has largely been compressed at primary points. There are two compresses in the Imperial Valley, one at Imperial and the other at Calexico.

"The Pima crop is sampled at the gin before the bale is packed. The upland crop is sampled in the gin yard or at the compress, each bale being slashed on both sides for the sample.

"THE LABOR SITUATION.

"One of the earliest problems in connection with the establishment of cotton production in the Southwest was that of securing the labor for picking the crop. Labor has always been relatively scarce and high priced in these new regions, and it was feared that the labor requirements of the cotton crop might be difficult to meet. At first it was thought that it might be possible to draw upon the Indians of the various Arizona reservations for the cotton-picking season, and during the first years that cotton was grown numbers of Pimas and Papagos were brought into the Salt River Valley for the picking season. As the cotton acreage was extended, however, it became clear that the supply of Indian labor available would not be sufficient to meet the needs of the cotton growers, and it was decided to seek additional labor in Mexico.

"The effective importation of Mexican labor required money and united action. To meet these needs the farmers of the Salt River Valley formed a labor organization and selected Mr. W. H. Knox to take charge of the work. The necessary money was raised by an ingenious expedient. All of the gin owners of the valley were persuaded to sign an agreement that they would increase the ginning charge by \$2 per bale above the regular charge and pay over to the labor organization the money so collected to be used as a fund for securing pickers.

"With these signed agreements as collateral the management of the labor organization was able to borrow from the local banks the money needed for its operations early in the season. This enterprise was launched in the summer of 1916. For the first two years labor was sought not only in Mexico but from Texas and Oklahoma and other points in the older cotton belt. Later it was found easier to get results from Mexico, so that recently that country has been the chief source of supply.

"It has been necessary for the labor organization to get a special dispensation from the Federal immigration authorities to bring this labor in. The immigrants not eligible for permanent entry must be returned to Mexico. It has been found advisable to bring in families, and this has necessitated the provision of medical care, shelter for living, and schooling for children. So far as can now be judged, this plan of importing labor has worked out well in the Salt River Valley. It has been possible to bring in sufficient labor to fill the need, and thus to prevent undue increases in the cost of cotton picking. At first the current rate of pay for cotton picking (Pima cotton) was \$2 per hundred pounds of seed cotton. This rate has been increased from time to time until in 1920 the pickers are paid \$4 per hundred pounds.

"It is estimated by Mr. Knox that there were in the Salt River Valley in 1920 about 30,000 cotton pickers. Of these, about 15,000 were brought in from Mexico during the season, about 5,000 were Mexicans who had remained in the valley from previous seasons, and the remaining 10,000 included those diverted from other work in the valley and those who came in on their own account from other sections.

"Attempts have been made to extend the operations of the Salt River Valley labor organization to the Yuma and Imperial Valleys, but so far without conspicuous success. In the Imperial Valley south of the line it is possible to use Chinese, Japanese, and Mexicans almost without restriction, and that

district has not suffered any serious labor shortage. North of the line it has been different, labor shortages have been perennial. This past season a serious attempt was made to form a central labor organization patterned after the one in the Salt River Valley. This failed because the ginners would not all agree to assess their patrons and thereby raise the funds. As a result of this lack of organization picking costs have been higher both in the Yuma and Imperial Valleys than in the Salt River Valley and the picking has not been so well done. Apparently no organized effort was made to get cotton pickers for the crop in the San Joaquin Valley this past season. There was, in consequence, a shortage of pickers even at the price of \$5 per hundred, which is equivalent to 19 cents or 20 cents per pound of lint.

"It is estimated that on the average cotton pickers will gather from 60 pounds to 100 pounds of seed cotton per day when working in Pima fields and from 125 to 175 pounds per day in picking upland cotton. Thus on the basis of an average yield of 1,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre from Pima cotton provision must be made for one picker for each 6 acres of the crop. For upland cotton, on the other hand, the labor situation might be regarded as satisfactory if there were available one picker for each 12 acres.

"THE COST OF PRODUCTION.

"It is not proposed here to undertake to state how much it costs to produce a pound of cotton in the Southwest. To do so would be like attempting to say how much it costs to build a house. But just as one might in the latter case set down some fairly precise information as to the local prices of brick, cement, lumber, and skilled labor, so it is possible to make some estimates at least of the costs involved in the production of cotton. However, these can be no more than estimates. The actual costs will differ from farm to farm and from section to section.

"The production of cotton in the Southwest involves the use of land, of irrigation water, of certain agricultural implements, of labor both of men and horses, of skilled supervision, and finally seed for planting. Items of cost or value such as these may be assessed against each acre of land involved, regardless of the yield obtained. When the crop is ready to harvest the cost items are more conveniently charged against some unit of the crop as the 100 pounds of seed cotton or the bale of lint.

"This matter of production costs is always one of acute interest to cotton growers, but in 1920 the interest became abnormally keen as the season advanced and market prices for cotton declined. Growers and bankers alike felt the need of taking stock of the situation, not only to deal with the immediate problem of operating credits but also to determine a future course of action.

"It may be worth while before taking up current production costs to recall estimates made in 1913 and 1914, when cotton was a new crop in the Salt River Valley. Such estimates were published in Bulletin 332 of the United States Department of Agriculture. They may be listed as follows:

	Table IV.	Table V.
1. Fixed charges:		
Land rental or interest and taxes.....	\$12.00	\$17.25
Irrigation water.....	1.50	2.00
	13.50	19.25
2. Growing cost:		
Cultural operations and seed.....	15.00	15.10
Total cost per acre.....	28.50	34.35
3. Harvesting cost (per 100 pounds seed cotton):		
Picking.....	2.00	2.00
Hauling to gin.....	.21	.07
Ginning.....	.56	.56
Cost per 100 pounds seed cotton.....	2.77	2.63

"There were three different yields involved in the two tables cited above, (1) 1,200 pounds, (2) 1,800 pounds, and (3) 2,552 pounds, all in terms of seed cotton per acre. The first two were included in the estimate of Table IV and the third in Table V. If we divide the total cost per acre of Table IV by 1,200 we have \$2.37, which, with the harvesting cost of \$2.77, makes a total of \$5.14 per hundred pounds of seed cotton. Similarly we find for the 1,800-pound yield a total cost of \$1.58 plus \$2.77, or \$4.35. Finally, for the third case, with a yield of 2,552 pounds of seed cotton per acre, the cost is \$1.35 plus \$2.63, or \$3.98.

"The ginning experience in 1913 and 1914 was that 100 pounds of seed cotton would yield about 28 pounds of lint and 72 pounds of seed. The seed could then be sold at the gin for \$15 per ton, or 75 cents per hundred pounds. Thus, if we

deduct from the cost of the 100 pounds of seed cotton the gin value of the 72 pounds of seed, we have, by dividing the 28 pounds of lint into the remainder, a figure for the net cost of the lint:

- "Case 1. Yield, 1,200 pounds: $\$5.14 - \$0.54 = \frac{\$4.60}{28} = 16.4$ cents per pound lint.
- "Case 2. Yield, 1,800 pounds: $\$4.35 - \$0.54 = \frac{\$3.81}{28} = 13.6$ cents per pound lint.
- "Case 3. Yield, 2,552 pounds: $\$3.98 - \$0.54 = \frac{\$3.44}{28} = 12.3$ cents per pound lint.

"These figures are approximately what was thought to be the cost of production of Egyptian cotton in the Southwest in the first years of the industry. At that time it was thought that this type of cotton might bring on the average 20 to 22 cents per pound, at which price a fair profit might be made if good yields were obtained. The importance of high yields, even at some increase in the cost of cultural operations, is very obvious. The proportionate amount of fixed charges is so large that it is only with large yields that the unit cost of the product can be reduced.

"With this background of prewar costs in mind, we can make a comparable list of the costs prevailing in 1920. It should be kept in mind that in the six years since the time of the earlier estimate land values, as well as the cost of labor and material, have increased very greatly. While the figures given below do not represent any extensive compilation of data, it is believed that they represent fairly well the average of the rather wide range of costs. In the case of land rental or its equivalent, interest on investment, the range for 1920 was very great. Some good land under a long period of rental cost the operator only \$15 per acre. On the other hand, land rented in the spring of 1920 committed the operator in some cases to as much as \$84 per acre for the year. The costs of land preparation and of irrigation water also varied greatly, though probably within narrower limits than the item of land rental. On the other hand, the costs of picking and ginning were nearly if not quite the same in all cases, and the costs of most of the other labor operations were not widely different.

Cost of producing Pima cotton in the Salt River Valley in 1920, estimate.

1. Fixed charges:		
Land rental or interest and taxes.....	\$35.00	
Use of machinery and equipment.....	3.75	
Irrigation water.....	5.00	
		\$43.75
2. Growing cost:		
Cultural operations and seed.....	30.50	
Supervision.....	5.00	
		35.50
Total cost per acre.....		79.25
3. Harvesting cost (per 100 pounds seed cotton):		
Picking.....	4.00	
Hauling to gin.....	.25	
Ginning.....	1.20	
Yardage, insurance, association fees.....	.35	
Picking, supervision, tents, etc.....	.15	
Total.....		5.95

"The ginning experience of 1920 showed that 100 pounds of seed cotton would yield about 25 pounds of lint and 75 pounds of seed. The price of seed was somewhat uncertain, but it is hardly safe to estimate it as above \$20 per ton. It is thought that the average yield in 1920 will turn out to be a little above 1,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre (0.5 bale), with many fields giving only 800 pounds and a few giving 1,600 pounds. To cover this range the cost estimates may be given for yields of 800 pounds (0.4 bale), 1,200 pounds (0.6 bale), and 1,600 pounds (0.8 bale). With these data the complete formula for determining the cost of production for any yield may be stated as follows: Divide the acre cost of production by the yield of seed cotton, to the quotient add the harvesting cost, from this sum subtract the value of the seed, and divide the remainder by the lint percentage to obtain the net cost per pound of lint. For the three yields mentioned we have the following:

- 1. Yield 800 pounds per acre:

$$\frac{\$79.25 + \$5.95}{800} - .75 = 60.4 \text{ cents.}$$
- 2. Yield 1,200 pounds per acre:

$$\frac{\$79.25 + \$5.95}{1,200} - .75 = 47.2 \text{ cents.}$$
- 3. Yield 1,600 pounds per acre:

$$\frac{\$79.25 + \$5.95}{1,600} - .75 = 40.6 \text{ cents.}$$

"If we add to these three the formula for the half-bale yield generally estimated for the Salt River Valley, we have:

$$4. \text{ Yield 1,000 pounds per acre: } \frac{\$79.25 + \$5.95}{1,000} = .75$$

$$\frac{.75}{25} = 52.6 \text{ cents.}$$

"This figure may be taken as a fair statement of the average cost of production for the valley in 1920.

"It may be proper at this point to consider the problem of how Pima cotton may be produced at a lower cost in the future. This reduction in cost may be accomplished either by obtaining larger yields or by lowering the land rental and wages, or by a combination of the two. If we are entering upon a period of economic readjustment during which lower prices prevail, it is inevitable that there must be lower returns on capital invested and a lower scale of wages for labor.

"Prior to the war land rentals in the Salt River Valley ranged around \$15 per acre, and the wages of farm labor were little more than half those prevailing in 1920. The prices of agricultural machinery were also much lower five years ago. It is, of course, impossible to forecast the rate or the extent of price readjustment, but it is the part of wisdom to consider seriously how to reduce production costs.

"In order to simplify this problem as much as possible, at least two basic assumptions may be made, one that Pima seed cotton will turn out 25 per cent at the gin and the other that seed will be worth \$20 a ton. With these two assumptions granted, it is possible to construct a table of cost and yield relationships that will show what yields must be secured with given production costs or what production costs can be allowed with a given yield in order to obtain cotton lint at a certain price. In this table production cost is held to include all charges assignable to an acre of cotton land, such as land rental or interest and taxes; use of machinery and equipment; irrigation water; all costs of growing the crop, such as preparation of the land and planting; planting seed; labor for irrigation, cultivation, thinning, and weeding; and supervision of production operations. These items in the 1920 estimate given above totaled close to \$80 per acre. The item in the table designated as net harvesting cost is made to include the cost of picking; hauling to gin; ginning; yardage, insurance, and association fees; picking supervision; tents, etc., less the value of the cotton seed at the gin. Thus, the net harvesting cost given in the 1920 estimate was slightly above \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton.

"The following table shows in a striking way how the cost of the lint declines as yields increase. Thus, in the first line of the table, with a production cost of \$80 per acre and a net harvesting cost of \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton, the lint cost is 60 cents per pound when the yield is 800 pounds of seed cotton per acre and only 36 cents per pound when the yield is 2,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre. On the other hand, if it is possible to reduce the production cost to \$50 per acre and the net harvesting cost to \$4 per hundred, a yield of only 1,000 pounds per acre can be made at 36 cents.

Table showing the net cost of cotton lint, in cents per pound, with different rates of production cost, harvesting cost, and yield of seed cotton.

$$\frac{P}{Y+H} = C \quad G=25 \text{ per cent.}$$

P	H	Yield (pounds of seed cotton per acre)							
		800	1,000	1,200	1,400	1,600	1,800	2,000	
\$80	\$5	60.0	52.0	46.6	42.8	40.0	37.7	36.0	
	4	58.0	48.0	42.6	38.8	36.0	33.7	32.0	
	3	52.0	44.0	38.6	34.4	32.0	29.7	28.0	
\$70	5	55.0	48.0	43.3	40.0	37.5	35.5	34.0	
	4	51.0	44.0	39.3	36.0	33.5	31.5	30.0	
	3	47.0	40.0	35.3	32.0	29.5	27.5	26.0	
\$60	5	50.0	44.0	40.0	37.1	35.0	33.3	32.0	
	4	46.0	40.0	36.0	33.1	31.0	29.3	28.0	
	3	42.0	36.0	32.0	29.1	27.0	25.3	24.0	
\$50	5	45.0	40.0	36.6	34.2	32.5	31.0	30.0	
	4	41.0	36.0	32.6	30.2	28.5	27.0	26.0	
	3	37.0	32.0	28.6	26.2	24.5	23.0	22.0	
\$45	5	42.5	38.0	35.0	32.8	31.2	30.0	29.0	
	4	38.5	34.0	31.0	28.8	27.2	26.0	25.0	
	3	34.5	30.0	27.0	24.8	23.2	22.0	21.0	
\$40	5	40.0	36.0	33.3	31.4	30.0	28.9	28.0	
	4	36.0	32.0	29.3	27.4	26.0	24.9	24.0	
	3	32.0	28.0	25.3	23.4	22.0	20.9	20.0	
\$35	5	37.5	34.0	31.7	30.0	28.8	27.8	27.0	
	4	33.5	30.0	27.7	26.0	24.8	23.8	23.0	
	3	29.5	26.0	23.7	22.0	20.8	19.8	19.0	
\$30	5	35.0	32.0	30.0	28.5	27.5	26.6	26.0	
	4	31.0	28.0	26.0	24.5	23.5	22.6	22.0	
	3	27.0	24.0	22.0	20.5	19.5	18.6	18.0	

NOTE.—In the column headed "P" the production cost is given in dollars per acre. In the column headed "H" the net harvesting cost is given in dollars per hundred pounds of seed cotton. In each yield column is given the corresponding cost of lint in cents per pound. In making these computations it is assumed that the seed cotton yields 25 per cent of lint and that the seed is worth \$20 per ton.

"In considering the cost of producing upland cotton in the Southwest a somewhat different set of figures must be used. In some cases where upland cotton has been produced on less valuable land than Pima cotton the yields, in terms of seed cotton, have been approximately the same, though because of the higher ginning percentage upland has given distinctly higher lint yields. The cost of picking and ginning has been much less.

"On the other hand, the production costs, except for a possibly lower land rental, are approximately the same for the two kinds of cotton. The harvesting costs may be estimated for the season of 1920 as follows:

Harvesting cost (per 100 pounds of seed cotton, upland):	
Picking	\$2.00
Hauling to gin	.25
Ginning, \$0.35, including bag and ties	.50
Yardage, insurance, association fees	.35
Picking supervision, tents, etc.	.15
Total	3.25

"From this total there may be deducted the value of the cotton seed at the gin. With a ginning outturn of 33 per cent of lint there should be left 67 pounds of seed, which may be estimated as worth \$20 per ton. This taken from the total harvesting cost leaves \$2.58 as the net harvesting cost.

"If it is assumed that the average yield of upland seed cotton in the irrigated Southwest in 1920 was 1,000 pounds per acre, or two-thirds of a bale, and that the production cost was as much as \$10 per acre less than for the Pima, because of lower land rental, we find by reference to the following table that the cost of lint would be close to 29 cents per pound.

Table showing the net cost of lint, in cents per pound, with different rates of production cost, harvesting cost, and yield of seed cotton.

$$\frac{P}{Y+H} = C \quad G=33 \text{ per cent.}$$

P	H	Yield (pounds of seed cotton per acre)							
		800	1,000	1,200	1,400	1,600	1,800	2,000	
\$80	\$5	37.9	31.8	27.7	24.9	22.7	21.0	19.7	
	4	36.4	30.3	26.2	23.4	21.2	19.5	18.2	
	3	34.9	28.8	24.7	21.9	19.7	18.0	16.7	
\$70	5	32.6	28.8	25.2	22.7	20.8	19.4	18.2	
	4	31.1	27.3	23.7	21.2	19.3	17.9	16.7	
	3	29.6	25.8	22.2	19.7	17.8	16.4	15.2	
\$60	5	30.3	25.7	22.7	20.6	18.9	17.7	16.7	
	4	28.8	24.2	21.2	19.1	17.4	16.2	15.2	
	3	27.3	22.7	19.7	17.6	15.9	14.7	13.7	
\$50	5	26.5	22.7	20.2	18.4	17.1	16.0	15.2	
	4	25.0	21.2	18.7	16.9	15.6	14.5	13.7	
	3	23.5	19.7	17.2	15.4	14.1	13.0	12.2	
\$45	5	24.6	21.2	18.9	17.3	16.1	15.2	14.4	
	4	23.1	19.7	17.4	15.8	14.6	13.7	12.9	
	3	21.5	18.2	15.9	14.3	13.1	12.2	11.4	
\$40	5	22.7	19.7	17.7	16.2	15.2	14.3	13.6	
	4	21.2	18.2	16.2	14.7	13.7	12.8	12.1	
	3	19.7	16.7	14.7	13.2	12.2	11.3	10.6	
\$35	5	20.8	18.2	16.4	15.2	14.2	13.5	12.9	
	4	19.3	16.7	14.9	13.7	12.7	12.0	11.4	
	3	17.8	15.2	13.4	12.2	11.2	10.5	9.9	
\$30	5	18.9	16.7	15.2	14.1	13.3	12.6	12.1	
	4	17.4	15.2	13.7	12.6	11.8	11.1	10.6	
	3	15.9	13.7	12.2	11.1	10.3	9.6	9.1	

NOTE.—In the column headed "P" the production cost is given in dollars per acre. In the column headed "H" the net harvesting cost is given in dollars per hundred pounds of seed cotton. In each yield column is given the corresponding cost of lint in cents per pound. In making these computations it is assumed that the seed cotton yields 33 per cent of lint and that the seed is worth \$20 per ton.

"It has been the general experience for many years that cotton of 1½-inch staple, such as the Pima, is worth in the market one year with another about twice as much per pound as upland cotton of 1-inch staple. There is no good reason for expecting that this price relationship will be changed materially in the near future.

"Even in the demoralized market at the close of the year 1920, when upland cotton is worth only 12 cents to 13 cents to the grower in the Southwest, Pima cotton could be sold at better than 30 cents. Where the two kinds of cotton have been grown on the same class of land in 1920, each yielding 1,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre, equivalent to one-half of a bale of Pima and two-thirds of a bale of upland, it will be seen by reference to the two preceding cost tables that the net cost of the Pima lint is nowhere twice as much as the net cost of the upland lint. Even with the lowest production cost given in the table, \$30 per acre, and allowing the corresponding net harvesting costs of \$5 for Pima and \$2.50 for upland, the table shows that for the 1,000-pound yield a lint cost of 32 cents for Pima and of 16.7 cents for upland. A comparison of these net costs with current market values gives no ground for changing from Pima production to the production of upland cotton.

"THE IMPORTANCE OF INCREASED YIELDS.

"The most conspicuous feature of the cotton situation in the Southwest in 1920 was the importance of getting larger yields. It was to be expected that with such a large increase in acreage much of the land planted to cotton would be found unsuited to the crop, and many of the farmers with little or no previous experience would make serious mistakes in the cultural operations, particularly in irrigation.

"It is not the purpose here to attempt to point out in detail the mistakes made in land selection or in cultural practice. It is intended rather to point out that large yields are essential to cheap production. To make this point clear one has only to study the tables given in the previous chapter. Take, for instance, the first of these which deals with Pima cotton, the first line of which shows a production cost of \$80 per acre and a net harvesting cost of \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton. When the yield is 800 pounds per acre the net cost of lint is shown to be 60 cents per pound, while a yield of 2,000 pounds of seed cotton per acre, not an unusual yield for good land and good care, shows a net cost of only 36 cents per pound of lint.

"This matter can be stated in another way. Supposing there were two farmers growing cotton with a scale of harvesting costs that would net \$5 per hundred pounds of seed cotton and with a market outlet at 35 cents per pound for the lint, so that they would aim to make the crop for at least 33.3 cents per pound. If one of them should so handle his operations as to make a crop of 1,200 pounds of seed cotton while his neighbor with more skill or better land made 1,800 pounds per acre, the first farmer would get only \$40 per acre to cover production costs and land rental, while the other would have \$60 to apply on the same account.

"Some of the land in the Salt River Valley, for instance, is not well suited to cotton because of some inherent quality, such as alkali or liability to root rot. But for the most part, the low yields that have been obtained have been due either to adverse climatic conditions, improper cultural management, or lack of suitable crop rotation. Of these difficulties the two last named may be overcome and doubtless will be in large measure, as experience is accumulated.

"THE CLIMATIC DIFFICULTIES.

"The cotton crop in the Southwest is subject to the hazards of climate no less than in the eastern cotton belt. Cold weather in the early spring, rain that crusts the ground after the crop is planted, wind and hail during the growing season, excessively hot weather during the flowering period, an occasional water shortage during the critical months of late summer when the crop is making, and early autumn frosts make up a formidable array of hazards. Add to these plant lice and cotton stainers, with an occasional epidemic of 'black arm,' and there are surely troubles enough.

"Fortunately, however, it is unlikely that all these adversities will occur in any one season. And there is one outstanding advantage, the season of the cotton harvest is seldom rainy or windy, so that field damage is relatively slight.

"The season of 1920 was characterized by a cold, late spring, followed by a period of favorable growing weather which was in turn followed by a period of excessive heat. The first killing frost in the autumn did not come until near the end of November, except in the San Joaquin Valley, where a killing frost occurred on October 31.

"In other seasons there have been killing frosts in all the southwestern valleys as early in the fall as was the case in the San Joaquin Valley this year. When a killing frost occurs it stops the growth of the cotton plant, but it does not ordinarily injure the bolls that are nearly or quite mature, but have not yet opened. It is the usual thing for these bolls that are full-sized but green at the time of frost, to burst open within a week or 10 days after the frost, so that the final picking can be made.

"In the San Joaquin Valley this season it was observed that the normal frost opening did not occur, particularly on the lower lands of the valley. On the higher lands the early frost was less severe, and the weather after the frost was drier and nearly normal frost-opening occurred. On the lower lands, however, fields seen a month after the frost showed very little frost-opening. A few bolls on the upper part of the plant had cracked at the tip, but had not fluffed out so as to permit easy picking, while the bolls on the lower part of the plant, where the bulk of the crop was borne, had not cracked at all.

"In seeking an explanation of this phenomenon it was learned that the weather in the valley during November had been unusually humid. There had been a number of rainy and cloudy days and also many days in which the morning fog had hung over the valley bottom until well into the middle of the day.

The humidity record of the Weather Bureau station at Fresno shows that the month of November, 1920, was more humid than normal, while the same month in 1919 was less humid than normal. The significant data are given in the following table.

"Dry-bulb temperatures in degrees F., and relative humidity in per cent for November, 1919, and November, 1920, and the normal relative humidity for the month, as reported from the Weather Bureau station at Fresno, Calif., station located 89 feet above the ground:

	Dry bulb.			Relative humidity, per cent.		
	5 a. m.	Local noon.	5 p. m.	5 a. m.	Local noon.	5 p. m.
November, 1919, mean.....	43.1	61.1	62.3	59.4	35.9	31.5
November, 1920, mean.....	46.9	60.1	60.0	84.4	55.7	57.5
Normal.....				78.3	49.2	48.0

"This delayed opening of the bolls was observed on both Pima and upland cotton, and if such conditions are found to be of frequent occurrence, they may constitute a serious obstacle to the extension of cotton production in the lower part of the valley, where the cheaper land and cheaper irrigation water would otherwise favor such extension. This autumn humidity, if it proves to be a serious obstacle to cotton production, is the more to be regretted, because the climatic conditions of the summer appear to be particularly favorable to heavy fruiting of cotton. It has been observed that cotton plants of both types are more fruitful in the San Joaquin Valley than in the other valleys of the Southwest. They seem to produce more flowers and a larger proportion of the flowers develop into bolls than is the case in the other valleys.

"It is probable that this greater fruitfulness is associated with the less extreme summer temperatures, though other factors may be involved. It is clear that there is ordinarily much less boll shedding in the San Joaquin Valley than in the other southwestern valleys.

"BOLL SHEDDING.

"The flower of the cotton plant is borne at the node of a fruiting branch, the flower pedicel being attached to the node close to one side of axil of the leaf. When the plant is subjected to certain adverse conditions during the flowering period, the flower bud, the flower, or the young boll may be dropped off the plant by a process similar to that by which mature leaves are dropped from deciduous plants. This reaction is known as boll shedding, and is one of the chief causes of reduced yields in the Southwest. The exact cause of boll shedding is not yet definitely known. It is believed to result from a combination of high temperatures and a sudden change in the water supply available to the plant.

"It has been observed that upland cotton reacts more quickly to the conditions that cause shedding than Pima cotton, but, on the other hand, when these conditions become particularly severe the final loss to the Pima cotton is likely to be greater than to upland cotton. This may be explained by the capacity of the upland cotton to recover more quickly than Pima cotton and put on more fruit late in the season when conditions are more favorable.

"Boll shedding was so severe on Pima cotton in 1920 as to attract general attention. It is estimated that in some cases fully half the potential crop was lost in this way. In many fields the plants had practically no fruit on the lower branches, and the first few nodes on the branches near the middle of the plant had lost their fruit.

"The outstanding characteristic of the Pima cotton in the San Joaquin Valley was that the fruit was held on the lower branches as well as on the upper ones. Though final maturity was checked by an early frost, the crop was on the plants. The plants in the San Joaquin Valley bore fruiting branches at the eighth or ninth node of the main stem, and these lower branches held their crop. In the Imperial and Salt River Valleys, on the other hand, few plants bore fruiting branches below the sixteenth node, and often these lower branches were bare of fruit.

"There was sufficient uniformity in the plant reactions in the different valleys to indicate that climatic rather than cultural differences were primarily responsible. But there were sufficient differences from field to field in the same section to indicate that the adverse effect of climatic conditions could be minimized, to some extent at least, by the proper cultural practice. Just what this proper cultural practice is remains to be determined. It is probably to be sought in the matter of

irrigation. There is some reason for believing that if the irrigation water is so applied that the plants do not suffer for water during excessively hot weather in the flowering period the tendency to shed the fruit may be checked. There is probably a soil relationship as well—that is, a soil that is very permeable and has at the same time a relatively high water-holding capacity, so that the extremes of available moisture supply are less acute, may be found to have a restraining effect on boll shedding.

"If it should be found that more uniform soil moisture conditions during the flowering period actually offsets to some extent the injurious effects of very hot weather, it would be important to avoid overdoing the remedy. During the early years of Pima cotton production it was observed that farmers were inclined to give the crop too much water during the early period of its growth. Too much irrigation early in the season appears to stimulate the vegetative growth of the plants at the expense of fruit production, and to increase also the difficulty of picking, because of the larger size of the plants. It may be possible to restrict irrigation early in the season before flowering time, thus checking excessive vegetative growth, and then irrigate frequently enough during the flowering and fruiting period, and particularly during the times of very hot weather, so as to check boll shedding, without forcing the plants into too much growth. Experiments to determine this point would seem to be well worth while; for, as the matter stands at present, boll shedding is a very serious factor in reducing yields in the irrigated Southwest, and cotton producers must find a way of getting larger yields if profitable crops are to be made under present economic conditions.

"COTTON PRODUCTION AND OTHER CROP INDUSTRIES.

"It is a well-recognized fact that cotton production can not be continued on the same land for an indefinite number of years without a decline in yield. It is not possible, however, to predict the rate of decline in any given case. On some land, naturally rich, the rate of decline would probably be slow. In some cases as many as eight successive crops have been grown with the last one showing no serious signs of distress. In other cases the second or third successive crop has shown a marked decline in productivity.

"When cotton was first proposed as a crop for the Southwest it was thought that in case it proved profitable it might come to occupy as much as 25 per cent or even 30 per cent of the cropped land. With this proportion of the land in cotton it was thought that a satisfactory system of crop rotation could be worked out, including alfalfa, grain, and truck crops. The profitable production of grain and alfalfa in the irrigated Southwest presupposes the feeding of live stock on the farms, for these commodities are too bulky to justify long shipment to market. Live-stock production, in itself ordinarily profitable, also gives a by-product of farm manure which if used on cotton land greatly increases yields.

"The abnormal prices for cotton during and since the war have stimulated cotton production to such an extent that in the Salt River Valley at least the cotton acreage in 1920 was nearly equal to the combined acreage of all other crops. It is hardly to be expected that such a large proportion of the land in this valley will be put in cotton again in the near future. Already plans are being made to put some of the cotton land back into alfalfa and more of it will doubtless go into grain sorghums next summer. But such crops are profitable only if fed to live stock on or near the project, and at the present time the live-stock population of the Salt River Valley is not large enough to consume much more alfalfa and grain than is now grown.

"The obvious need for the welfare of that valley is to increase its live-stock population, but that is another story.

"The present discussion of cotton in relation to other crop industries may be limited to pointing out two important considerations, namely, these other industries should be profitable in themselves and not used solely or too largely as a means of maintaining cotton yields and thus stand, in a measure, as an associated crops, such as alfalfa and grain, can not be grown continuously and profitably under conditions where its essential associated crops such as alfalfa and grain can not be grown at a profit on their own account. This second consideration is intended to apply to those sections where, because of recent high prices, cotton production has been undertaken with land and water costs so high that the production of alfalfa and grain is conceded to be out of the question.

"SYNDICATED COTTON PRODUCTION.

"The term 'syndicated production' is used here in reference to large-scale production operations, whether individual, partnership, or corporate, as to management. When a single or-

ganization operates several thousand acres, all or chiefly in a crop like cotton, it has to deal with problems which differ in important respects from those of a farmer operating 100 acres or less. In the irrigated Southwest there are a number of cases where as much as 5,000 acres and even 10,000 acres of land is operated under a single management.

"There is, of course, nothing very unusual in this so far as size alone is concerned; the unusual feature lies in the fact that almost without exception those who are managing these large producing enterprises have had no previous experience or training in such work. Some of them may have had some farming experience and some of them have had experience in large-scale operations in other lines, but for most of them, if not for all of them, large-scale cotton production is a new experience. The remarkable thing, then, about these syndicated enterprises is not that serious mistakes and miscalculations have been made in their management, but that they have been even passably successful.

"These syndicated production enterprises, particularly those inaugurated by interests associated with the manufacture or use of cotton, have served one very useful purpose: They have given the farmers and bankers of the Southwest confidence in the ultimate stability of the market for cotton. These farmers and bankers, some of whom were at first skeptical as to whether there would be a satisfactory and continuing market for cotton, saw no further occasion for doubt on this point when the ultimate consumer began to invest large sums of money in production.

"There is no very obvious reason why cotton can not be produced on a large scale nearly or quite as efficiently and economically as on a small scale. But this can not be done if the large-scale producer does not know or disregards the fundamental agronomic or economic principles of cotton farming. Without undertaking to formulate all these fundamental principles, the following may be set down as among the more important for the cases under consideration:

"1. The average cotton farm is not very profitable and the large enterprise must get better than average yields at little if any more than average production costs if it is to return a profit on the investment.

"2. Expensive overhead costs must be avoided and labor must be continuously and effectively employed.

"3. Cotton must be grown in rotation with other crops if yields are to be maintained and labor and equipment effectively utilized.

"4. The other crops grown in connection with cotton for purposes of rotation must be so produced and utilized as to return at least a small profit on their own account and not stand as a liability against the cotton crop.

"5. The whole operation should be so conceived and conducted as to pay a reasonable return on the investment over a period of years and not so as to have to look for ultimate profit to an increase in land values.

"It may be urged that most of the actual profits that have been made in American farming have been derived from the progressive increase in land prices and not from the difference between production cost and crop returns. But it would be unsound economics to hold that the increase in land prices can go on indefinitely. There is reason for believing that in some sections of the country it has already gone too far.

"There may be a justification for syndicated cotton production when undertaken by cotton manufacturers which would not hold for others. This lies in the fact that certain users of cotton have such specialized requirements and their needs are so exigent that they can not afford to depend for their supplies of raw material on the hazards of a fluctuating market or the whims of a group of farmers who may change from one kind of cotton to another in a season or two. In such a case the cotton manufacturer might be justified in undertaking to produce all, or at least a large part, of the cotton he required, not so much because he could hope to do so cheaper than it could be done by farmers but because he could thereby reduce the hazards of his business.

"RELATIONS OF MANUFACTURERS TO COTTON PRODUCERS.

"One of the outstanding features of cotton production in the United States has been that cotton manufacturers have not maintained close relationships with cotton producers. Until recent years the two were completely separated geographically, cotton manufacturing being done almost wholly in New England or overseas. Within the last few years a number of cotton-manufacturing plants have been built in the South, but even these are quite as likely to draw their supplies of cotton from distant parts of the Cotton Belt as from near by.

"The producers of cotton and the users of the raw material have had almost no direct dealings with each other. The gap has been bridged by an elaborate system of middlemen. These middlemen have served, and doubtless continue to serve, many useful purposes, but they have also acted as a very effective insulation between the producers and manufacturers of cotton. It is very largely because of this insulation that the special needs and the ultimate discriminations of the manufacturers have been so slow in finding their way back to the producer.

"While the manufacturers of cotton have not maintained direct relationships with the producer, the manufacturers of cottonseed products have taken a different course. They have built their plants in the very midst of the cotton fields, and in many cases have built and operated ginning plants for the use of the farmers. Through these ginning plants the seed manufacturers have been able to establish direct relations with the producer. They have largely determined the kind of cotton that should be planted, because they have had planting seed to sell, and they have in many cases acted as the agents through whom the farmer secured credit for the production of his crop. Because of this advantage of position the cottonseed-oil man has been in position to influence the farmer in certain important matters. Were it to his interest to do so, he might exert a powerful influence in such matters as clean picking and better baling.

"This important advantage of position has only recently been appreciated by a few cotton manufacturers. These have begun, particularly in the Southwest, to establish gins, to furnish planting seed, to provide credit for growing the crop, and in some cases to contract in advance for the lint produced. This course of procedure may come to be regarded as an alternative to syndicated production. It has the advantage of being cheaper to undertake and of being less likely to result in serious loss.

"The service of establishing and operating a cotton-ginning plant and providing of credit for crop production partakes somewhat of the character and involves some of the responsibilities of a public service. Because of that fact, persons thus engaged are in a measure subject to public regulation, and unless the business is conducted in a satisfactory manner it will not be possible to exercise much influence through such agencies. If a cotton manufacturer aims to use these agencies as a means of obtaining a fairly constant supply of a certain type of cotton, he must so conduct them as to retain the confidence and good will of his patrons. This should not be a very difficult matter, particularly if he is prepared to operate this part of his business at a small profit or even at a small loss in order to provide himself with a continuing supply of cotton. Probably the most important feature of such an arrangement as the one outlined is the opportunity to provide cotton growers with planting seed. The kind of seed planted very largely determines the kind of cotton obtained, and it is upon the proper management of the ginning business that the purity and value of the seed supply depends.

"SEED SUPPLIES.

"Certain differences between Pima cotton and the upland varieties grown in the Southwest have already been mentioned. None of these differences is more marked than is the contrast as regards seed supply. Ever since Pima cotton was first grown in the Salt River Valley the matter of maintaining the purity of the seed has been given most serious consideration. A group of farmers organized under the somewhat inappropriate name of the Tempe Cotton Exchange has assumed responsible leadership in supervising the production and distribution of planting seed. They have operated one 10-stand gin at Tempe, which has ginned only cotton from selected fields intended to supply seed. The seed is delinted and bagged at the gin and stored in a concrete warehouse. Each bag of seed is stamped with the variety name and the association mark, and it is now planned to ticket each bag with a certificate of inspection provided by the county agent.

"The records of field production of the seed supply are so handled that each bag of seed bears a number which shows when that particular stock of seed was inspected in the field to insure its purity. The system of field roguing and inspection has been described in detail elsewhere and need not be further mentioned here. During the past two seasons it has been necessary for the Southwest Cotton Co. to assist the Tempe Exchange in ginning and storing the seed supply. The capacity of the exchange gin is only about two and a half million pounds of seed, which has not been enough to supply the demand in the Salt River Valley and the other sections of the Southwest. In the spring of 1920 the demand for seed was so great that all of the pure seed was used for the first planting. The spring weather was cold and more than the usual replanting was required. As a result it was necessary to use some seed that had

been run into oil-mill warehouses. Although this oil-mill seed was all grown locally, and therefore reasonably pure, there was enough seed in it of hybrid origin so that hybrid and off-type plants could be seen in every field in which it was used. This year's experience is a striking demonstration of the importance of guarding the seed supply continuously, even in a community where no other type of cotton is grown.

"It is hard to describe the seed-supply situation in the upland cotton districts. There have been supplies of pure seed in these sections in time past. There was at one time a large supply of Durango seed and shipments of pure seed of other varieties have been brought in from time to time. These stocks have been so effectively mixed at the gins that it is now almost impossible to distinguish them. This mixture of varieties would be much less serious if it were possible to bring in new supplies of seed, but the danger of insect invasion is so great that it has been necessary to prohibit the westward movement of seed.

"The effect of this general mixture of the upland varieties has been shown both in decreased yields and in reduced prices for the lint. For several years the upland cotton from the irrigated Southwest sold at a premium over similar eastern cotton because of its bright color. Recently, however, there has been a pronounced tendency to discriminate against it because of the irregularity in length of staple, despite its better grade.

"If there is to be maintained a continuing production of upland cotton in the Southwest, it seems clear that some provision must be made to produce locally a supply of better planting seed than that now available. In fact, it would seem that one of the best reasons for continuing to grow upland cotton on high-priced irrigated land would be found in the production of pure stocks of planting seed to ship to the main cotton belt. One of the serious problems in the East is that in wet seasons the seed loses its vitality before planting time. In this respect the seed from the dry western valleys would have a very great advantage.

"FINANCING AND MARKETING THE CROP.

"It may be assumed from the figures given in preceding pages that the cotton crop of the irrigated Southwest in 1920 will turn out about 120,000 bales of Pima cotton, about 160,000 bales of upland cotton, and about 170,000 tons of seed, and that the production and harvesting of this crop up to the time it is ready for market will involve the use of money or credit to the sum of about \$50,000,000. This money or credit is chiefly supplied through the local banks.

"In the case of the Salt River Valley alone the total investment in the production and harvesting of the Pima crop must be not less than \$20,000,000. The bank resources of Phoenix, the financial center of the valley, were reported in the recent census as \$27,500,000. Clearly the financing of the production of the cotton crop is among the most important of the problems of the Phoenix bankers. The daily interest charge on the money invested in the Salt River Valley cotton crop this year is something over \$4,000. With the turn of the year new calls must be met for funds for the next season's operations, and other crops and industries demand credit accommodations, for only about half the acreage of the valley is devoted to cotton. The 1920 cotton crop must be placed on another credit basis.

"In the last two or three seasons the cotton crop was much smaller in amount, if not much less in aggregate value, and buyers from the East were bidding for it actively as it came from the gins. This season buyers are holding off. Some cotton has been consigned to eastern points on credit advances ranging from \$175 per bale down to \$100 per bale for Pima. These advances were not sufficient, in some cases at least, to release the cotton from the obligations already made against it. This situation was rapidly becoming serious in the latter part of November and continues so. It is receiving, as it deserves, the serious attention of the best minds in the community, and in this, as in other difficulties that have been met and overcome, there is a spirit of community action and community confidence that is indomitable.

"In conclusion it may be said that while the production of cotton under irrigation in the Southwest has scarcely yet passed beyond the experimental stage, it has been given a fair trial. The present indications are that it will be continued, though probably on a reduced scale for the next few years. The experiment has gone far enough to demonstrate that good cotton can be grown, that varietal purity and high quality of product can be maintained where proper attention is given to the matter of seed supplies. At present it is doubtful if there is another crop that could be extensively substituted for cotton that would give better returns for the labor and capital invested."

STATEMENT BY DWIGHT B. HEARD, OF PHOENIX, ARIZ., REPRESENTING THE ARIZONA EGYPTIAN COTTON GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, THE PHOENIX (ARIZ.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AND THE PHOENIX CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION, AS TO THE NEED OF A PROTECTIVE TARIFF ON AMERICAN EGYPTIAN OR PIMA LONG-STAPLE COTTON.

HON. WILLIAM R. GREEN,

Chairman Subcommittee on Cotton,
Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Availing of your suggestion that I present in concise form a statement in behalf of the needs of the producers of American Egyptian cotton, I present the following:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.

The American Egyptian or Pima long-staple cotton industry, which during the past 15 years has developed as an essential national industry, now faces destruction through competition with cotton of similar type produced by the present labor of Egypt on a present wage scale of 40 cents per day for a 12-hour day.

This Egyptian long-staple cotton is now being laid down at New England spinning points at 26 cents per pound, almost exactly one-half the estimated production cost of last year's American Egyptian crop, as per a report recently furnished Congress by Mr. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture.

In the season of 1919-20, 485,000 bales of Egyptian cotton were imported into the United States as compared with an average importation for the previous five years of 202,000 bales. It is conservatively estimated that 70 per cent of this importation was Sakellaridis cotton, the type principally used for the manufacture of tire yarns and with which the American-grown Egyptian cotton comes in direct competition.

The standard of living of the Egyptian peasants who furnish the labor in the cotton fields of Egypt is vastly inferior to an American standard of living. This peasant labor is exceptionally efficient. These Egyptian laborers at the price of 40 cents per day work from sunrise to sunset, while in Arizona, where 85 per cent of the American Egyptian crop is grown, the cost of field labor for a 9-hour day in 1920 was \$3. It is estimated that in 1921 this will be reduced to \$2—still more than five times as large as the Egyptian wage, in view of the shorter hours in Arizona.

It is conservatively estimated that one-third of the cost of the production of long-staple cotton is involved in the picking. The cost of picking cotton in Egypt in 1920, according to the best information available, was less than \$10 per 500-pound bale; while in Arizona the cost of picking the same size bale was \$80. This situation presents an intolerable condition which can only be remedied by the reasonable protection asked. Officials of the United States Department of Agriculture have recently estimated that the cost of producing American Egyptian Pima cotton in Arizona in 1920, on the basis of a yield of half bale to the acre, was 52.6 cents. The attached statements from well-informed Arizona growers show an estimated average cost of production in 1921 of approximately 41 cents. According to the most recent market quotations, Old World Egyptian cotton of the Sakellaridis variety, the type which most nearly corresponds to the American Pima, and which comprises about 70 per cent of the import from Egypt, is being laid down in New Bedford for 26 cents per pound. The duty asked for by American producers to maintain this industry on a living basis is but 20 cents per pound. It is evident that unless the relief asked for through a protective tariff is promptly granted the industry built up through 20 years' cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture faces destruction.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN EGYPTIAN COTTON.

Pima cotton was originated and developed by the Department of Agriculture as a result of plant-breeding work carried on in Arizona since 1902. A strikingly superior individual plant, selected in 1910 at the Government experimental station at Sacaton on the Pima Indian Reservation in southern Arizona, was the parent of the Pima variety, of which 250,000 acres were grown in 1920 in Arizona and California. It is an interesting coincidence that the plant which gave rise to the Sakellaridis variety, the principal competitor of Pima, was discovered in Egypt in the same year, 1910.

Pima cotton can be successfully grown only on the irrigated lands of southern Arizona and California, where the climatic and soil conditions have proven to be exceptionally favorable for the growth of this type, which is not adapted to conditions in the eastern cotton belt.

The Pima cotton has an average length of staple of 1½ inches and is maintained in a high state of uniformity by careful seed selection, under the supervision of the United States Department of Agriculture. It is used in the manufacture of fine dress goods, hosiery, and sewing thread; but principally in

automobile-tire fabrics. It is estimated that 80 per cent of the Pima crop in recent years has been used for this last purpose. In all these classes of manufacture the American-grown Egyptian cotton is in direct competition with Sakellaridis cotton imported from Egypt.

DECLINING SEA-ISLAND PRODUCTION MAKES PIMA ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE.

During the recent war exhaustive Government tests showed that the Pima cotton was a thoroughly satisfactory substitute for sea-island cotton in the manufacture of airplane wings and balloon cloth, and during the last year of the war large quantities of cloth were manufactured from Pima cotton and successfully used in the air work. The first tests of Pima cotton for this work were made at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture, which pointed out that with the rapid advance of the boll weevil the sea-island crop might be suddenly wiped out and that a substitute must be found, if possible, in an American-grown cotton. Since Arizona and California are well isolated from the boll-weevil district and were already producing a cotton of extra long staple and great uniformity, which was known to be capable of substitution for sea island, an extension of Pima cotton growing in that region appeared to be a military necessity, and for that reason was especially encouraged by the Department of Agriculture in the war period. The figures given in the table showing the production of sea-island and American-Egyptian cottons during the last five years make it clear that the Department of Agriculture was thoroughly justified in calling attention to the necessity of a substitute for sea-island cotton, which now has almost disappeared from cultivation. If the war had been prolonged even for another year, the Pima cotton would have become the sole reliance for this vital purpose.

Partly as a result of stimulation by the Government during the war the acreage of Pima cotton has been greatly expanded during the past two years, and with the sudden slump in the market in 1920 the growers have been left with fully 90 per cent of their last crop unsold. The danger is very great that unless adequate protection is furnished against the competition of cheaply grown foreign cotton this highly specialized cotton, which recent experience has shown to be essential to the national defense, will disappear.

With the sea-island cotton practically gone, this country would be entirely dependent on foreign sources of supply.

Statement of the production of Pima and sea-island cottons, in bales, during the past five years.

Year.	American Egyptian or Pima. ¹	Sea island. ²
1916.....	3,331	117,559
1917.....	15,966	92,619
1918.....	40,343	52,208
1919.....	42,374	6,916
1920.....	91,965	1,725

¹ 500-pound bales.

² 400-pound bales.

Estimated imports of Sakellaridis Egyptian cotton in equivalent 500-pound bales during the past five years.

1915-1916.....	204,000
1916-1917.....	119,000
1917-1918.....	80,000
1918-1919.....	70,000
1919-1920.....	340,000

COST OF PRODUCTION.

In a very carefully prepared statement recently issued by Mr. C. S. Scofield, of the United States Department of Agriculture, based on a yield of a half bale to the acre in the Salt River Valley of Arizona, where about 85 per cent of the Pima cotton is produced, a production cost is shown for the season of 1920 of 52.6 cents per pound. Owing to reductions which have already occurred in the price of field labor and estimated reductions which are anticipated in the cost of picking and ginning Pima cotton for next season, it is estimated that the cost of production in 1921 on the basis of a half bale to the acre will be at least 42 cents.

It will be observed that if the 20 cents per pound tariff asked for is added to the present delivered price of Egyptian Sakellaridis cotton in New England the American grower would make only a very small profit above cost of production. It is hoped by this legislation to stabilize the price of American-Egyptian Pima cotton so as to justify continuing the American industry based on a price of approximately 50 cents to the producer.

The attached statements, Exhibits A, B, and C, of estimated cost of production in the Salt River Valley of Arizona for 1921, made by Mr. W. S. Stevens, president of the Arizona American-Egyptian Cotton Growers' Association, Mr. Charles M. Smith,

a grower who keeps exceptionally accurate records, and the writer, who has grown this type of cotton for the past five years, are presented for the purpose of giving detailed estimates as to the cost of production for 1921.

On the Salt River Valley reclamation project in Arizona 186,000 acres were farmed in Pima cotton in 1920, on which a crop of seventy-two thousand 500-pound bales was produced. Confronted as they have been during the recent months with a price for this cotton far below its cost of production, the majority of the producers, through the assistance of the banks, have held on to their cotton, anticipating a relief from the existing situation, and it is estimated that 67,000 bales of this crop still remain in the hands of the producers. This situation illustrates the urgent need for immediate relief.

The emergency tariff bill, as passed by the House of Representatives on April 15, 1921, and now before the Committee of Finance of the Senate, in paragraph 16 contains the following clause as to the protective duty on long-staple cotton:

Cotton having a staple of 1 1/4 inches or more in length, 7 cents per pound.

It is evident that the above is not adequate to protect this industry on the basis of American standards of living. In the report of April 13, 1921, in connection with the emergency tariff bill, on page 20, the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture definitely recommends a duty of not less than 10 cents per pound, making the following statements:

(4) Large areas of land in this country are available for the production of extra staple cotton, but because of the costs of reclamation, irrigation, and the higher standards of living and cost of labor, the cost of production of such cotton in the United States is high and our producers need a protective tariff to equalize the cost of production abroad with that in the United States.

(6) In the table following are presented quotations on the selling price of Sakellaridis Egyptian and American-Egyptian cottons. It will be observed that on March 15 the price of fully good Sakellaridis was 35 1/2 cents and good fair Sakellaridis 26 1/2 cents, c. i. f., landed Boston, and that American-Egyptian cotton of No. 2 grade was quoted at 26 1/2 cents, and No. 3 grade at 25 1/2 cents, landed Boston. Such prices are far below the estimated cost of production of cotton in Arizona and California. It should be further pointed out that from the table the prices of good fair Sakellaridis and No. 2 Arizona-Egyptian have been practically identical since November 13 last. In other words, the price of good fair Sakellaridis seems to fix the price of American-Egyptian cotton.

(9) Producers of long-staple cotton have faced adverse market conditions in the sale of last year's crop and are said to have on hand a large part of last year's production. Accordingly, it is believed that the producer would receive the benefit of whatever protection that might be conferred by the proposed tariff measure.

I am presenting the foregoing statement at the request of the Arizona American-Egyptian Cotton Growers' Association, the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, and the Clearing House Association of Phoenix, whose letters in this connection are attached herewith. In this statement I have endeavored to present figures and facts as to this industry whose existence is so seriously threatened, and in view of the fact that through some misunderstanding the producers of American-Egyptian cotton had no opportunity to present their case before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House I trust opportunity may be found before the emergency bill passes the Senate to increase the duty on long-staple cotton from 7 cents to the 20 cents so urgently needed.

Very respectfully,

DWIGHT B. HEARD.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., April 25, 1921.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD also the Exhibits A, B, and C attached to the communication.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A.

ARIZONA AMERICAN-EGYPTIAN COTTON GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
Phoenix, Ariz., April 13, 1921.

Mr. DWIGHT B. HEARD,
Phoenix, Ariz.

MY DEAR MR. HEARD: Complying with your request to make up an additional statement of cost for producing cotton in 1921, as I view the situation, I submit as follows:

There is such a wide difference in the ideas of rental values that I have eliminated this altogether, considering a man that is working on payment of one-fourth of his crop as rent. I have eliminated, as far as possible, the question of diversified farming in that a portion of the crops produced might be used in feeding and caring for the stock of the grower. I am taking as a basis an exceptionally good man with an exceptionally good team, and giving him all the land that such a man can possibly handle under favorable circumstances, which is 50 acres. I am considering that this man and his one team must do all the work of preparing and planting, cultivating, supervising, picking, and deliver the cotton to the gin. In handling this acreage he will have no time whatever to do any hoeing or irrigating. This is provided in moderate charges. We have considered the cost of picking on the prewar basis, which is really less than it should be when we consider the fact that shoes are 100 per cent more than four years ago, and that provisions and clothing have not anywhere near been reduced to prewar basis.

This man and his team are allowed \$1,200 for the year. Out of this \$1,200 the man's only living expense, or his wage and feed for his

team, are all included. This man and his team is far above the average in being thoroughly able to cultivate and handle 50 acres of land, but I am considering the average yield to be the actual average being produced in our valley since Pima cotton has been introduced, which has been one-half bale per acre. Of course, we have exceptional cases where people may average better than one-half bale for several years, but this is offset wherein just as many farmers produce less than one-half bale for the same period of time, because they are liable to the losses incurred from hailstorms, black arm, root rot, and other troubles; so that, on the whole, I think that this is a very conservative estimate of the average cost of the year 1921.

A man and team, one year	\$1,200.00
Irrigation water, at \$3.75 per acre	187.50
Planting seed, \$1 per acre	50.00
Hoeing, including thinning, at \$7 per acre	350.00
Expense of irrigation, \$3 per acre	150.00
Implements, \$250, depreciation only	50.00
Shopwork	25.00
Incidentals, including sacks, tents, etc.	100.00
Ginning 25 bales, at \$20	500.00
Picking 25 bales, at 3 cents per pound	1,500.00
Total, less 1 1/4 tons of seed, at \$20	4,112.50
Total cost of 18 1/2 bales, 6 1/2 having been paid as rent	3,887.50
Cost per pound	.413

Very truly,

W. S. STEVENS.

EXHIBIT B.

APRIL 24, 1921.

Mr. DWIGHT B. HEARD,
Phoenix, Ariz.

DEAR MR. HEARD: The following is my estimate of the cost of production of Pima cotton in the Salt River Valley for 1921:

ESTIMATED COST OF PRODUCTION, 30 ACRES COTTON, SEASON 1921.

Based on low wage scale of \$3 per day, including board—cheap horse feed, but no allowance for horses when not actually employed, nor for man when he is not actually in field.

Plowing, at \$3.75 per acre	\$300
Disking after plowing, at 80 cents per acre	64
Dragging twice, at \$2	160
Labor, irrigating before and after plowing	54
Disking before planting, at 80 cents	64
Planting, at 70 cents per acre	56
Cultivator, at 50 cents per acre	40
Cultivating about 8 times, including furrowing out, at 70 cents	448
Chopping, at \$1.25 per acre	100
Hoeing twice, at \$1.50 per acre	240
Labor, irrigation, 4 times after planting	60
Planting seed	40
Depreciation in equipment	150
Incidental expenses	250
Irrigation water, 3 acre-feet, at \$7.50 per acre	600
Taxes, State and county, at \$5 per acre	400

Estimated cost to picking time	3,026
Picking, basis 1/2 bale per acre, at 3 cents per pound	2,400
Ginning, basis 1/2 bale per acre, at \$20 a bale	800
Overhead, including tents, tacks, wood, insurance, hauling cotton to gin, etc., at 1 cent per pound seed cotton	600
Total as above	6,826

Actual cost of production (labor only), 34 cents per pound.

IMPORTANT NOTE: The above does not include any land rent or interest on land investment—does not allow anything for living expenses while farmer is not in field—nothing for ditch cleaning, keeping up fences, etc. On the above basis 45 cents per pound would mean ultra-conservative cost of production, 1921.

CHAS. M. SMITH.

EXHIBIT C.

APRIL 21, 1921.

Estimate of Dwight B. Heard, of Phoenix, Ariz., as to cost of production of American-Egyptian (Pima) cotton, under the Salt River reclamation project, Arizona, for season of 1921, cost per acre based on production of one-half bale to an acre and present cost of labor and supplies.

Annual payment to United States Government due on Roosevelt Dam and Salt River Valley project	\$2.00
Taxes on basis average assessed on location \$183 per acre and average combined State, county, school, high-school, and road-district tax rate of \$2.50	4.57
Irrigation water service, based on annual use of 3 acre-feet	3.60
Seed for planting, select Government-inspected seed, at 2 cents per pound, 30 pounds per acre	.60
Labor for irrigating once before plowing, six times after plowing, at 30 cents per acre	2.10
Plowing, per acre	4.50
Harrowing twice, at \$1	2.00
Dragging twice, at \$1	2.00
Planting	.75
Rolling	.75
Seven cultivations, including furrowing out	5.60
Chopping or thinning	1.25
Average summer hoeing, cost per acre	7.50

Expense per acre to picking time	37.22
Picking 1,000 pounds seed cotton, equaling one-half bale of lint, at 3 cents per pound	\$30.00
Ginning one-half bale cotton, at \$20	10.00
Transport to gin of seed cotton, 5 cents per 100 pounds	.50
Overhead and incidental expenses per acre, including tents and wood for pickers, depreciation on machinery, shop work, picking sacks, insurance based on 7 cents per pound of seed cotton	7.00
Total	47.50

84.72

Deduct value of cotton seed, 750 pounds to each 1,000 pounds of seed cotton, at value of \$16 per ton	\$6.00
Net cost of producing one-half bale, or 250 pounds, of Pima long-staple cotton lint per acre	78.72
Cost per pound Pima lint cotton, exclusive of any return on value of land	.3149
Figuring a revenue on the land of but \$20 per acre would add 8 cents to production cost of lint cotton and make the actual production cost per pound of Pima cotton lint	.3949

[Copy.]

Hon. J. W. FORDNEY,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From the standpoint of safeguarding the financial interests of the Salt River Valley of Arizona, the Phoenix Clearing House Association is vitally interested in the proposal to enact a protective tariff on American Egyptian Pima long-staple cotton. This is a special type of cotton developed by the United States Department of Agriculture through an experimental stage of 12 years or more, and which has become known to the cotton trade at large as the equal of any cotton in the world. This type of cotton has been extensively used for the manufacture of tire fabric on account of its superior length of staple and high tensile strength.

Last year in the Salt River Valley 185,000 acres were planted to long-staple cotton with a resulting yield of more than 72,000 bales. Estimates place the cost of last year's crop at about 60 cents per pound.

No general market has so far developed for the staple, and the few sales made during recent weeks have ranged from 24 to 30 cents per pound, basis No. 2.

Salt River Valley is especially adapted to the growing of long-staple cotton: the cultivation of this staple is restricted to a few valleys in the Southwest, where the length of the growing season permits the development of the fiber and general cultural conditions are favorable.

It seems important that some steps be taken to insure the permanence of this new industry in the Southwest, which is just beginning to supply a growing demand for this superior type of cotton.

In order that the industry may survive the growers of Arizona and California need the benefit of a protective tariff of a sufficient amount to enable them to compete with Egyptian Sakellarides cotton, produced in Egypt by native labor on a wage scale entirely out of harmony with the American standard of living.

The Phoenix Clearing House Association, in special meeting, hereby earnestly advocates the adoption of a protective tariff on American Egyptian Pima long-staple cotton of 20 cents per pound.

Mr. Dwight B. Heard, representing the Arizona American Egyptian Cotton Growers' Association and the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, will appear before your committee in behalf of the foregoing proposal. Mr. Heard is fully qualified to speak for the cotton growers of the Southwest, and we bespeak for him your most favorable consideration.

Yours, respectfully,

THE PHOENIX CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION;
By B. E. MOORE, Vice President.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., April 14, 1921.

[Copy.]

THE PHOENIX CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
PHOENIX, ARIZ., April 14, 1921.

Hon. DWIGHT B. HEARD,
Heard Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

MY DEAR MR. HEARD: We are glad to have you represent the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, with a membership of 1,100, at any and all meetings held in Washington in connection with the tariff or any other subject vital to this section of the Southwest.

This is to advise that you have been appointed as the general official representative of this organization at the board of directors' meeting held to-day, April 14.

Yours, very truly,

W. W. LAWSON, President.
HARRY WELCH, Secretary.

EXHIBIT D.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 20, 1921.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with your request of April 15, I take pleasure in quoting below the imports of unmanufactured cotton into the United States from Egypt during the calendar year 1920 and the months of January to March, 1921, inclusive:

Calendar year:	Pounds.
1920	179,894,406
1921—	
January	3,455,490
February	3,881,283
March	6,508,351

The reports furnished to this department covering imports of unmanufactured cotton do not indicate the number of bales, but show figures for pounds instead.

Yours, faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1921.

Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I am sending you herewith a copy of a report on cotton production in the irrigated Southwest in 1920, together with some data prepared by Mr. Kearney for Mr. Heard's use.

Very truly, yours,

C. S. SCOFIELD,
Agriculturist in Charge Western Irrigation Agriculture.

[Compiled Apr. 20, 1921.]

Production of American Egyptian cotton (500-pound bales).

1912	375
1913	2,135
1914	6,187
1915	1,095
1916	3,331
1917	15,966
1918	40,343
1919	42,374
1920 ¹	92,561

Imports of Egyptian cotton into United States (equivalent of 500-pound bales).

Period Aug. 1 to July 31.	Bales imported.	Per cent of total Egyptian crop.
1910-11	183,786	12.4
1911-12	175,835	12.0
1912-13	191,075	12.9
1913-14	137,355	9.1
1914-15	261,220	20.5
1915-16	339,854	35.3
1916-17	198,805	19.9
1917-18	114,580	9.2
1918-19	100,000	10.5
1919-20	485,003	43.7

Cotton acreage of Egypt and percentage of total in Sakellaridis variety.
[Compiled Apr. 21, 1921.]

Calendar year.	Total acres.	Percentage Sakel.
1912	1,788,000	16.2
1913	1,789,000	21.9
1914	1,820,000	32.2
1915	1,231,000	58.0
1916	1,718,000	62.4
1917	1,742,000	67.6
1918	1,864,000	72.4
1919	1,634,000	72.9
1920	1,897,000	69.5

¹ Census Bureau ginning report of Mar. 21, 1921.

Sea-island cotton production in United States (from Bureau of the Census ginning reports).

	Bales.
1915	111,716
1916	117,559
1917	92,619
1918	52,208
1919	6,916
1920	1,868

COTTON PRODUCTION IN EGYPT.

Mr. ASHURST. John A. Todd, "The World's Cotton Crops" (1915), states that the average size of landholdings in Egypt in 1913 was about 3½ acres and the average land value per acre in 1913 was £50 to £200. There has been a considerable increase in land values and rentals since that time.

The average yield of fiber, according to the monthly agricultural statistics of the ministry of finance of Egypt (Oct. 31, 1920), was 343 pounds per acre for the five years 1915-1919. The following table, compiled from Government reports of Egypt and the United States, has been compiled by the Bureau of Crop Estimates:

	Number of persons engaged in agriculture.	Acres in cultivated land.	Average area cultivated for each farm worker.
Egypt (1907-1912)	2,315,000	5,457,000	2.4
United States (1910)	12,390,000	293,794,000	23.7

COST OF PICKING COTTON IN EGYPT.

According to John A. Todd in The World's Cotton Crops (1915), the prewar wages for picking in Egypt ranged from 5 pence to 1 shilling per day, the lower wage being paid to children, who could pick from 30 to 50 pounds per day each. Taking Todd's statement as a basis and assuming (1) that adults average 75 pounds daily and received a wage of 1 shilling, (2) that the wage has doubled since the war and is now 2 shillings, this at current exchange is equivalent to about 39 cents for 75 pounds, or about one-half cent per pound of seed cotton. Since the lint percentage in Egypt averages at least 30 per cent, as compared with an average of 25 per cent in Arizona, 1,666 pounds of seed cotton in Egypt will yield a 500-pound bale. The cost of picking 1,666 pounds of seed cotton at

¹ Ginned prior to June 30, 1921.

one-half cent per pound is \$8.33. The picking cost per pound of lint in Egypt, therefore, works out to 1½ cents, while in Arizona the cost is 16 cents when the pickers receive 4 cents per pound of seed cotton (the 1920 wage) and 8 cents when the pickers receive 2 cents per pound of seed cotton (the prewar wage).

—
Resolution 2.

Whereas it is reported that Congress is seriously considering adjournment; and

Whereas there are now before Congress many measures immediately necessary for the live-stock business of the State; and

Whereas the proposed adjournment would delay the enactment of this necessary legislation and may block its passage entirely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Wool Growers' Association and Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, in joint convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., July 8 and 9, earnestly request that any adjournment of Congress be postponed until the present measures affecting the live-stock industry are acted upon; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators ASHURST and CAMERON and Congressman HAYDEN.

A true copy.

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

—
Resolution 3.

Whereas the transportation act purports to place in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission exclusive jurisdiction to grant or deny certificates of convenience and necessity relating to the construction of railroad lines and facilities, or the abandonment or discontinuance thereof; and

Whereas the exercise of this power by the Federal Government might result in great inconvenience and discomfort to the general public and irreparable financial loss to individuals and communities; and

Whereas the carriers are incorporated in and receive their only authority for corporate life and activity from the States wherein they are incorporated, and should therefore be subject to the authority under which they exist for their corporate acts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Wool Growers' Association, at its annual meeting held in Flagstaff, Ariz., on July 9, 1921, express its firm conviction that the transportation act of 1920 should be at once so amended as to eliminate the objectionable provision above referred to and to restore to the States their rightful authority over the children of their creation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our delegates in Congress, and that they be requested to secure the passage of a suitable amendment for the accomplishment of the above purposes at the present session of Congress.

A true copy of the original resolution.

Attest:

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

—
Resolution 4.

Whereas that section of the transportation act known as section 15a, carrying a mandate to the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix such rates as will insure a return of 5½ or 6 per cent on the aggregate value of the railroad property, has resulted in the levying of rates which have stifled commerce and prevented the free movement of commodities; and

Whereas the agricultural and horticultural interests of the entire Nation are to-day practically at a standstill, the food products unable to reach the consuming markets, largely as a result of rates that have been fixed under the provision of this section of the transportation act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Wool Growers' Association, in annual convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., on July 9, 1921, urges upon Congress immediate legislation for the repeal of this section of the act to regulate commerce and the support of Senate bill 1150, introduced by Senator CAPPER, or any other similar measure.

A true copy of the original resolution adopted as above.

Attest:

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

—
Resolution 5.

Whereas in the present condition of markets where the prices of our products are below the cost of production; and

Whereas every element of assistance that will stimulate the market prices of such production so that a fair and reasonable return may be had therefrom; and

Whereas the tariff on dressed meats, wool, hides, and pelts is one element that will protect us against competition wherein lower labor and grades of living are thrown against the desired conditions of living in this country; and

Whereas in the present proposed tariff bill hides and pelts are placed upon the free list, and the tariff on dressed meats and wool are too low for sufficient protection: Therefore be it

Resolved at the joint convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., July 8 and 9, by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association and the Arizona Wool Growers' Association, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State be asked to use every effort in their power to bring before the proper committee all knowledge of the conditions of our markets and use all efforts to have hides and pelts protected and dressed meats and wool sufficiently protected to guard us against those who are able to undersell us by reason of their low cost of production.

A true copy.

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

—
Resolution 11.

Whereas the American National Live Stock Association has instituted hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of revoking the last 35 per cent increase in freight on live stock in the western group and the 25 per cent increase in the mountain Pacific group; and

Whereas the present freight rates on live stock are unreasonable and prohibitive; and

Whereas the price of our products has depreciated more than 50 per cent in the last year; and

Whereas there are many cases where the price received for live stock at the market is little more than enough to pay freight and selling expenses; and

Whereas the continued existence of the live-stock industry in our State is dependent to a large extent in a material decrease in our freight rates: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arizona Wool Growers' Association and the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, in joint convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., July 8 and 9, That we heartily indorse the action taken by the American National Live Stock Association, and we respectfully request that the Interstate Commerce Commission take the necessary steps to make a material reduction in freight rates on live stock in the western group and mountain Pacific group at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Interstate Commerce Commission and also to the secretary and president of the Arizona National Live Stock Association.

A true copy of original.

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

—
TRUTH IN FABRIC BILL.
Resolution 13.

Resolved, That, as we believe in the honest labeling of all products emanating from the live-stock business, having particularly in mind at this time the manufacture and sale of so-called all-wool goods, under the term "all wool," which term is construed by the buying public to mean virgin wool, and, whereas, there is a bill now pending in Congress known as the French-Capper bill, we respectfully urge both our Senators and our Representatives in Congress to use their united efforts looking to the early passage of this bill.

The above is a true copy of resolution adopted by the Arizona Wool Growers' Association and the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association in joint convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., July 8-9, 1921. A resolution of same import has heretofore been adopted by the Arizona Wool Growers' Association and forwarded to you.

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

Resolution 14, concerning appropriations for destruction of rodent pests and predatory animals.

Whereas the live-stock and agricultural industries of Arizona annually suffer losses due to the killing of live stock by predatory wild animals and to the destruction of farm and

range forage crops by rodent pests, amounting to several million dollars; and

Whereas the work of exterminating crop and range destroying rodents and predatory wild animals as conducted by the United States Biological Survey in cooperation with the Livestock Sanitary Board and the University of Arizona is essential to the full utilization of valuable farm and range lands and a saving each year of a large percentage of the normal increase of the herds, and it has been observed by stockmen and farmers that in localities where the Biological Survey and its cooperators have conducted their work the losses due to predatory animals and rodent pests have steadily decreased; and

Whereas the funds appropriated annually by Congress for this purpose have proved wholly inadequate to meet the needs for such work: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, the Arizona Wool Growers' Association, and the Arizona Farm Bureau, in joint convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., on July 8 and 9, 1921, That we urge the Secretary of Agriculture to approve the estimates of the Bureau of Biological Survey for carrying on this work for the fiscal year 1923, and that we further urge our Congressmen to support the budget as submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The foregoing is a true copy of the original.

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

Resolution 18.

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission, under its construction of the transportation act of 1920, has assumed jurisdiction over all matters, interstate and intrastate, relating to rates, fares, and charges, directly or indirectly, of the common carriers of the country; and

Whereas we believe that such assumption of authority by the Federal Government constitutes an unwarranted and unconstitutional encroachment upon reserved and inherent rights and powers of the sovereign States; and

Whereas we believe that such delegation of power to the Federal Government, if it were constitutional, would be inadvisable since obviously because of the great distance from the seat of Government it would have to be administered through subordinates unfamiliar with local conditions; perhaps disinterested in the growth and development of districts far removed from the Capitol and having no personal feeling of responsibility in the momentous problems before them; and

Whereas we believe that the continuance of the policy inaugurated by the Interstate Commerce Commission in this respect will handicap and retard the progress and development of the industries and commerce of the Nation and create a dangerous menace to the exercise of the sovereign rights of the States; and

Whereas we believe that the transportation act of 1920 should be immediately amended so as to remove any possible ambiguity relating to State and Federal jurisdiction and that the exclusive power of the States over matters of purely internal character should be at once reaffirmed and so thoroughly and definitely established that there can never again be a question of doubt raised with reference thereto; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arizona Wool Growers' Association and the Arizona Cattle Growers' Association, in joint convention assembled at Flagstaff, Ariz., July 8 and 9, 1921, record their unalterable opposition to centralized Federal control over intrastate commerce, and that they urge upon Congress the necessity of at once amending the transportation act of 1920 in consonance with the views herein expressed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our delegates in Congress, with the request that they immediately caucus and determine which of the various bills now pending before Congress is the best suited for the accomplishment of the purpose herein designed, and that thereafter united, concerted, and vigorous efforts be constantly made for its passage at the earliest possible date of the present session.

The above is a true copy of the original resolution adopted as stated therein.

Attest:

F. W. PERKINS,
Secretary Arizona Wool Growers' Association.

CLAIM OF NORWAY FOR DETENTION OF SEAMEN (S. DOC. NO. 53).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred

to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in relation to a claim presented by the Government of Norway against the Government of the United States based on the action of the authorities of Hudson County, N. J., in holding for their appearance as witnesses in a criminal case in that county in violation of treaty provisions between the United States and Norway, as the Norwegian Government alleges, three members of the crew of a Norwegian ship called the *Ingrid*, and I recommend that, as an act of grace, and without reference to the question of the liability of the United States, an appropriation be made to effect a settlement of this claim in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

In view of the comparatively small amount of this claim and in view of the lapse of time since the case was first presented to the Congress, I hope that provision may be made for the payment thereof at an early date.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 1921.

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 five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 25, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1921.

MEMBER OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Frederick I. Cox, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the term expiring December 31, 1926, vice Edgar E. Clark, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Frank Seymour Reed, of Culbertson, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Glasgow, Mont., vice Edward C. Hargadine, whose term will expire July 31, 1921.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Edwin Malcolm Kirton, of Malta, Mont., to be register of the land office at Glasgow, Mont., vice Thomas R. Jones, whose term will expire July 31, 1921.

MEMBER OF THE CALIFORNIA DÉBRIS COMMISSION.

Col. Herbert Deakyn, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Débris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Débris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. E. Eveleth Winslow, Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

John Hegness to be postmaster at Nome, Alaska, in place of J. J. Walsh. Incumbent's commission expired July 14, 1920.

COLORADO.

Vivian A. Flaugh to be postmaster at Pagosa Springs, Colo., in place of V. A. Chambers. Name changed by marriage.

DELAWARE.

Fred C. Powell to be postmaster at Harrington, Del., in place of E. B. Harrington, deceased.

IDAHO.

Fred H. Chase to be postmaster at Leadore, Idaho, in place of G. F. Johnston. Office became third class July 1, 1920.

Lewis N. Balch to be postmaster at Pocatello, Idaho, in place of W. A. Fiscus, resigned.

Benjamin E. Weeks to be postmaster at Shoshone, Idaho, in place of Everett Noble, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

Ruth J. Hodge to be postmaster at Area, Ill., in place of J. C. Dorfler, resigned.

Robert W. Gibson to be postmaster at Mason, Ill., in place of C. C. Kavanaugh, resigned.

Robert B. Ritzman to be postmaster at Orangeville, Ill., in place of E. R. Ritzman, resigned.

Elijah Williams to be postmaster at Tonica, Ill., in place of H. I. Baldwin, resigned.

William C. Ohse to be postmaster at Yorkville, Ill., in place of H. B. Fasmer, resigned.

IOWA.

Harriette Olsen to be postmaster at Armstrong, Iowa, in place of Kaspar Faltinson, deceased.

Andrew N. Jensen to be postmaster at Elk Horn, Iowa, in place of Walter Gregersen. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

Andrew C. Ries to be postmaster at Ringsted, Iowa, in place of Ida M. Truesdale, resigned.

Roy O. Kelley to be postmaster at Westside, Iowa, in place of C. R. Kracht. Office became third class April 1, 1919.

KANSAS.

Charles M. Tinkler to be postmaster at Gypsum, Kans., in place of S. M. Dickerson, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

Mattie B. Mullins to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Ky., in place of C. W. Brown, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Addison T. Winslow to be postmaster at Nantucket, Mass., in place of J. Y. Deacon. Incumbent's commission expired July 11, 1920.

Clifford H. Dickson to be postmaster at Pittsfield, Mass., in place of E. T. Scully. Incumbent's commission expired July 25, 1920.

MICHIGAN.

Olof Brink to be postmaster at Tustin, Mich., in place of Emmett Pullman, resigned.

MINNESOTA.

Frank H. Nichols to be postmaster at Comfrey, Minn., in place of A. J. Yackel, resigned.

Emmett R. Brown to be postmaster at Kasson, Minn., in place of J. H. Parker, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Gerhard J. Naber to be postmaster at Antioch, Nebr., in place of O. C. Messler, removed.

George V. Brownfield to be postmaster at Hershey, Nebr., in place of F. A. Rasmussen. Office became third class October 1, 1917.

Leonard E. Byrd to be postmaster at Lewellen, Nebr., in place of W. A. Naviaux, resigned.

James W. Gilbert to be postmaster at Minatare, Nebr., in place of H. M. Townsend, deceased.

Archie V. Jones to be postmaster at Mitchell, Nebr., in place of E. D. Smith, resigned.

John Q. Kirkman to be postmaster at Wood Lake, Nebr., in place of M. A. Waggoner, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Nellie R. Dowd to be postmaster at Lincoln, N. H., in place of S. F. Downing, removed.

NEW JERSEY.

David Hastings to be postmaster at Boundbrook, N. J., in place of J. V. D. Field. Incumbent's commission expired March 19, 1918.

NEW YORK.

Bernie R. Bothwell to be postmaster at Hannibal, N. Y., in place of W. H. Chillson, jr., resigned.

Katheryn M. Oley to be postmaster at Jamesville, N. Y., in place of E. G. Kenyon, resigned.

George A. Phillips to be postmaster at Bemus Point, N. Y., in place of T. P. Mattison, resigned.

Walter F. Billington to be postmaster at Rye, N. Y., in place of Michael Daly. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1920.

Jay Farrier to be postmaster at Oneida, N. Y., in place of L. G. Quackenbush, resigned.

Harry J. McDaniel to be postmaster at Sherburne, N. Y., in place of J. H. Shepard, deceased.

OKLAHOMA.

William H. McKenzie to be postmaster at Cement, Okla., in place of A. C. Melton, resigned.

Horace Bradley to be postmaster at Wewoka, Okla., in place of J. S. Barham, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Charles H. Truby to be postmaster at Apollo, Pa., in place of F. M. Newingham, resigned.

Dunham Barton to be postmaster at Mercer, Pa., in place of F. P. Craig, removed.

John E. Anstine to be postmaster at Stewartstown, Pa., in place of G. F. Trout, resigned.

TENNESSEE.

Wiley O. Mangum to be postmaster at Savannah, Tenn., in place of T. J. Welch, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Roy E. Curtis to be postmaster at Hundred, W. Va., in place of S. J. Cole, resigned.

WISCONSIN.

Herman A. Krueger to be postmaster at Merrill, Wis., in place of R. B. Runke, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 1921.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ALASKA.

Karl Theile to be surveyor general of Alaska.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

To be colonel.

Charles Brooks Clark.

To be captain.

Ellis Bashore.

To be first lieutenants.

Edward Herendeen.

John Corwin Shaw.

Howell Harrell.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonel.

Herman Walter Schull.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be colonel.

Henry Blow Farrar.

To be lieutenant colonel.

J. Alfred Moss.

CAVALRY.

To be colonels.

Leon Benjamin Kromer.

Charles Annesley Romeyn.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be captains.

William Thomas Fisher.

William Paul Dodds.

George William Reyer.

Joseph Rogers Darnall.

Claude Cyril Langley.

Nathan Rosenberg.

Byron Johnson Peters.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains.

Arthur Clay Foard.

Elmer Henry Nicklies.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Raymond Thomas Seymour.

Walter Richard Pringle.

Oscar Charles Schwaim.

Claude Francis Cox.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

To be lieutenant colonel.

Francis Herbert Lomax.

To be major.

Rudolf William Riefkohl.

To be captains.

Gwynne Conrad.

Harold Lancelot Finley.

Enrique Garcia.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captain.

Horatio Gano Fairbanks.

To be first lieutenant.

Reynolds Johnston Burt, jr.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be major.

Robert Collins Eddy.

To be first lieutenant.

William Edward Ryan.

To be second lieutenant.

George Bernhard Anderson.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be major.

Francis Augustus Englehart.

To be first lieutenant.

Lyle Sayers Lindsey.

AIR SERVICE.

To be first lieutenant.

Paul Evert.

SIGNAL CORPS.

To be captain.

Winchell Ivan Rasor.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE.

To be captain.

March Hugo Houser.

To be first lieutenant.

Chase Whittier Hoadley.

CHAPLAIN.

Edmond Joseph Griffin, with the rank of captain.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 22, 1921.

POSTMASTER.

ALASKA.

T. D. Baker to be postmaster at Nome, in the Territory of Alaska.