

Mr. HOPWOOD. No; he is about 60 or 65. He was born and raised in my district. I knew him when quite a young man, and I knew his father before him, and his mother; and he comes of as fine stock as there is in the United States of America. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has gone far afield in attacking Mr. Lewis personally because the War Department has not accepted the Lewis gun. I do not know anything about guns, but I believe Mr. Lewis has the best gun that has ever been gotten up in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] I believe that, although I am not an expert on guns. But I just want to say that when the gentleman attacks Mr. Lewis he attacks the wrong man. Mr. Lewis is as distinguished a man as there is in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I have not attacked him, but what I said I do not retract. I make no retraction or apology for what I said.

Mr. HOPWOOD. I do not care whether you do or not. But I want to reiterate here that Mr. Lewis comes from as good stock as anybody in this House, and I will not sit here, knowing him as I do, having known him as a boy and as a man for 50 years, and remain silent while a slur is attempted to be put upon that man. He has done as much, and more, probably, for his country, considering the position he has occupied, than any man in this House has done. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted a word, I just simply stated, from the information that I had, that a good deal of this trouble has been started by Mr. Lewis because the War Department had refused to take his gun. I make no apologies for that statement. I believe the Record shows it. I do not care what family Mr. Lewis comes from or who his ancestors were.

Mr. HOPWOOD. And I do not care what the gentleman thinks about it either.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word. This is not a question that Mr. Lewis has stirred up, as suggested by the gentleman from Washington. The question here is, the National Guard have been ordered to the front, and they have no machine guns. It is not a question that anybody has stirred up, except that it is a question as to lack of equipment for the Army that has been called out in the defense of the Government.

It seems to me that the officers in charge are derelict in their duty in not supplying the National Guard with proper equipment when they are called in the service of the country. They have had two or three years testing these various guns, and the time to quibble about whose make of gun shall be used has passed, and these officers ought to secure the best equipment possible. They ought to get it, and they ought to get it immediately. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That all the money hereinbefore appropriated under the titles Subsistence of the Army; Regular supplies, Quartermaster Corps; Incidental expenses, Quartermaster Corps; Transportation of the Army and its supplies; Water and sewers at military posts; and Clothing and camp and garrison equipage, shall be disbursed and accounted for by officers and agents of the Quartermaster Corps as "Supplies, services, and transportation, Quartermaster Corps," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment by Mr. FITZGERALD: On page 5, after line 2, insert as a new paragraph the following:

"Medical and Hospital Department: For Medical and Hospital Department, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for 1916, \$1,584,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendment to the House with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee having, as Speaker pro tempore, assumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 16678) making

appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, had instructed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 7617, the roads bill, and I ask unanimous consent for a few minutes in which to make a preliminary statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] calls up the conference report on the bill H. R. 7617, the roads bill.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I want to make a statement, and for that purpose I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there is a written statement accompanying the report?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7617) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, there is a little embarrassment about this conference report concerning which I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

When this bill went to conference there were some gentlemen who objected to section 8, the forest-reserve section in the Senate substitute, and a portion of the conferees on the part of the House gave those gentlemen to understand that before a conference report was agreed to they would be given an opportunity to have a separate vote on section 8. In the midst of the pressing business the conferees on the part of the House by an oversight made the conference report to the House without having first given the House an opportunity to vote upon that section separately.

What I desire now is to ask unanimous consent that before the vote is taken on the adoption of the conference report a vote may be taken to express the sense of the House on section 8.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the gentleman from Missouri to say that if objection is made to his request for unanimous consent the conferees will not be able to keep an agreement which they made?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is true, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MONDELL. I am very much interested in section 8 and think it is the best part of the bill, and therefore I regret to have section 8 separated from the balance of the bill and put to the test of a separate vote, but I certainly shall not object to the request if the gentleman assures us that it is necessary in order to give the conferees an opportunity to carry out an agreement they made.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I think that is true.

Mr. CARTER. Is section 8, which is being discussed now, included in the conference report, or was it rejected by the conferees?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It was adopted in the conference report.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOWELL. In the event that section 8 is submitted to a vote and is not adopted, what is the status of the conference report?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. As I understand it, if that is voted down, then the question would arise as to whether the conference report should be adopted. If the sense of the House is that section 8 should go out of the bill, I suppose the next thing would be to disagree to the conference report and send the bill back to conference.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the request of the gentleman from Missouri is that it shall be in order, pending the consideration of the conference report, to consider a resolution something like this: *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House that section 8 of the Senate amendment to this bill ought not to be agreed to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is my understanding.

Mr. MANN. And if that motion should prevail, then the conference report would be rejected by the House. If the motion should not prevail, then the question would be on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That presents the situation.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not have the same understanding of the gentleman's request that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has. I do not understand that the gentleman requested the adoption, by unanimous consent, of a resolution that it was the sense of the House that section 8 should go out. Those of us who are in favor of section 8 could not agree to that sort of unanimous consent.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The gentleman misunderstands my request.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood that the gentleman's request was for a vote on section 8.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is correct.

Mr. MONDELL. Without any expression on the part of the conference committee as to whether it ought to stay in or go out. It is to be assumed that the committee desire to have it remain in the conference report, they having brought it in.

Mr. MANN. There is no way of taking a vote on section 8 while the conference report is undisposed of, except by unanimous consent, in the method I have suggested.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. That is the only way.

Mr. MANN. It is to avoid rejecting the conference report, which I think under the agreement that was made would probably be rejected, except for a unanimous-consent agreement like this.

Mr. DOWELL. I desire to make an inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Let me answer this and then I will. What I intended to ask is that before a vote is taken on the adoption of the conference report a vote shall be taken to express the sense of the House as to whether it desires section 8 to remain in or go out of the bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, if the House rejects section 8, does that reject the conference report?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I think it would take a separate vote.

Mr. DOWELL. I understood that it would reject the conference report.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. No; it would take another vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Now, will the gentleman state his request.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask unanimous consent that pending the consideration of this conference report a vote of the House be taken as to whether it desires section 8 of the Senate substitute to remain in or go out of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have section 8 read for the information of the House, so that we will know just what it is.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It is the forest-reserve section.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to know just what it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read section 8.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. That there is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, out of any moneys in the National Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and each fiscal year thereafter, up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in all \$10,000,000, to be available until expended under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, upon request from the proper officers of the State, Territory, or county for the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within or only partly within the national forests, when necessary for the use and development of resources upon which communities within and adjacent to the national forests are dependent: *Provided*, That the State, Territory, or county shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture for the survey, construction, and maintenance of such roads or trails upon a basis equitable to both the State, Territory, or county, and the United States: *And provided also*, That the aggregate expenditures in any State, Territory, or county shall not exceed 10 per cent. of the value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, of the timber and forage resources which are or will be available for income upon the national forest lands within the respective county or counties wherein the roads or trails will be constructed; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the amounts expended hereunder.

That immediately upon the execution of any cooperative agreement hereunder the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount to be expended by the United States within or adjacent to any national forest thereunder, and beginning with the next fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall apply from any and all revenues from such forest 10 per cent. thereof to reimburse the United States for expenditures made under such agreement until the whole amount advanced under such agreement shall have been returned from the receipts from such national forest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Do gentlemen desire some time for discussion of this?

Mr. LENROOT. I would like some time.

Mr. MONDELL. We would like some time.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. How much time?

Mr. MONDELL. Would 45 minutes on a side be too much?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Let us have as little as we can get along with.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Forty-five minutes on a side will be all right. Is that enough for the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. LENROOT. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. MONDELL. There are quite a number of gentleman who want to be heard, as I understand it. I do not want to delay action, but have not quite a number of gentlemen asked the gentleman from Missouri for an opportunity to speak?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Not very many. There have been some.

Mr. MONDELL. I think 40 minutes on a side would cover it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I will ask unanimous consent that there may be 40 minutes on a side to discuss section 8, half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] asks unanimous consent that there shall be 80 minutes debate on this proposition, half of it to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will state to the gentleman from Missouri that I want to get 15 minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. In view of the number of applications for time that have suddenly come in, I do not think anybody can get more than five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, section 8 of this bill provides an appropriation of a million dollars annually for 10 years to be used for building roads in forest reservations under cooperative agreements to be made between the Secretary of Agriculture and the authorities of the State, the money to be reimbursed from the receipts from the forest reserves.

Ultimately, therefore, not a dollar of this expenditure, which can not exceed \$1,000,000 a year, will come out of the pockets of the American people, or will be money raised by taxation. Every dollar of it will be money received from the reserves, and a considerable part of it will be money the flow of which into the Treasury will be quickened by building the roads which will make it possible to reach the resources of the reserves now locked up on account of lack of transportation.

The forest reserves of the United States occupy approximately 160,000,000 acres of land, an area between four and five times the size of the State of Iowa, and unless there is some provision of this kind in the bill this vast area will receive no essential benefit by the terms of this bill. Nearly 20 per cent of the State I have the honor to represent will not be affected or helped in any way by the general provisions of the good-roads bill. There are few post roads in the forest reserves; there is little population in the forest reserves except those that are there temporarily at certain periods of the year, and unless this provision remains in the bill it will be equivalent to excluding from the benefits of the bill an area as large, as I have said, as five or six good-sized States in the Union.

Furthermore, the money proposed to be expended under this section of the bill is the only money proposed to be expended under the bill that will not be drawn from the people in the way of taxes, for it will come from income which the expenditure will itself largely create. This provision was adopted by the conference committee. They believe in it; they are for it; but they had made a promise to present this forest reserve road section for a separate vote in the House, and we are bound to respect that promise, and therefore we did not object to this request for unanimous consent. But we ask every Member of this House who is in favor of the bill, who proposes to vote for it, to vote for section 8 and do justice to that great forest-reserve section of the country, as we hope to do justice to the balance of the country in the enactment of the general provisions of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this proposition for two reasons: First, assuming there was merit to section 8, with the present condition of the Treasury, the Congress is not justified in voting a \$10,000,000 appropriation for this purpose at this time. It ought not to require any argument, with Democrats especially, who are responsible for the appropriations

made by this Congress, to convince them that they should vote to remove section 8 from this bill.

Mr. Speaker, aside from that, upon the merits of the proposition itself, section 8 as framed is without merit. There is a very clever joker concealed in the section, and I want to try to make it plain if I can. If this was a proposition to expend \$10,000,000 upon the roads within the forest reserves, there might be, and indeed I am ready to say there would be, some merit to it. But, if you will observe the language of the bill, not one single penny of the \$10,000,000 will necessarily be expended upon the roads within the forest reserves. The language is:

In all, \$10,000,000 to be available until expended under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, upon request from the proper officers of the State, Territory, or county for the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within or only partly within the national forests.

That means that if here is a road 50 miles in length, and a half a mile of the 50 miles is in a forest reserve, this money can be expended, not upon the half a mile within the forest reserve necessarily, but on the 49½ miles outside the forest reservation.

Mr. BROWNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. BROWNE. I would like to ask the gentleman, if the bill is subject to the construction he places on it, would it not be the fact that if a Secretary of Agriculture should approve of the construction of that kind it would forever relegate him to private life and the administration under it?

Mr. LENROOT. No; because under the provisions of the bill the Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to do two things—to approve the plans and specifications of the project, and if the road, the proposed plans and specifications of which meet the standard that is prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, in my mind he has no option but to approve that project. With reference to this very section the provision is:

Provided, That the State, Territory, or county shall enter into a co-operative agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture for the survey, construction, and maintenance of such roads or trails upon a basis equitable to both the State, Territory, or county and the United States.

That would mean, if it means anything, an arrangement between them with reference to the expense of the road, and the language of section 8 declares that the \$10,000,000 may be expended within or without the forest reservation, and that deprives the Secretary of Agriculture of any discretion of saying that the money shall be expended within the national forest reserve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would it not be the case that a road running 1 mile in a forest reserve and 20 miles outside, the Forest Department would say that the expense would be enough to take care of 1 mile?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly not; because the section expressly declares that the money may be expended on roads within and without the forest reserve.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would it be helpful to the gentleman if I told him that the Forester, when testifying before the Committee on Agriculture, stated that in some cases it would be necessary in developing the resources of the national forests to improve the roads altogether outside of the national forests?

Mr. LENROOT. That may be; but no such discretion is reposed in the Secretary of Agriculture or in the Forester in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think it is fair for a county—say, my county—to spend \$100,000 of its money to build roads in the forest reserve—in other words, on the public domain?

Mr. LENROOT. No. I stated a moment ago, as the gentleman knows if he was following me, that if this was a provision which provided for the expenditure of money upon roads within forest reservations there would be some merit to it. In addition to this the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has just made a plea to the House that an injustice was suffered by these western States, because so much of the area was taken up in the forest reservations, and therefore that they would not receive any benefit from the major portion of this bill because of that fact. But I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that in making the apportionment of the \$75,000,000 appropriated in the bill under the other sections credit is given to those States for every acre of land within the forest reservations; they receive a full share, counting in every acre of the forest reservations; and, not satisfied with that, they come in with section 8 and ask for \$10,000,000 additional.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Is it not also true that this apportionment is made according to population, which is comparatively small in the public-land States?

Mr. LENROOT. One-third is made according to population and one-third is made according to area, and that means that you will in the State of Idaho include every acre of land you have in forest reservations in determining the amount that you will receive of the \$75,000,000. Mr. Speaker, is there anything just in this kind of proposition? Is this House warranted in voting to expend \$10,000,000 under this kind of a proposition? If they wanted a proposition that had some merit to it, that would appeal to this House, this language would have confined the building of roads within forest reservations, or at least have given to the Secretary of Agriculture in section 8 the absolute power over the matter, and provide that no money should be expended outside forest reservations except when it was necessary to complete the scheme of roads within a forest reservation.

I frankly say from the way things go in this House that I expect the House will vote to appropriate this \$10,000,000, not because it is a good business proposition, not because it is good economy, not because a single Member of this House if he was treating this question as a business question would vote for it, for I know they would not do so, but I realize the force behind this bill, and that many Members will fear that if anything is done or any change is made in it, the entire bill will fall. So far as the body of the bill is concerned, I have said repeatedly that I am heartily in favor of Federal aid to roads, but I have said, and I repeat it, that with the present condition of the Treasury appropriations are not justified either for new public buildings or any unnecessary expense, but they should be confined to the absolutely necessary expenditures of the Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I understand the gentleman to say that in the general appropriation of the whole sum these States that have forest reserves within them have apportioned to them that portion to which their whole growth entitles them, and then in addition \$10,000,000 are added as a superfluity, over and above the other States.

Mr. LENROOT. That is correct. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But this superfluity would be paid back by the other States, would it not? Are not the States to return this million dollars per year from returns given them from forest reserves?

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman really think that the National Government in the next 50 years will receive any substantial return from this \$10,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I certainly do.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the gentleman takes a position contrary to the position he has taken every time when the matter of national forests has been before this House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I base my opinion upon the reports of the chief forester in which the estimates in the three reserves in my district show an increase from year to year over that which is cut, and until you have these roads you have no returns into the Treasury. The roads themselves will not cost what they will save in fire protection alone. You make this Government build fire trails, when you ought to build roads.

Mr. LENROOT. I have simply to say to the gentleman that if he was talking about something in the bill there would be merit to it, but the gentleman is not talking about the provisions of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will give me time I will.

Mr. LENROOT. The provisions of the bill do not confine the \$10,000,000 to roads within the national forests. That is the answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In or adjacent to it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must not break in upon a Member's speech without his consent.

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

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The one item in it that was winning my sympathy was the promise that the money would be paid back again. Am I to understand that there is no force to that at all?

Mr. LENROOT. Practically none; at least for a generation to come.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Does not the bill provide that 10 per cent of the receipts from forest reserves shall be returned to the Federal Treasury each year?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but will the gentleman state what those receipts are?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I do not know what they are.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, the gentleman knows.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The gentleman knows as well as I do. It stands to reason that when these forests are opened up, and this timber goes to the market at a reasonable price, there will be a lot of it sold, instead of allowing the lumber companies to combine and charge any price they demand for the lumber, as they do now.

Mr. LENROOT. It is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen from the West desire to talk about something they would have the House believe is in the bill which is not there. The provision for reimbursement to the Government of 10 per cent of the receipts from forest reserves means nothing, for these very receipts from which the 10 per cent will be taken are money belonging to the Government and now paid into the United States Treasury; so the provision for reimbursement is a fraud upon its face.

In conclusion, I want to say that the application of this \$10,000,000 will not be primarily for roads within national forests, but for roads outside of national forests. That is human nature; I do not blame them. They want all the money they can get out of the Federal Treasury, and this is a scheme to get more than their share out of the National Treasury because of the use of the words "national forests."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 14 minutes.

DRAFT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] I call up the conference report on House joint resolution 242 and move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia calls up House joint resolution 242 and asks that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) to authorize the President to draft members of the National Guard and of the Organized Militia of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia and members of the National Guard and Militia Reserves into the military service of the United States under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced the conferees as follows: Mr. HAY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. ANTHONY.

FEDERAL AID TO ROADS.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, there are practically three points the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has made against the bill, or, rather, section 8. First, that the condition of the Treasury does not warrant the appropriation provided. Well, now, whatever is necessary to appropriate for proper development this Government and the people of this country are ready and willing to provide the money to the end that the people may have roads that they may take their produce to the markets. So as to the first objection I believe that it is not well founded. The American people want development and are willing to provide the means therefore. All they ask is honest and proper expenditures. The other propositions I will take up in order, and the next proposition of the gentleman is that this is "pork."

I say that is only to scare Members, that there might be "pork" in this bill, whereas it is a clean-cut proposition for this Government to improve and develop its own property, that belongs to it and that it handles and that it controls. Then, after this money is expended, which is obtained from the proceeds of the timber and forests now controlled by the Government, it will be returned to the Government as the proceeds are received from proper sales, rentals, and so forth, from the forest reserves. The joker that our friend refers to in the bill, while ordinarily he reads the whole of a statement, in this instance I do not believe the gentleman read it all. The restricting clause in this bill his argument would not apply to, and I want to read it for the benefit of the House.

For the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within or only partly within the national parks.

That is practically what the gentleman read. But we find the following language, following the above, read by the gentleman from Wisconsin:

When necessary for the use and development of resources upon which communities within and adjacent to the national forests are dependent.

Now, the question of constructing, when, where, and how, provided for in the bill must be determined by the proper official; that the road, if any is built without a national forest, must be for the purpose of developing the national forests. It must be dependent upon and must be necessary to assist the communities within the national forests—

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

Mr. RAKER. I do.

Mr. LENROOT. Is there any language that says it must be necessary for the development of the forests? Is it not confined to the development of resources of the community outside of the forest?

Mr. RAKER. No; I do not think so. It says the development of resources upon which the communities within and adjacent to the national forests are dependent. For instance, here on that road is a large national forest that is distant 10 or 15 miles, sometimes 5 miles, running to another national forest with another 15, 20, or 50 miles. The question is whether or not you would build a road in that forest and then, with this 10 miles outside of the national forest, say that no money could be expended to make that road available so that both forests might be connected and the people in the intermediate part might receive the benefit of the development, to the end not that their property be developed but that the Government property be developed.

It is not for the purpose of constructing roads outside the national forests. That is furthest from the object of the bill. But there may be instances where it is absolutely necessary to construct some part of the road outside the forest reserve. When this occurs the road should be built. Those in charge must determine that it is necessary to develop the land within and adjacent to the forest. They must determine it is dependent upon that fact. Then they will use a part of the money or some of the money for the purpose of constructing these roads. Why, gentlemen, you have set aside these great national forests. They belong to this country; they are owned by all the people. It retards the development of the rest of the country in many, many ways, and why should you not appropriate the money from the sales of timber and other products of these forests, to the end that it may be used to develop, or at least assist in developing, the surrounding country; and when the timber is sold and the minerals in these forests are disposed of and the coal and water power is developed, then is returned this 10 per cent used, and the whole country is benefited. Section 8 of the conference report should be adopted. I firmly believe that the good judgment of the House will be exercised and the provisions of the bill providing for roads in the national forests will become a part of this bill when it is finally approved by the President. This legislation means immediate and great development in the Western States in which there are national forests. California is behind this bill and its people will be much pleased when this bill is finally a law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will agree to section 8 of this bill. I have read it carefully, and I certainly do not construe it as does my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. As I understand it, it simply provides that \$1,000,000 shall be appropriated each year for the next 10 years for the development of roads within or partly within forest reserves. The reason that language was inserted was because the Forester determined that in building a road in a national forest engineering reasons would make it necessary at times to build a short stretch of road without the limits of the forest reserve, and that to compel them to discontinue the improvement of that link of the road simply because it ran for a very short distance outside the forest reserve would not be wise.

Now, from the standpoint of the Government, can we believe that it is the purpose to make this a vehicle for the construction of roads entirely without the forest reserves? It is difficult to believe that fact possible, because it is provided that the Secretary of Agriculture must approve the project, and he would not approve of any project not within the spirit of this law. It is further provided:

That immediately upon the execution of any cooperative agreement hereunder the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount to be expended by the United States within or adjacent to any national forest thereunder; and, beginning with the next fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall apply from any and all revenues from such forest 10 per cent thereof to reimburse the United States for expenditures made under such agreement until the whole amount advanced

under such agreement shall have been returned from the receipts from such national forest.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I regret I have not the time.

Mr. LENROOT. I will yield time to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I will ask the gentleman where that money comes from that the Government is going to reimburse itself with?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It comes from the forest revenues, and, as I am informed, the revenues from that source last year amounted to more than \$2,000,000, and it has averaged that for a number of years.

Mr. LENROOT. Whose money was the \$2,000,000?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It has come from the forest reserves.

Mr. LENROOT. But whose money was it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is the money of the Government. It is placed in the miscellaneous fund.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; so that if we vote to reimburse 10 per cent of this fund, we are taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another. That is all.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It comes from the forest reserves. The gentleman from Wisconsin overlooks the fact that these forests are now there. Will you abandon them or develop them? If you develop them, you must provide these roads in order to procure revenues for them. You can not expect the States to provide them, because, as you state, the revenues now go to the Government and not to the States.

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

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I can not yield; I have not the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. This whole question boils down to this, that this Government is not spending one cent of money for the improvement of land that is not its own land. It is for the development of the forest reserves owned by the United States Government, and these roads will make more valuable the forest reserves that are the property of all the people of this country.

When we know that this conference report is already approved by the Senate and to become law needs only our approval, will you vote against section 8 and send the bill back to conference and run the risk of having the bill defeated? The Senate has indicated its determination to stand by section 8. If you by your vote approve of section 8, then this conference report will be agreed to this afternoon and the Government will commit itself to the policy of developing the roads of this country. If you vote against it and send it back to conference, the chances are it will meet the fate it has for the last six years.

I wish to ask every Member of the House on this side not to be carried away by the arguments of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. Remember you are voting to improve lands belonging to the United States Government, and when you appropriate money for that purpose it is coming back into the Treasury from the revenues of the Forest Service. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin use some of his time?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield five minutes, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if you were to listen to the advocates of this unfair proposition from the western country, you would think that the Western States are not receiving any return whatever from the building of roads at the present time. But we have a law that grants 25 per cent of the returns of the forest reserves, to be used for school purposes and for roads in the counties where the forest reserves are located.

In addition to that there is another law that requires 10 per cent of the net results of the forest reserves to be expended upon roads in the Forest Service. We are granting to these Western States that contain these forest reserves an advantage to the extent of 35 per cent of the revenues resulting from the forest reserves, and yet they come here and ask not to be treated on a par with the rest of the country, based upon territory, based upon population, and based upon rural and star routes, but they ask to be singled out and in addition receive \$1,000,000 annually, besides the amount appropriated every year

in the Agricultural appropriation bill, besides the 35 per cent that I have already referred to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not at present. I have only five minutes. In the Agricultural appropriation bill passed at this session \$400,000 is appropriated for the building of roads, in addition to the 35 per cent of the forest reserves receipts that the law grants to these States—first, 10 per cent for roads exclusively, and in addition 25 per cent to be apportioned at the discretion of the States for the support of schools and roads.

Why, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], who I thought had some acquaintance with the conditions in the Western States, says that in those forest reserves there are no post roads. I have not much acquaintance with them, but last summer I spent three weeks in the Yosemite National Park, and I went about the various forest reserves thereabouts, and I saw with my own eyes roads covered by the rural mail service in the national reserve parks—

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Those roads that you saw in the Yosemite Valley were built by this Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not referring to roads in the Yosemite Valley but to roads in the forest reserves adjacent to the Yosemite National Park.

Now, they say that they want this fund for the development of the forest reserves. Who ever heard of the building of a carriage road for the purpose of aiding logging operations? Any person who knows anything about the building of logging roads in the development of a timber country knows that they do not build those logging roads along the line of a permanent highway. The question before us is whether these Western States shall again get an unfair advantage at the expense of the rest of the country.

We have treated them fairly by portioning out 25 per cent of the net receipts of the sales of the forest reserves, to be utilized by the States, and apportioned to the counties where the forest reserves are located for the use of schools and roads. Then, again, we provide for an additional 10 per cent, to be used solely for the building of roads and trails and telegraph and telephone lines in forest reserves; and, in addition to that, to which they would be entitled under the general provisions of this bill—and no one questions that they have vast areas which entitle them to their proportionate part, based on area, and that they have star routes and rural routes, besides—they want you to vote, in addition to those large amounts, other millions annually. They want you to vote \$1,000,000 annually in addition to all these amounts. I submit to you gentlemen whether it is right for them to ask it, whether it is proper for us in the condition of the Treasury, when we are going to vote \$75,000,000 here, to vote an additional \$10,000,000 as a favor to States that are already amply provided for in existing legislation and in existing appropriation bills?

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not have any remaining to yield back.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the Forest Service is already losing over \$3,000,000 a year, that is about all the Government should stand. If the States in which the forest reserves are located are getting their just proportion of the money appropriated for the construction of roads by the aid of the Federal Treasury, it seems to me that is all they ought to expect. We are already paying the States in which the forest reserves are located 25 per cent of all the revenues that come from forest reserves, and we are paying them 10 per cent in addition for other purposes; and if we ever get any money back, which I doubt, we will be getting our own money back.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Why does the gentleman doubt whether the Government will get any money back, when the law provides specifically that 10 per cent of the yearly receipts shall be turned into the Treasury?

Mr. MADDEN. Because, if we do get any money back. It will be our own money that we have already paid them; so that we can not get money back without getting our own money back, for we have already handed it to them.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman realize that a large amount of the receipts from forest reserves

come from the grazing privileges, from the stock pastured in those States and owned by residents of those States?

Mr. MADDEN. It does not make any difference from what source the receipts come.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. How can it be your money?

Mr. MADDEN. It goes into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, and it belongs to the United States Government, and not to the people of the States in which the reserves are located. We ought not to do for the people who live in these territories more than we do for other people. We ought not to do for them more than we do for those who pay the taxes to meet the bills.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the Government will not build trunk-line roads into its own property, the forest reserves, where it hopes to have returns, who will do it?

Mr. MADDEN. If I were going to run the forest reserves on a business basis, with the expectation of marketing the timber, I would not build highways over which to run wagons to move the timber that I wanted to move to market. I would build tramways, that could be built for almost nothing, over which the timber could be moved to a place where it could be marketed. You can not move timber economically to market by horses and wagons, and to talk about the construction of highways for that service is absurd. It is ridiculous, and no man with an ounce of sense, running this timber business for his own profit, would dream of it—not a man.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. As a great captain of industry, which the gentleman from Illinois is, I want to ask him, if he owned 100,000 acres of fine timberland, would he build roads in it to get the timber out, or would he allow the timber to mature and decay?

Mr. MADDEN. If I wanted to market the timber I would build tramways, and I would put locomotives on the tramways, and I would haul the timber to market in that way, and not by wagons with horses or mules. You can not do it by building highways. There is no use to talk about it. It is ridiculous; it is absurd. It is nonsense, and it is not business.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman vote for an amendment providing for the building of railroads in there and buying locomotives to haul the timber to market?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not have any left to yield back.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, there are 138,000,000 acres of forest reserve in the 17 Western States of this Republic, and we are all in favor of conservation, and we all ought to be in favor of it. I say to you now as a friend of conservation and as a friend of the forest reserves those of you who are fighting these roads in the forests to-day are cutting off your noses to spite your faces. You are making the forest reserves in the West so unpopular that sooner or later the people of those States will come in here and break down the forest reserves, and you will have no conservation and no forest reserves. My good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and my other good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], neither one voted for the roads bill when it first passed the House, and they are evidently not in favor of it now. They both voted against it when this section relating to forests was not in the bill. Are you gentlemen on this side of the aisle going to let them fling dust in your eyes on some side issue when they are opposed to good-roads legislation altogether? Are you gentlemen over on this side going to be misled into striking down conservation and helping to make it unpopular because a few gentlemen here—a very few—are opposed to any appropriation here for roads? During the last three days we have sat here, silent witnesses, and have seen millions appropriated on this floor without ever having been considered by a committee, without ever having any department reporting in favor of it. This proposition is favored by the department; it is reported on favorably by the department; it is asked for by the department; it is needed by the department; it is agreed to by the conference committee. The conference report is adopted by the Senate. The West is entitled to this consideration. It is only fair to them; it is only just to them. We ought not quibble and beat around the bush in giving it to them.

Let me call the attention of this House to one thing: You appropriated \$35,000,000 for an Alaskan railway to open Alaska. Now you are asked to appropriate \$1,000,000 a year for 10 years, to be returned to the Treasury out of these receipts, to help build roads in the 138,000,000 acres of forest reserves of

the West. This is only advancement. These reserves are right here on the mainland of the United States. The roads are needed; the local communities are not able to build them. Are you going to do it, or are you going to screw up your faces and say, "This is wild abandonment of economy"? Are you going to try to break down the Forest Service? I do not believe this House is going to take the back track.

My good friend from Illinois, MARTIN MADDEN, comes in here every year and tries to break down irrigation. He would accomplish that if he could. I do not expect Chicago to do much irrigating in the West, and I do not expect my beloved friend, MARTIN MADDEN, to do much for irrigation in the West. I do not expect him to be in favor of it, but it is the duty of the rest of us to see to it that the Reclamation Service, that the Forest Service, and that conservation are not broken down in the West. It is easy for some one to come in here and start up a big hurrah and try to scare Members to death. I should think in the interest of good administration you would at least have selected two fellows in favor of the good-roads bill to wage this fight. I have called attention to the fact that the gentlemen from Wisconsin, both of them, voted against this very good-roads bill when it passed the House, and they were in slim company then, and if the House does its duty they will be in slim company to-day. Seventeen States out West can not carry the whole conservation propaganda for a hundred million people. You keep it up and the injustice so practiced will finally overthrow the forest reserves. The 17 Western States have 34 Senators and they, plus the industrious and diligent Members of the House from out there, will focus attention on it until it will break it down. The true friends of the forests will try to make them popular, not unpopular. This road provision will help popularize them and will help reconcile the West to these large reserves.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I have but five minutes, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. If the forest reserves were cared for by section 8, why were they considered and allowed for in the general apportionment?

Mr. FERRIS. They get a very small amount—10 per cent of the total receipts—not enough to make 1 per cent of what they ought to have.

Mr. HARDY. I do not think the gentleman appreciates my question. They are estimated as a part of the area of the State, and they get their proportion of the general fund. Is not that an injustice to other States if you take care of them in this section?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think so. Here is a great Government reserve that pays no taxes, that is held there without use, without occupation, without productiveness, and what for? In order that the rest of the country may have conservation of timber, lumber, and all the uses for which timber can be used. I say to you that the little, sparsely settled, arid States of the West can not longer in justice carry the whole conservation propaganda for a hundred million people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 15 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I have read the provisions of this bill and I wonder what my colleagues on the House Committee on Roads think of the measure that has come back to this House after the glowing representations they made here on the floor of the House as to the perfect piece of legislation that they had evolved when it was discussed last January. I stand somewhat amazed at the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] when he gets up here and holds out something akin to a threat to the House, and says that if you do not leave this section in the bill 17 States small in population, 17 half-settled States in the West, are coming in here and overthrow and tear to tatters the great program of conservation which has heretofore been followed. These 17 States have Representatives on the floor who believe in the conservation of everything except the Public Treasury. Section 8 was evidently put into the bill, Mr. Speaker, to give it a little air of respectability.

Mr. FERRIS rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. WALSH. No; I do not yield. It was put in there to give the bill some semblance of respectability. A provision is put in here about the reimbursement of the Public Treasury.

If it is a good thing for the United States Government to reimburse itself out of its own funds, why isn't it a far better thing for the States within which these roads are to be built to reimburse the Government for the funds that will be used in the building of the roads? That would hardly be a pleasing prospect to these States or the States who have for years neglected a plain duty in relation to taking care of their internal improvements. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that section 8 ought to be stricken from the bill. The whole bill ought to be defeated, as it is an unnecessary burden for the Nation to assume at this time. It is colossal in its raid on the Treasury and is barefaced in its discrimination against the States that pay the major portion of the taxes now assessed as a result of Democratic policies.

Mr. RAKER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALSH. I do not. I say that this section ought to be stricken from the bill for another reason, and that is because it is a subject entirely apart from the purpose of this bill. It is not to promote or facilitate the carrying of the rural mails on any roads on which they may now or hereafter be carried. It is an entirely foreign subject. It ought to come in here as a separate proposition, and should come in here connected with some measure having to do with forest reserves or national parks. Where, oh where, has the \$65,000 slice of park gone to, Mr. Speaker? That apportionment which was so vigorously defended by the farmers' friends from the vast agricultural States of Virginia, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina. Truly, those gentlemen have just cause to weep.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will not. The appropriation of \$25,000,000, which the Shackleford bill called for, in a few years will be increased by this glorious measure to \$75,000,000 for rural post roads, and we will then only have just begun this enormous program for the construction of roads throughout the States of this country under Federal auspices, and paid for by the dozen or so really progressive States of the Nation. Under the proportions established by this bill these 17 sparsely populated Western States are going to get the lion's share, because they are going to get it under the seven other sections of this bill and because of their vast areas of nonproductive, lightly taxed land, and if this section is allowed to remain in there they are going to get it also under the pretense of assisting in the development of the forest reserves. [Applause.] They will get an unfair and unjustifiable proportion of the sum herein appropriated, and at the expense of New England and the great manufacturing States within our borders.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill, but I believe if section 8 is voted down it means no good-roads legislation at this session of Congress. There have been arguments made by the opponents of this bill that section 8 of this bill does not provide that the roads shall be made within the forest reserves; that the State having forest reserves can obtain aid for roads located any place within the whole State where the forest reserve is located. I call your attention to section 1 of the bill, which seems to have been overlooked. If anyone will read this section of the bill, they will see that any road that is located under the provisions of this bill must be located with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture and the State highway departments must agree where the road shall be located. Therefore the roads provided for under section 8 must be located in and adjacent to the national forests for the development of the national forests and making the resources of the national forests available. Unless the Secretary of Agriculture and the State authorities conspire together to evade the law, these roads will be located fairly, and with this object in view, as clearly expressed in the bill.

I do not believe that a public officer like the Secretary of Agriculture is going to do anything wrong or unfair in locating a road upon which Government aid shall be expended. The Government is simply improving its own property and is advancing money that it will receive back from the forest reserves. The resources of the forest reserves are not available unless we have roads to those resources. These large forest reserves located throughout the West, exempt from taxation, retard the States' development, and it is only fair that the Government do something toward building roads through its own property to connect the State roads on each side. Even an individual would be compelled to do as much as this. The State also is obliged to contribute an equitable amount toward the building and maintenance of these roads.

Another thing. I think that many of our eastern friends who are opposing this road legislation will want to go out and visit our great national parks and forest reserves, and the only way to visit our national parks is to make the beautiful scenery and rich resources of the parks accessible to the public by building good roads in these parks. People spend millions of dollars every year in going to Europe to view scenery that does not begin to be as good as that which we have in our national parks, and I think it is only fair and just that some of the money coming from these great forest reserves be used to make roads within the national parks and forest reserves. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that almost every man who has spoken against this provision of the bill spoke or voted against the good-roads bill when it first passed the House. They undoubtedly know that it means, if this eighth section of this bill is defeated at this time, that this bill goes back to conference, and it is extremely doubtful whether we will get any good-roads legislation at this session of Congress. We can not ever get a road bill which everyone will be perfectly satisfied with. We have to concede certain points in a great country with so many diversified interests when we legislate for the whole country on a question like roads.

In all great national projects we have to concede certain points, and even if this road law does not meet with the approval of everyone in every particular, I think on the whole it is a step in the right direction, and it will start us in on a great project of national aid to roads which is going to be of inestimable value to all of the people of the country. By passing this bill at this time, voting in favor of this eighth provision and the conference report, we will have a good-road law, and we will at least have national aid given to wagon roads which the people of this country have been trying to get for the last 50 years. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, as a believer in the conservation of our national forests, I do not look upon it that that means that they are not to be developed. We nationally conserve them in order to avoid waste or abuse by private industry, and as a believer in this principle of conserving them I also believe in developing them. [Applause.] I am not opposed to the extension of conservation, but I desire to see the forest reserves made usable for the Government instead of for the individual, and if that is true, then we do not want them to stand unused or undeveloped. I want to make them usable, and I think the Government is justified in advancing, if necessary, a certain portion of the money to develop the forests, with the understanding that that is to be returned to the Government. Believing that it is the policy of the Government to use the forests in our conservation scheme rather than to allow them to be regarded as something too valuable to be utilized, I am going to vote for section 8. I think I am justified in it, and I also believe in the building of roads with Federal aid. I think that is a justifiable expenditure of money. For that reason I shall vote not only for section 8 but for the bill as reported. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT].

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in opposition to section 8 of this measure, which is calculated to mislead the House as to the real purpose and intention of this section. It has been suggested that this money may not be expended for the purpose of developing roads in the national forests, and for opening up the national forests, but may be expended outside of the national forests. In reply to that, I will say to the House that this measure was prepared and is asked for by the Secretary of Agriculture, who has the national forests under his care and charge. Furthermore, the bill provides that before a dollar can be expended a contract must be entered into between the State on the one side and the Secretary of Agriculture on the other; nothing can be done without his approval; he is there to protect the national forests, as it is his duty to do, and it is his duty to see to it that the proposed roads shall be such as will develop and open up the national forests. There is nothing in the objection that this money may not be spent to open up the national forests unless you assume that the Secretary of Agriculture will neglect his duty. What is the situation in my State and in other Western States? Gentlemen from Eastern States demand that some of our Western States shall be set aside in reservations as wood lots, I might call them, for the use and welfare of the future. We do not object to having our States set aside as wood lots, but if they are set aside as wood lots, we do not want these wood lots running across and lengthwise of our States as impassable barriers, as they are in the State of Oregon. Running across my State for 275 miles there is an enormous forest. It renders one side of

the State during a large portion of the year inaccessible to the other side of the State, except that there was built by public-spirited citizens and counties at the northern boundary along the Columbia River, at a cost of nearly \$1,000,000, the great Columbia highway. Otherwise this forest renders the eastern part of the State practically inaccessible to the western part of the State. We have in the State of Oregon 13,000,000 acres in forest reserves, worth four or five hundred million dollars—an area almost three times the size of the State of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is objecting so strenuously to section 8 of this bill. We can not tax this great area which is almost three times the size of his State. If we could tax that area we would build, at our own expense, roads from one end of the State to the other. Last year that enormous area only brought into the State treasury for road and school purposes the small sum of about \$49,000. We do not think we are making an unjust demand on the Government when we ask that money be appropriated to open roads through these forests to develop them and to make one side of our State accessible to the other.

I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, Mr. McARTHUR.

[Mr. McARTHUR addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I make the request to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request. The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days to extend their remarks upon this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen be allowed to extend their remarks in the Record on this bill for five legislative days. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the House will agree to section 8, authorizing the expenditure of \$1,000,000 per year for a period of 10 years for the construction of roads in the forest reserves in cooperation with the States and counties in which such reserves are situated. This section enables the Government to improve and make accessible and salable the timber, grazing, and other resources on its property. It also makes it possible for the people who live in and adjacent to the reserves to have the means of communication and transportation absolutely necessary for their growth and development, and to give them opportunity for obtaining proper mail facilities. During the past year Oregon received three-eighths of 1 cent per acre in lieu of taxes for forest-reserve lands. No one will maintain that such an amount gives any appreciable relief to the counties in the construction of roads. The proposed appropriation in this section gives, it is true, small relief in a very difficult situation. If the Government intends to hold these vast reserves, it should not leave them in a wild and inaccessible condition. They should be improved by the Government, at least in construction of roads, to the same extent that they would be required to be improved if they were held in private ownership. Such improvement is only the merest justice to the States in which great areas are withheld from taxation. I am not advocating any utopian scheme at the expense of the National Government, and nothing of that kind is possible under this section. These roads will be built in cooperation with the States and counties, and every dollar expended will be profitably expended. Moreover, the Forest Service in its road construction has proved that it builds good roads at minimum cost also.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS].

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to express the full appreciation on my part and of my colleague [Mr. SHACKLEFORD] of the kindness of friends on both sides of this aisle which has enabled us, through the medium of unanimous consent, to make effective an understanding which through inadvertence had been overlooked.

The immediate proposition before the House this afternoon, is the very simple one whether the United States Government shall improve its own property. That is the kernel of this controversy. I do not think it was ever contemplated that these forests should remain wholly undeveloped and unprovided with roads or trails. The addition of roads will plainly increase the value of the vast area included within our forest reservations. Section 8 provides that the United States shall improve its own property. Is there any valid objection to that action, particu-

larly when we find included in this section a provision for the reimbursement of this expenditure out of the revenues derived from this forest property? In what other legislation for the development of the country, and surely no one can deny this is a proposition of national development, do we find a provision for the reimbursement of the Federal Treasury for the amounts proposed to be expended?

It was only a day or two ago that this body provided hundreds of thousands of dollars for the development of roads in Alaska with no provision or suggestion of provision for reimbursement. Speaking for myself, I see much greater merit in a proposition which looks to the development of the States in the West which hold these great forest reserves than in one looking solely to the development of Alaska. [Applause.] This proposition commands my unreserved support on its merits. It is a project of real conservation. In this connection I desire to call attention to the fact that every gentleman who has opposed this section, is a gentleman who by antecedent vote and speech has shown that he was opposed to the entire policy of Federal aid to road development. It is not that this proposition is particularly obnoxious and objectionable, but that these gentlemen now in opposition are fundamentally opposed to the plan for the Federal Government to aid in the development of the United States through the construction and maintenance of roads over which the mails and traffic of the entire country will be carried.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. I know that the gentleman from Virginia wants to be correct.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why, certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. He does not want to state that speeches made in opposition to this section of the report are all made by men who are opposed to the bill for good roads as it originally passed the House?

Mr. SAUNDERS. So far as I am aware—

Mr. MADDEN. I voted for the bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. So far as I am aware every speech that has been made this evening in opposition to section 8 has been made by some gentleman who was originally opposed to the road bill.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman must be mistaken, for I voted for the bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Did not the gentleman speak against the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I spoke for the bill and voted for it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. My recollection was that the gentleman's attitude toward the bill when it was under consideration, was one of antagonism to the bill, and his speeches were to that effect; but I do not recall how he voted. Of course I accept the gentleman's statement in that connection.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I find that I have promised seven minutes more than the time I have, and I want to ask unanimous consent to extend the time—

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, what is the request? [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. There is only one more speech on this side.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri have any request to make?

Mr. LENROOT. I stated to the gentleman I had two more speeches. Now, if the gentleman wants to hold me to it—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have only one on this side. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. LENROOT. Does the gentleman object to my having two short speeches?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. No; go ahead.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota. [Mr. ANDERSON.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the good-roads bill when it passed the House. I have always been for Federal aid for the construction of roads. I am for Federal aid now, but I am opposed to section 8 of this bill.

The question presented by section 8 is not the question of whether we will do something for the development of the national forests or for the development of roads in national forests, but a question of how much we will do. We are now appropriating \$400,000 a year for the construction of roads and trails in national forests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not yield in five minutes. In addition we are turning over to the States for expenditure in the counties in which the national forests are situated for schools and roads 25 per cent of the proceeds of the national forests and in addition 10 per cent more for roads alone.

Now, the statement has been made that the amounts which will be paid under this bill for the construction of roads in the national forests will be reimbursed out of the proceeds arising from the sales of timber in national forests. As a matter of fact, nothing of the kind will be the case. Instead of paying for these roads out of the proceeds of national forests, we must pay for them out of the money which we collect from the taxpayers' pockets. We are now paying for the maintenance of the national forests approximately \$5,000,000 per year, and we receive from the sales of timber in the national forests approximately \$2,500,000 a year, so that there is now in the operation of the national forests a deficit each year of \$2,500,000, out of which we are proposing to reimburse the Government for the additional million dollars that we propose to expend under this bill.

Of the \$2,500,000 which we receive from the proceeds of national forests, as I said before, we now spend approximately \$1,300,000 in the construction of roads and trails in these national forests, and we are now proposing to spend an additional one million, although the national forests are not now self-supporting, and we are unable to find out from the Forest Service when they will be self-supporting.

If, as a matter of fact, the Forest Service were self-supporting; if, as a matter of fact, we were getting more from the national forests than we were putting into them, then there would be some justification for this proposal to pay a million dollars more than we are now paying for the construction of roads and trails in those national forests. But the proposition to pay it out of a deficit is absurd and a pure humbug.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Does not the gentleman know that the Forester tells the committee that the reason, or the principal reason, why the receipts from the national forests are not larger is that the development is retarded by lack of roads?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not remember any such statement having been made to the committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It has been made year after year.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have not heard it made, and if it has been made, I doubt whether it is correct. The proposition suggested by the gentleman of building roads in national forests for the purpose of aiding logging operations is absurd, as it will be seen to be by anybody who knows anything about logging operations on a large scale. The purpose is not for the development of the national forests, but it is to build roads for the settlers in the national forests and settlers who have settled in areas adjacent to the national forests. It is a proposition to give the national-forest States a sum in addition to that to which they would be entitled if they were treated on the same basis as the other States are treated and in addition to the \$1,300,000 they are now getting.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has six minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, the course of this debate has taken a turn that was quite expected by me. Nearly every gentleman who has spoken on this subject at some time or other in his speech has warned the Members of the House that if they vote against section 8 there will probably be no good-roads legislation, which leaves the proposition a logrolling one—that you tickle me and I will tickle you, or else we can not get any legislation at the hands of Congress at this session.

Now, in the first place, Mr. Speaker, that is not so. This House can vote to express itself under this motion that section 8 should be stricken out, but the House will hereafter have opportunity to recede from the position that it may take to-day and adopt the provision of section 8 included in the Senate bill if later it shall be found necessary.

Mr. Speaker, another phase of this subject: My good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] in the speech that he made said that he took the position he did because he was afraid that unless legislation of this character was enacted the whole system of conservation would be broken down.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can say that I have been somewhat active in pressing conservation measures before this House during the years that have gone, and one of the reasons why I am opposed to section 8 is that if we are going to legislate in this manner conservation is in danger of being broken down. In time to come, if these conservation measures relating to the West shall be broken down, it will not be because of pressure against them from the West, but it will be because of the millions of

dollars that have been paid out of the United States Treasury, coming from the taxpayers as a whole, from which there is no direct return to them, but only to the people who inhabit the Western States.

That is the danger there is to the conservation movement to-day. On these forest reservations we are spending out of the United States Treasury two and one-half million dollars more than is received, and when section 8 becomes a law we will be expending \$3,500,000 out of the money of the taxpayers of all the United States for the benefit of the people of the Western States alone, and we must call a halt somewhere, so far at least as extravagant expenditures are concerned.

Now, in the opening speech that I made I said that I am not opposed to roads upon national forests. I am not. We do need them, but we do not need them in the manner proposed in this bill, where in all probability we will not get them. If we are going to build roads upon national forests—and we ought to—the Government ought to build the roads from beginning to end. They ought to be appropriated for in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and the Government ought to have the right to supervise and construct the roads from start to finish, which it will not have under this bill.

Now, it has been said a number of times by a number of speakers that I and my colleague [Mr. STAFFORD] voted against the original bill before this House, and therefore our arguments should not be given any great amount of weight. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that I voted against that bill, not because I am not in favor of the principle embodied in that bill or in this bill, because I am in favor of it. I did have an idea—there were not many of us, it is true—but I was one of a small number who had the idea that under the present condition of the Treasury, with a daily increasing deficit in the Treasury, there ought to be some halt upon expenditures by the Government during this time of stress and of trial.

Reference has been made to the Alaskan bill. I voted for the Alaskan bill. I want to say to this House that if the Alaskan bill had come up in this session as a new proposition, under the present condition of the Treasury, I should not have favored it. I should have voted to postpone the building of that railroad in Alaska until the Treasury of the United States was in better condition. True, I was in favor and am in favor of going on with that construction in Alaska, because unless we go on we will lose a very large percentage of the Government money already expended upon that railroad, and we should go on with the work for exactly the same reason that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors were justified in appropriating for continuing improvements upon harbors wherever to stop the improvement would mean a loss to the Government of the money already expended. But, Mr. Speaker, to launch out upon new propositions, however worthy they may be, and however desirable they might be when the Treasury was in a normal condition and we had normal times in the country, this is not the time, under the present circumstances, to launch into expenditures of hundreds of millions of dollars. [Applause.]

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this conference report precisely as it has been presented to this House. I intend to vote for it for the reason that I am in favor of Federal aid in the building of roads and, further, because I am in favor of the conservation of the natural resources of this country through a proper and sane development of them.

This bill as reported involves both propositions—aid in the construction of roads in order that the farmers of this country may more cheaply transport their products to the market and that they may be more cheaply bought by those who consume them; and, then, I am in favor of it because I see in it a great forward step in the matter of the conservation of the natural resources of this country.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] alludes sneeringly to the 17 forested States of the West as "17 little Western States." The gentleman from Massachusetts does not realize that the public forest domain of this country, composing 137,000,000 acres, is twice as large as all the New England States put together, Massachusetts included. [Applause.]

The truth of the matter is that the distinguished, active, and energetic gentleman from Massachusetts has been the one fly in the ointment of good-road legislation at this session of Congress. [Applause.] It is true, Mr. Speaker, that he has been a rather small fly, but nevertheless a fly. [Applause and laughter.]

I have been greatly surprised at the attitude of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who has posed—and I think properly posed—for many years as the

chief champion of conservation legislation in this country. The gentleman is still a conservationist. I am sure of that; but the gentleman is overlooking the fact that in this section 8 of this conference report is to be found one of the longest steps in the direction of real conservation that this Congress has ever taken. [Applause.] The gentleman's principles have not changed on this conservation proposition. It is that his judgment has gone wrong. I am a conservationist. I have stood here for 14 years—battling with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in many instances—to prevent private corporations and big business either from bottling up the natural resources of this country or entirely gobbling them in their own interests. I stand here now opposed to exploitation of the property that belongs to all the people of the country by and for a few great private concerns. I am not such a conservationist as to fail to see the absolute necessity and the wisdom of developing to their full capacity and service the natural resources of the country. Here we have an immense domain of forested area. It belongs to me in South Carolina, 3,000 miles away, as much as it does to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], who sits next to me and is a part of that domain. I am interested in the development of that property. I want to see it bring into the Treasury a fair return. I think I have sense enough to know that a great forest with hundreds of millions of acres of standing timber in it will never be of any use to the people of this country until we have some means of getting into it and developing it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. Those in favor of keeping section 8 in this bill will vote "aye," those opposed "no."

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LENROOT. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 180, noes 53.

The SPEAKER. Section 8 stays in the bill, and the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have the conference report and statement been read?

The SPEAKER. They have not. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement.

During the reading of the report the following occurred:

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be dispensed with and that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The statement was read.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 856).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to H. R. 7617, entitled "An act to provide that in order to promote agriculture, afford better facilities for rural transportation and marketing farm products, and encourage the development of a general system of improved highways, the Secretary of Agriculture, on behalf of the United States, shall in certain cases aid the States in the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads which may be used in the transportation of interstate commerce, military supplies, or postal matter," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the amendment of the Senate insert the following:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the States, through their respective State highway depart-

ments, in the construction of rural post roads; but no money apportioned under this act to any State shall be expended therein until its legislature shall have assented to the provisions of this act, except that, until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature held after the passage of this act, the assent of the governor of the State shall be sufficient. The Secretary of Agriculture and the State highway department of each State shall agree upon the roads to be constructed therein and the character and method of construction: *Provided*, That all roads constructed under the provisions of this act shall be free from tolls of all kinds.

"Sec. 2. That for the purpose of this act the term 'rural post road' shall be construed to mean any public road over which the United States mails now are or may hereafter be transported, excluding every street and road in a place having a population, as shown by the latest available Federal census, of 2,500 or more, except that portion of any such street or road along which the houses average more than 200 feet apart; the term 'State highway department' shall be construed to include any department of another name, or commission, or official or officials, of a State empowered, under its laws, to exercise the functions ordinarily exercised by a State highway department; the term 'construction' shall be construed to include reconstruction and improvement of roads; 'properly maintained' as used herein shall be construed to mean the making of needed repairs and the preservation of a reasonable smooth surface considering the type of the road; but shall not be held to include extraordinary repairs, nor reconstruction; necessary bridges and culverts shall be deemed parts of the respective roads covered by the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the sum of \$5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the sum of \$10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of \$15,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of \$20,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$25,000,000. So much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available for expenditure in that State until the close of the succeeding fiscal year, except that amounts apportioned for any fiscal year to any State which has not a State highway department shall be available for expenditure in that State until the close of the third fiscal year succeeding the close of the fiscal year for which such apportionment was made. Any amount apportioned under the provisions of this act unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of this section shall be reapportioned, within 60 days thereafter, to all the States in the same manner and on the same basis, and certified to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the State highway departments and to the governors of States having no State highway departments in the same way as if it were being apportioned under this act for the first time: *Provided*, That in States where the constitution prohibits the State from engaging in any work of internal improvements, then the amount of the appropriation under this act apportioned to any such State shall be turned over to the highway department of the State or to the governor of said State to be expended under the provisions of this act and under the rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture, when any number of counties in any such State shall appropriate or provide the proportion or share needed to be raised in order to entitle such State to its part of the appropriation apportioned under this act.

"Sec. 4. That so much, not to exceed 3 per cent, of the appropriation for any fiscal year made by or under this act as the Secretary of Agriculture may estimate to be necessary for administering the provisions of this act shall be deducted for that purpose, available until expended. Within 60 days after the close of each fiscal year the Secretary of Agriculture 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 State highway departments, and to the governors of States having no State highway departments, in the same way as other amounts authorized by this act to be apportioned among all the States for such current fiscal year. The Secretary of Agriculture, after making the deduction authorized by this section, shall apportion the remainder of the appropriation for each fiscal year among the several States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the population

of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census; one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery routes and star routes in all the States, at the close of the next preceding fiscal year, as shown by the certificate of the Postmaster General, which he is directed to make and furnish annually to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Sec. 5. That within 60 days after the approval of this act the Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and to each State highway department and to the governor of each State having no State highway department the sum which he has estimated to be deducted for administering the provisions of this act and the sum which he has apportioned to each State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and on or before January 20 next preceding the commencement of each succeeding fiscal year shall make like certificates for such fiscal year.

"Sec. 6. That any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this act shall, by its State highway department, submit to the Secretary of Agriculture project statements setting forth proposed construction of any rural post road or roads therein. If the Secretary of Agriculture approve a project, the State highway department shall furnish to him such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates therefor as he may require: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve only such projects as may be substantial in character and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such improvements. Items included for engineering, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies shall not exceed 10 per cent of the total estimated cost of the work. If the Secretary of Agriculture approve the plans, specifications, and estimates, he shall notify the State highway department and immediately certify the fact to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon set aside the share of the United States payable under this act on account of such project, which shall not exceed 50 per cent of the total estimated cost thereof. No payment of any money apportioned under this act shall be made on any project until such statement of the project, and the plans, specifications, and estimates therefor, shall have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"When the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that any project so approved by him has been constructed in compliance with said plans and specifications he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State the amount set aside for said project: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, from time to time make payments on said construction as the same progresses, but these payments including previous payments, if any, shall not be more than the United States's pro rata part of the value of the labor and materials which have been actually put into said construction in conformity to said plans and specifications; nor shall any such payment be in excess of \$10,000 per mile, exclusive of the cost of bridges of more than 20 feet clear span. The construction work and labor in each State shall be done in accordance with its laws, and under the direct supervision of the State highway department, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and in accordance with the rules and regulations made pursuant to this act.

"The Secretary of Agriculture and the State highway department of each State may jointly determine at what times, and in what amounts, payments, as work progresses, shall be made under this act. Such payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury, on warrants drawn by the Secretary of Agriculture, to such official, or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State highway department and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds of the State or county.

"Sec. 7. To maintain the roads constructed under the provisions of this act shall be the duty of the States, or their civil subdivisions, according to the laws of the several States. If at any time the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that any road in any State constructed under the provisions of this act is not being properly maintained he shall give notice of such fact to the highway department of such State and if within four months from the receipt of said notice said road has not been put in a proper condition of maintenance then the Secretary of Agriculture shall thereafter refuse to approve any project for road construction in said State, or the civil subdivision thereof, as the fact may be, whose duty it is to maintain said road until it has been put in a condition of proper maintenance.

"Sec. 8. That there is hereby appropriated and made available until expended, out of any moneys in the National Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and each fiscal year thereafter,

up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, in all \$10,000,000, to be available until expended under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, upon request from the proper officers of the State, Territory, or county for the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within or only partly within the national forests, when necessary for the use and development of resources upon which communities within and adjacent to the national forests are dependent: *Provided,* That the State, Territory, or county shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture for the survey, construction, and maintenance of such roads or trails upon a basis equitable to both the State, Territory, or county, and the United States: *And provided also,* That the aggregate expenditures in any State, Territory, or county shall not exceed 10 per cent of the value, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, of the timber and forage resources which are or will be available for income upon the national forest lands within the respective county or counties wherein the roads or trails will be constructed; and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the amounts expended hereunder.

"That immediately upon the execution of any cooperative agreement hereunder the Secretary of Agriculture shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount to be expended by the United States within or adjacent to any national forest thereunder, and beginning with the next fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall apply from any and all revenues from such forest 10 per cent thereof to reimburse the United States for expenditures made under such agreement until the whole amount advanced under such agreement shall have been returned from the receipts from such national forest.

"Sec. 9. That out of the appropriations made by or under this act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to employ such assistants, clerks, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, to be taken from the eligible lists of the Civil Service Commission, to rent buildings outside of the city of Washington, to purchase such supplies, material, equipment, office fixtures, and apparatus, and to incur such travel and other expense as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 10. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 11. That this act shall be in force from the date of its passage.

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes.'

And the Senate agree to the same.

D. W. SHACKLEFORD,

E. W. SAUNDERS,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,

CLAUDE A. SWANSON,

CHAS. E. TOWNSEND,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House make the following written statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the conference committee submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The title to the bill has been amended as follows: "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes."

The following changes in the amendment of the Senate were made by the committee on conference:

Section 1: The following language stricken out: "Nor shall any of the money appropriated under this act be used for constructing extensions of, or mere branch roads out from, toll roads."

Section 2: The following language stricken out: "Not constructed under this act."

Section 2: And also the following language was substituted: "'Properly maintained' as used herein shall be construed to mean the making of needed repairs and the preservation of a reasonably smooth surface considering the type of the road; but shall not be held to include extraordinary repairs nor reconstruction."

Section 4: Three per cent was substituted for 5 per cent.

Section 6: The language substituted in this section was for the purpose of enabling States to receive the benefit of this act by building roads other than by contract.

Section 7: The language of this section was stricken out and the following inserted:

"Sec. 7. To maintain the roads constructed under the provisions of this act shall be the duty of the States, or their civil subdivisions, according to the laws of the several States. If at any time the Secretary of Agriculture shall find that any road in any State constructed under the provisions of this act is not being properly maintained he shall give notice of such fact to the highway department of such State and if within four months from the receipt of said notice said road has not been put in a proper condition of maintenance then the Secretary of Agriculture shall thereafter refuse to approve any project for road construction in said State, or the civil subdivision thereof, as the fact may be, whose duty it is to maintain said road, until it has been put in a condition of proper maintenance."

D. W. SHACKLEFORD,

E. W. SAUNDERS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. RUBEN) there were 181 yeas and 53 noes.

So the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SHACKLEFORD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

DRAFT OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, inadvertently, a little while ago, when the conference report was up on House joint resolution 242, the conference report was not agreed to. It is the joint resolution to authorize the President to draft members of the National Guard.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) to authorize the President to draft members of the National Guard and of the Organized Militia of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and members of the National Guard and Militia Reserves into the military service of the United States under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read the conference report as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 867).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) to authorize the President to draft members of the National Guard and of the Organized Militia of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and members of the National Guard and Militia Reserves into the military service of the United States under certain conditions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have been unable to agree.

JAMES HAY,

S. H. DENT, Jr.,

D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the House.

GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,

G. M. HITCHCOCK,

F. E. WARREN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House made every effort to come to an agreement with the managers on the part of the Senate, but were unable to do so.

JAMES HAY,

S. H. DENT, Jr.,

D. R. ANTHONY, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, since this conference report was agreed to and the conferees appointed by both Houses another conference has been had, and I now present the conference report and ask that it be agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 882).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 242) to authorize the President to draft

members of the National Guard and of the Organized Militia of the several States, Territories and the District of Columbia, and members of the National Guard and Militia Reserves into the military service of the United States under certain conditions, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4 and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter inserted by said amendment and change the section numbers in the bill as follows:

On page 2, line 23, strike out "3" and insert "2."

On page 3, line 3, strike out "4" and insert "3."

On page 3, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "4."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment strike out the word "drafted," and after the word "forces" insert the following: "drafted for this emergency"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES HAY,

S. H. DENT, Jr.,

Managers on the part of the House.

GEO. E. CHAMBERLAIN,

LUKE LEA,

F. E. WARREN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire which House had the papers, and whether any action has been taken on the conference report by the Senate.

Mr. HAY. On the first conference report, which was a report to which we could not agree, the Senate acted and asked for a further conference. I asked that that request be granted and that the House further insist on its amendments. When I did that I neglected to ask that the report be agreed to, but the House appointed the conferees.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman at any time up to the present asked that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate?

Mr. HAY. I have, and the conferees were appointed. The meaning of the conference report is this: The first amendment of the Senate was to strike out the declaration of the House that an emergency existed. The Senate receded on that. The second amendment of the Senate was to strike out the language providing that the provisions of section 111 of the defense act of 1916 should be applied in this emergency. The Senate receded on that amendment. The next amendment of the Senate was to strike out section 2, which provided an appropriation for dependent families, and the Senate inserted in place thereof a provision that members of the National Guard who had families dependent upon them should be discharged on their own application. The action of the conferees strikes out both of these provisions, both House provision and Senate provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. And leaves it as if no action had ever been taken.

Mr. CANNON. Either by the House or the Senate.

Mr. HAY. Yes. Amendment 5 is a transposition of words, and amendment 6 strikes out the word "article" and inserts the word "resolution." I desire to say to the House that so far as I was concerned, I would have insisted upon the provision of the House providing for the dependent families if there had been any way by which we could have brought the Senate to agree with us. I am informed by the Secretary of War that this resolution is absolutely necessary in order that the mobilization of these forces shall proceed and to have insisted further would have been to defeat the resolution. But I will to-morrow introduce a separate bill for the dependent families and ask the Speaker to recognize me on Monday under suspension of the rules. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman give me two minutes?

Mr. HAY. I will yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. BENNET. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNET. Is it the intention of the gentleman to take up the conference report at once without being printed in the Record.