

in time of peace and nitrates for the Government in time of war.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HEFLIN. I do.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to inquire if the Senator can not complete his speech to-night. We are very anxious to reach a vote on the pending joint resolution as soon as we can, and, if the Senator could proceed for a little while and finish his speech to-night, I should like to have him to do so. There are other Senators ready to speak in the morning.

Mr. HEFLIN. On this measure?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, I am about through.

Mr. CURTIS. Then can not the Senator finish to-night if he proceeds?

Mr. HEFLIN. I have about finished for the present. I may want to say something in reply to other Senators, but I think I have about covered the ground.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield the floor, I will move an executive session.

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, March 8, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 7 (legislative day of March 6), 1928

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

George D. Hubbard, of Seattle, Wash., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash., in place of Millard T. Hartson, deceased.

Carey D. Ferguson, of Detroit, Mich., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 7 (legislative day of March 6), 1928

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

David E. Kaufman to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Bolivia.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Joseph Fritsch, jr., to be United States marshal, western district of New York.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Peter Garrick, Camino.
Lew E. Wickes, Castella.
Cassius C. Olmsted, San Rafael.
Walter M. Brown, Turlock.
Jennie E. Kirk, Waterford.

FLORIDA

Mary Joyner, Bagdad.

MAINE

Carl W. Mitchell, Union.

NEBRASKA

Edwin P. Clements, jr., Ord.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ole H. Opland, Mott.

OREGON

David S. Young, Dufur.
Don Ellis, Garibaldi.
Fred C. Holznagel, Hillsboro.
Thomas G. Hawley, Multnomah.

PENNSYLVANIA

Christian Jansen, Essington.
Michael A. Grubb, Liverpool.

PORTO RICO

Nicholas O. Lebron, Albonito.
Jose E. Guenard, Mayaguez.
Roque Rodriguez, Ponce.
Juan V. Hernandez, San Sebastian.
L. Castro Gelpi, Vieques.

TEXAS

Louise Sackett, Bullard.
Walter E. Hall, Lufkin.
Willie M. Prouty, Wallis.
Fannie Dawson, Wilson.

UTAH

Agnes Turnbull, Scofield.

WEST VIRGINIA

Nina E. Welch, Camden on Gauley.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, March 7, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth! who hast set Thy glory above the heavens. When I consider the heavens, the work of Thy fingers; the moon and the stars, which Thou hast ordained; what is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou visitest him? For Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet. O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 4702) entitled "An act to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Benjamin S. McHenry," in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1498) entitled "An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay, and to fix the location of said bridge," and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. JONES, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. FLETCHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10286) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 437. An act authorizing the Maysville Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky.; and

H. R. 472. An act authorizing Dwight P. Robinson & Co. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property, located in Hernando County, Fla., known as the Brooksville Plant Introduction Garden, no longer required for plant introduction;

S. 150. An act for the relief of former officers of the United States Naval Reserve Force and the United States Marine Corps Reserve who were released from active duty and disenrolled at places other than their homes or places of enrollment;

S. 624. An act for the relief of the Van Dorn Iron Works Co.;

S. 656. An act to amend section 15a of the interstate commerce act, as amended;

S. 766. An act to fix the compensation of registers of local land offices, and for other purposes;

S. 1369. An act to authorize and direct the survey, construction, and maintenance of a memorial highway to connect Mount Vernon, in the State of Virginia, with the Arlington Memorial Bridge across the Potomac River at Washington;

S. 1678. An act for the relief of the estate of George B. Spearin, deceased;

S. 1823. An act to amend section 2 of the act approved June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. L. 470), entitled "An act to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes";

S. 1955. An act for the relief of Lieut. Charles Thomas Wooten, United States Navy;

S. 2126. An act to provide for compensation for Ona Harrington for injuries received in an airplane accident;

S. 2410. An act to amend section 1440 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 2442. An act for the relief of Lieut. Henry C. Weber, Medical Corps, United States Navy;

S. 2456. An act to establish game sanctuaries in the national forests;

S. 2660. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia," approved December 13, 1924, and for other purposes;

S. 2788. An act for the relief of Charlie McDonald;

S. 2855. An act for the relief of the estates of John Frazer, deceased, Zephaniah Kingsley, deceased, John Bunch, deceased, Jehu Underwood, deceased, and Stephen Vansandt, deceased;

S. 2966. An act for the relief of Oliver C. Sell;

S. 3194. An act to establish the Bear River migratory-bird refuge; and

S. 3198. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1915, granting double pension for disability from aviation duty, Navy or Marine Corps, by inserting the word "Army," so as to read: "Army, Navy, and Marine Corps."

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred to the appropriate committees, as follows:

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution authorizing the selection of a site and the erection of a memorial monument to the pioneers of the Pacific Northwest in Washington City, District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 1218. An act for the relief of Lincoln County, Oreg.; to the Committee on War Claims.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting to be sworn in my colleague WILLIAM P. COLE, duly elected from the second congressional district of Maryland.

Mr. COLE of Maryland appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules for printing in the RECORD.

House Resolution 134

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11526, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed six hours, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the bill, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall arise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RADIO VESTED RIGHTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a legal brief on the subject of vested rights in radio.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if anyone has used the ether for a period of time, he has a vested right to continue that use, subject to regulation by the United States Government.

A study of the term "regulation" raises the question: Does the power to regulate include the power to prohibit? It is my opinion that it does not.

However, assuming that my opinion is incorrect and that the power to regulate does include the power to prohibit, my opin-

ion, then, is that when the power to prohibit is enforced, just compensation must be given.

Congress for the first time assumed control of radio communication under its power to regulate interstate commerce by the act of 1912. (37 Stat. L. 302.)

Section 1 of this act required the obtaining of a Federal license before engaging in radio communication. The act of 1912 proved inadequate and unsatisfactory, as the following cases will show:

Under the law of 1912, the duty imposed upon the Secretary of Commerce in issuing licenses to operate radio stations was a purely ministerial one—the only discretion reposed in him was in selecting a wave length within the limitation prescribed in the act, which in his judgment would result in the least possible interference. (*Hoover v. Inter-city Radio Co.*, 286 Fed. 1003.)

In response to a letter from the Secretary of Commerce asking for a definition of his powers and duties under the act of 1912, the Attorney General of the United States, on July 8, 1926, replied that the act of 1912 did not confer authority upon the Secretary of Commerce to refuse applications for licenses, assign wave lengths, or limit power or time of operation. (35 *Opp. Atty. Gen.* 126.)

The new legislation to supply the defects of the 1912 law was approved on February 23, 1927, and is known as the radio act of 1927. (Public, 632, 69th Cong.)

As was said at the beginning, Congress assumed control of radio communication under its power to regulate interstate commerce.

Quoting from *Opinions of Attorney General*, volume 35, page 128, we have the following:

There is no doubt whatever that radio communication is a proper subject for Federal regulation under the commerce clause of the Constitution. (*Pensacola Telegraph Co. v. Western Union*, 98 U. S. 1, 9; 24 *Opp.* 100.)

And it may be noticed in passing that even purely intrastate transmission of radio waves may fall within the scope of Federal power when it disturbs the air in such a manner as to interfere with interstate communication. (*Minnesota rate cases*, 230 U. S. 352.)

A very recent case holding that radio broadcasting is interstate commerce is that of *Whitehurst v. Grimes*, reported in *Twenty-first Federal* (second series), 787.

Section 1 of the act of 1927 made operation of a station unlawful without the obtaining of a new license, and this even though the station was operating under license granted under the 1912 act. Under the 1912 act licenses were indeterminate as to time and revocable for cause. The new act did not declare a cause in ending them. It merely made further operation under them unlawful.

Section 11 of the act of 1927 reads in part:

If upon examination of any application for a station or for the renewal or modification of a station license the licensing authority shall determine the public interest, convenience, or necessity would be served by the granting thereof, it shall authorize the issuance, renewal, or modification thereof in accordance with such finding.

The commission thus grants or denies the application upon its determination as to whether or not public convenience, interest, or necessity will be served by the operation of the station.

The significance of these words when applied to the radio situation is rather vague. Not more so, however, I think, than when used in State statutes and applied to public utilities. They comprehend public welfare. (286 Ill. 582.)

There is one difference, however, between the radio act and State public utility laws: The radio act is directed in part against persons already engaged in commerce while the public utility laws of the States are mainly applied against persons preparing to enter commerce.

Taken by itself, requiring a license to engage in commerce is within the constitutional powers to regulate commerce. (*Colorado v. United States* (271 U. S. 153).)

Should the commission, however, refuse to issue a license to a station existing before the law, the question of vested rights of such owner arise.

It is the opinion of the writer that if anyone has used the ether for a period of time, he has a vested right to continue that use, subject to regulation by the United States Government.

This opinion is based upon a fair construction of the language of section 5 of the act of 1927, as deduced from a reading of that section together with a study of the history of this provision.

Section 5 provides that—

No station license shall be granted by the commission or by the Secretary of Commerce until the applicant therefor shall have signed a waiver of any claim to the use of any particular frequency or wave

length or of the ether as against the regulatory power of the United States, because of the previous use of the same, whether by license or otherwise.

The history of this provision shows that on July 3, 1926, Congress passed Joint Resolution 125, which became law on December 8, 1926. This resolution provided that no license or renewal should be granted—

unless the applicant therefor shall execute in writing a waiver of any right or of any claim to any right, as against the United States, to any wave length or to the use of the ether in radio transmission because of previous license to use the same or because of the use thereof.

When the radio act of 1927 was enacted this resolution was specifically repealed by section 39 of the radio act, and the new language of section 5, quoted above, was substituted.

It will be noted that in the language of the joint resolution enforced prior to the radio act the applicant for a license had to sign a waiver of any right or claim to any right as against the United States, while in the new radio act now in force the waiver is as to any claim as against the regulatory power of the United States.

Under the language of the resolution it seems to the writer that the licensee would become a mere tenant at will of the Government, and that under the resolution the Government could at any time order him to desist; and if so, he would have no legal right to continue and would have no remedy other than his constitutional right to just compensation.

The language of the new radio act, however, modifies the provision of the resolution and merely says that the applicant for license must sign a waiver of right as against the regulatory powers of the United States.

I deem the language as modified by the act of 1927 to mean that the licensee is merely subject to "regulation" by the Government.

If a radio station has been established under the law of 1912, and its license has not been revoked "for cause" as provided for in that act, it would seem to the writer that he would have a vested right to continue to use the ether under the new 1927 act, subject only to the regulatory power of the United States.

I am of the opinion that Congress under section 5 can subject the station owners to any reasonable regulations deemed necessary for the public welfare, but that it can not arbitrarily abrogate all privileges.

The radio act of 1927 is intended to be a regulatory and not a prohibitory measure.

The title of the radio act reads:

An act for the regulation of radiocommunications, and for other purposes.

The constitutional authority vested in Congress under the commerce clause is to regulate interstate and foreign commerce (of which radio is a part), not to prohibit it.

The right of Congress to prohibit commerce absolutely as a phase of regulation has been before the Supreme Court in a number of cases. The court stated in several decisions that the power to regulate includes the power to prohibit entirely. In accordance with this principle, it upheld acts of Congress prohibiting the transportation of lottery tickets (the Lottery case, 188 U. S. 321) and the food and drugs act prohibiting the transportation of impure foods and drugs (Hiplite Egg Co. v. U. S., 220 U. S. 45).

It was this absolute power of prohibition which was relied upon to support the child labor law prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce of certain classes of drugs manufactured by child labor.

But in its opinion declaring the child labor law unconstitutional (Hammer v. Dagenhart, 247 U. S. 251 and 271) the court differentiated the cases above referred to. The contention was made that they established the doctrine that the power to regulate includes the authority to prohibit the movement of ordinary commodities. The court, however, said that the contrary was the fact, since these cases rested upon the character of the particular subjects dealt with; that in each of them the use of interstate transportation was necessary to the accomplishment of harmful results; and that proper regulation of interstate commerce could be brought about only by prohibiting the use of its facility to effect the evil intended. The court proceeded to say that neither was such a purpose disclosed by the act under consideration, nor was the character of the article transported such as to make prohibition necessary.

There was a very strong dissent, based mainly upon argument that the power to regulate is absolute, the power to prohibit necessarily included within it, and that it is for Congress alone to determine the propriety of its exercise.

This decision is not a denial of the complete power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce. It is a holding that in the exercise of that power Congress must confine itself to regulation, and may not, under the cloak of regulation, grasp powers not delegated.

The above quotation is quoted from pages 72 and 73 of Mr. Stephen Davis's book on the Law of Radio Communication, 1927. Mr. Davis is Solicitor of the Department of Commerce.

Assuming, however, that the power to regulate does include the power to prohibit, the station owner can still stand upon his constitutional rights and maintain that the commission in revoking his license is taking private property without just compensation, in violation of the fifth amendment to the Federal Constitution.

If a license for an existing station is refused, the commission would not take the property of the owner, in the sense of an actual physical seizure. It would still remain in the possession of its owner, even though the value of the property would be practically destroyed—it might be thus contended that the constitutional provision against taking private property without due process has been avoided.

The only value of property lies in the use that may be made of it. It may be said generally that the forbidding of an individual to use his property is equivalent to a taking of it, and that deprivation of use violates the constitutional guaranty to the same extent as would an actual physical seizure or destruction of the property itself. The Supreme Court of the United States has expressed itself on the general subject as follows:

It would be a very curious and unsatisfactory result if in construing a provision of constitutional law, always understood to have been adopted for protection and security to the rights of individuals as against the Government, and which has received the commendation of jurists, statesmen, and commentators as placing the just principles of the common law on that subject beyond the power of ordinary legislation to change or control them, it shall be held that if the Government refrains from the absolute conversion of real property to the use of the public, it can destroy its value entirely, can inflict irreparable and permanent injury to any extent, can, in effect, subject it to total destruction without making any compensation, because in the narrow sense of that word, it is not taken for the public use. Such a construction would pervert the constitutional provision into a restriction upon the rights of the citizens, as these rights stood at the common law, instead of the Government, and make it an authority for invasion of private right under the pretext of the public good, which had no warrant in the laws or practices of our ancestors. (Pumpelli v. Green Bay Co., 13 Wall. 166, 177. See also Chicago Board of Trade v. Olsen, 262 U. S. 1; Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co., 47 Sup. Ct. 115; Cornell v. Moore, 267 Fed. 456.)

The above quotation is quoted from page 68 of Mr. Stephen Davis's book on the law of radio communication, 1927.

The Supreme Court of the United States has declared the rule as to the necessity for compensation in the following language:

"If in the execution of any power, no matter what it is, the Government, Federal or State, finds it necessary to take private property for public use, it must obey the constitutional injunction to make or secure just compensation to the owner. (Cherokee Nation v. Southern Kansas Ry., 135 U. S. 641, 659; Sweet v. Rechel, 159 U. S. 380, 399, 402; Monongahela Navigation Co. v. United States, 148 U. S. 312, 336; United States v. Lynch, 188 U. S. 445) * * * Upon the general subject there is no real conflict among the adjudged cases. Whatever conflict there is arises upon the question whether there has been or will be in the particular case, within the true meaning of the Constitution, a taking of private property for public use. If the injury complained of is only incidental to the legitimate exercise of governmental powers for the public good, then there is no taking of property for public use, and a right to compensation, on account of such injury, does not attach under the Constitution." (Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Ry. Co. v. Drainage Commissioners, 200 U. S. 561, 593.)

The American Bar Association made an interim report on radio legislation in December, 1926. It discussed the bills then pending in Congress with particular reference to the constitutionality of refusing licenses to existing stations without affording compensation. It urged the inclusion of provisions which would compensate the owners of stations so closed, the money necessary to be derived from a tax on those licensed. In support of that suggestion the committee said:

* * * To close stations in which large sums of money have already been invested is obviously a drastic provision. We do not believe that the courts would uphold as constitutional legislation which permitted such closing, either directly or indirectly by way of declining to issue new licenses, unless just compensation were paid * * *. The committee believes its suggestion is sound in law for the following reasons:

"a. The 1912 statute permitted everyone to obtain a license. As we have stated before, the secretary had no discretionary power and he could be mandated to compel the issuance of the license. The licenses were not for any stated term and could be revoked only for frauds. The companies with established business under such a situa-

tion had a right to believe that their investments could not be destroyed by the mere repeal of the 1912 law * * *."

"c. The obligation of the Federal Government to pay just compensation for closing an existing radio station was recognized in the joint resolution of July 16, 1918, which permitted the President to take over radio stations during the time of war, but only upon payment of just compensation. It is to be noted that even when this power was repealed, on July 11, 1919, the compensation provisions were specifically continued.

"d. The committee sees no newer constitutional authority for depriving the citizens of property rights under the pending legislation than was included under the 1912 legislation."

The above quotations are taken from pages 66, 70, and 74 of Mr. Stephen Davis's book on the Law of Radio Communication, 1927.

I therefore urge the Members of the House to give consideration to vested rights in radio, and that if such vested rights are to be taken away from station owners just compensation must be given, otherwise the statute is void, as violative of the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the committees. When the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was reached—

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Union Calendar the bill H. R. 11026.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar and the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAWLEY in the chair.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11026, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title to the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11026) to provide for the coordination of the public-health activities of the Government, and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be notified when I have used 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the committee in its report on this bill has aimed to discuss every feature of it, and for that reason I shall not attempt at this time to go into it in detail. The report discusses and gives the reason for every paragraph of the bill. In fact the mere reading of almost every paragraph gives the reason for it. The legislation was initiated in the Sixty-ninth Congress. The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] introduced the original bill in the last Congress. It was referred to the department and recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, and a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was appointed late in the session of the last Congress to consider the legislation. That subcommittee held hearings on the bill in February of last year, but the legislation was referred to the subcommittee too late to take any further action before the adjournment of the last Congress other than to hold hearings. The gentleman from New York reintroduced the bill in this Congress and appointed the same subcommittee to consider it, and that subcommittee in order to give everyone who desired it an opportunity to be heard, held additional hearings in this Congress.

The bill was redrafted in certain particulars and presented to the full committee, and the full committee has recommended the legislation as it appears before you in the draft of H. R. 11026.

There were two sections in the original bill which the committee struck out entirely, and it changed the wording in certain minor particulars of other sections of the bill. The first section of the original bill provided that the President might by Executive order transfer to the Public Health Service any agency in the other departments engaged in public-health activities.

The second section of the original bill authorized the President to detail any of the personnel of the Public Health Service to other departments that were carrying on public-health work as an incident to the work of their department to supervise or cooperate in such work.

The committee considered it advisable to eliminate both of those sections of the original bill.

A strong argument can be advanced to the effect that such delegation of power to the President as these two sections propose would be an unwarranted and unconstitutional delegation of legislative power. Practically all the activities of the Government are created by statutory enactment, and some people doubt whether these statutory provisions can be abrogated or repealed by Executive order.

The committee, in striking out those provisions, was also influenced by this further consideration: The more one considers the administrative branches of the Government the more he is convinced that no such order in fact would ever be made by the President unless approved and consented to by the heads of the different departments affected.

As a practical proposition, it is believed that the President would not make such an order until the heads of the different departments had joined in a request for it. That being so, the committee believes that the provision in the bill as reported by the committee authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to detail officers of the Public Health Service to any department carrying on public-health activities upon the request of the head of that department, will be for all practical purposes as beneficial and effective as the broader provisions in the original bill. There are some departments of the Government that carry on important public-health activities in connection with their major purpose, and others that have public-health activities of less importance. Some student of the Government says that there are altogether 40 different public-health activities of one kind or another carried on in different branches of the Government.

It seemed to the committee that it was desirable to give these different departments the benefit of the advice and experience of the more expert personnel of the Public Health Service if they desired it, and therefore the committee incorporated this permissive section in the bill as reported to the House.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. How does it affect the Child Welfare Division of the Department of Labor?

Mr. MAPES. It does not affect it at all unless the Secretary of Labor requests the Secretary of the Treasury to detail an officer from the Public Health Service to cooperate with the Child Welfare Bureau in its work.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. The bureau will remain under the Department of Labor?

Mr. MAPES. The bill does not attempt in any way to change the location of any bureau or activity.

The growth of the Public Health Service has been very interesting. It did not blossom forth full grown to its present proportions but had its origin in very simple beginnings. Its genesis goes back to 1798 with the passage of an act for the relief of disabled seamen, and it has grown from that simple provision of the law back in 1798 to its present proportions through the simple processes of evolution, taking on such work as was assigned to it by Congress from time to time. There has never been any broad, constructive, or all-embracing Public Health Service act. The work of the Public Health Service has been assigned to it from time to time by what might be termed piecemeal legislation as the necessities of the people and the requirements of the Government seemed to demand.

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

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Is it the purpose of this bill to make a sort of organic act for the Public Health Service, bringing together the different laws on the subject, or just what is the main object of the bill?

Mr. MAPES. It comes nearer being that than any other legislation that has ever been passed, although it does not attempt to codify the existing laws relating to the public health in detail. It attempts to coordinate the different public health activities, give the Public Health Service a little more concrete and definite statutory authority for some of its activities, and broaden others, and it also puts certain of the personnel of the Public Health Service on what is termed a commission basis so as to enable that personnel to make the Public Health Service more of a career service than is now possible.

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

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will this increase the cost of the Public Health Service, and, if so, how much?

Mr. MAPES. The bill will increase the cost of the service to a limited extent. It is estimated that the increase in cost will be \$17,185, although it is difficult to estimate it with exactness.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Per year?

Mr. MAPES. Per year.

Mr. OLDFIELD. How many additional men are provided for?

Mr. MAPES. It will not require any additional men. The estimated increase in the expense, it is expected, will be more than offset by the increased efficiency and economies which can be brought about by the legislation. For example, in making these details of the personnel from the Public Health Service to the other departments carrying on Public Health activities, it will do away with the necessity for calling in outside experts at considerable expense.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does it have the unanimous indorsement of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee?

Mr. MAPES. I can not say that it has. One member of the committee voted against the legislation in the committee. It has the indorsement of the five members of the subcommittee who studied it in the last Congress and who studied it faithfully in this Congress.

Mr. JONES. Does it provide for cooperation with the State health agencies?

Mr. MAPES. The existing law provides for cooperation between the Public Health Service and the State health officers. The law now provides for an annual meeting of the public-health officials of the different States in Washington, and that meeting is presided over by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. The cooperation between the Federal Public Health Service and the State public-health officials is something that is working in very excellent shape. There is no lack of harmony between the Federal service and the State service.

Mr. JONES. It would not interfere with it in any way?

Mr. MAPES. This does not interfere with that in any way, and this bill is indorsed by the public-health officials of all of the States. They are very anxious to have it passed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I notice on page 4 of the bill it is provided that—

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall hereafter be entitled to the same pay and allowances as the Surgeon General of the Army.

What change does that make in the pay of the public-health officials?

Mr. MAPES. The pay of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service at present is the same as that of a brigadier general in the Army. This would raise his pay to that of a major general in the Army, the same as the Surgeon General of the Army and the Surgeon General of the Navy now receive.

It makes a difference in dollars and cents in the pay of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of \$2,200 per year. He now receives, including his base pay and allowances, \$7,500, and this would raise his pay and allowances to \$9,700 per year.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Are any other salaries increased by virtue of this bill? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. MAPES. There are no other salaries increased directly by the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will notify the gentleman that he has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. I will take a little more time.

In the transfer of the noncommissioned officers in the Public Health Service to a commission basis, such as the sanitary engineers, scientists, and so forth, there will necessarily be a little readjustment of the pay, because they may not now be receiving in all cases the pay corresponding to the different pay periods in the Army. For example, a man might now be receiving \$3,300 per year. That may not be an actual case, as a matter of fact, but it will serve as an illustration. A man may be receiving \$3,300 now per year. There may not be in the Army pay law any schedule that corresponds exactly to that amount. There may be a \$3,000 or a \$3,600 salary. So that in the adjustment of this man's pay he would receive either \$3,000 or \$3,600. In that way some of the officers may receive an increase, but no substantial increase.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I notice this seems to be pretty much on the same basis as the Medical Corps of the Army. Is that correct?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And that would give some of them an increase of pay, and some not so much?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am in favor of increasing the pay of the heads of this bureau in particular, with a corresponding increase also in the pay of the men. I think we ought to do it.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. I think the salary of the employees in this department ought all to be increased. But in what general way does it broaden the work of this bureau and give them an opportunity for actually going out and giving the people the benefit of this work? Does this in any way broaden the scope of their duties or broaden their power to render good service to the people?

Mr. MAPES. Yes. One of the purposes of the bill is to authorize the officers of the Public Health Service to go into institutions conducted under private endowment that do research work, and it gives the officers of the institutions the reciprocal right to come to the hygienic laboratory to do research work. The students of the subject think this is a very desirable and important provision of the bill.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. As I understand, the gentleman thinks that the passage of this bill will make this bureau much more valuable and useful to the people?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; very much more. The more one studies the work of the Public Health Service, the more it seems to me he is bound to respect what they are doing for the health and welfare of the people. That has been my own experience, at least, and I think the more one studies this legislation and studies what is to be accomplished by it, the more he will approve of it, and the more he will see the necessity for it. Take any one individual provision or paragraph in the bill alone, and it may not impress one as being of great importance; but taking it as a whole, it is considered by the public-health workers and health students in the country to be of very great importance.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. What to-day is the salary of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in dollars and cents?

Mr. MAPES. It is now \$7,500; and this bill raises it to \$9,700.

Now, as I said at the beginning, I am not going to attempt to go into a detailed explanation of the different provisions of the bill, because the committee report does that as well as I could do it, and I do not want to repeat what is in the report. I only want to take enough additional time to call attention to some of the indorsements of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Before the gentleman goes into that will he permit a question, for information?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I see in the report here that there are 129 dentists in the regular establishment of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What in the main are the assignments of those dentists? What do they do?

Mr. MAPES. They take care of the men in the Coast Guard Service and the seamen. They have a very limited number, it is claimed, for the work which they have to perform. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman much more in detail on that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understand it, they devote most of their time and attention to departmental service, not work on the outside, as, for example, the public-school system.

Mr. MAPES. No; nothing of that kind.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. What is the function of the nurses in the service?

Mr. MAPES. There are United States marine hospitals and other relief stations under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, amounting to over 150.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Different hospitals?

Mr. MAPES. Hospitals and relief stations. The nurses are employed in these different hospitals and stations and are employed or used in cases of epidemic and plague, such as there was in New Orleans. They are required in such cases.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Do I understand this reduces the pay of the Public Health nurses?

Mr. MAPES. To a limited extent. It puts them on the same basis as the nurses of the Army, and it has the hearty indorsement, as I understand it, of the nurses in the Public Health Service. They are put on a more permanent basis and the nurses in the Public Health Service feel that they would be more assured of a career service with the passage of this bill than they are now. The Surgeon General says that because of the lack of security as to a career service the turnover among

the employees in the nurse corps is greater than it would otherwise be.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will they be promoted in grades just like those in the Army Nurse Corps?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. And will have the same rights of retirement?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I note on the first page of the first section it provides that—

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to detail officers or employees of the Public Health Service to such department or independent establishment in order to cooperate in such work.

The same feature follows on page 2, section 2. Does he have the right to detail them to these places without their request?

Mr. MAPES. No. That was such a provision in the original bill, but the committee struck out that provision and authorized the detail only in case the head of the department to which they are to be detailed requests it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There is no such provision in this bill. He might detail some of the men to go over into my State for the purpose of cooperating or investigating without a request or he might detail them to some independent organization without a request.

Mr. MAPES. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not understand his question. I thought it related only to the Federal Government.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I am speaking about the Federal Government. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to detail officers or employees of the Public Health Service to such department or independent establishment in order to cooperate in such work. I want to ask the gentleman whether he does not think there ought to be an amendment inserted in the bill providing that that shall be done upon their request?

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman has overlooked the first line of the section:

That upon the request of the head of an executive department or an independent establishment—

That may be done.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Which is carrying on a public-health activity?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But does not that seem to be limited by the latter part of the clause?

Mr. MAPES. Oh, no.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. What is meant by "independent establishment"? Would that include the Red Cross or the Salvation Army?

Mr. MAPES. No; nothing except an independent establishment of the Government. An independent establishment has a well-defined meaning as applied to the Government service, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the United States Veterans' Bureau, and others of that nature that do not come under any Secretary of the Cabinet.

Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma. Then it has to be a Government activity?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; it has to be a Government activity. I just want to call attention to the fact before I conclude that this bill did not have its inception with the Public Health Service. It was, rather, conceived by the students and workers in public-health work. It is indorsed by practically every public-health organization; in fact, every public-health organization that I know of in the country has indorsed it, and it is indorsed by industrial concerns as well. One of the principal witnesses before the committee was Doctor Armstrong, of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., who participated in the meetings that agreed upon the principles of the legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Did you not find in the hearings that the work that is being carried on under the direction of Surgeon General Cumming is universally commended?

Mr. MAPES. Practically universally. There is here and there a person who objects to some particular regulation or specific activity of the department, but the committee did not think that any of the objections went to the real merits of the legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But as a rule I understand that the authorities in all of the States applaud the way in which the work is being carried on under the present organization.

Mr. MAPES. I think it is safe to say that without any exception the authorities in the States, with emphasis on the

word "authorities," approve of the legislation and of the activities of the service.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Is there any laboratory established where this national department can carry on research work?

Mr. MAPES. The Hygienic Laboratory is one of the leading research laboratories of the country.

Mr. HUDSON. And that is under the direction of this staff?

Mr. MAPES. It is under the direction of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I do not know whether the gentleman has discussed it or not, but is not all of the quarantine service under the Public Health Service?

Mr. MAPES. All of it.

Mr. DENISON. That is a very important and responsible service, of course.

Mr. MAPES. It is. I intended, I will say to my colleague, to explain a little more in detail the work of the Public Health Service, but I have been diverted by the questions that have been asked. It does this quarantine work; it is authorized to prevent the spread of contagious diseases between the States and foreign countries; it conducts research work; it goes out, at the request of the public-health officials of the different States, to investigate any particular epidemic or any particular disease that the State authorities have not been able to cope with. In short, it is given the broad authority by statute to investigate the diseases of man and the causes thereof, including the pollution of streams. Among its other work it issues a public-health bulletin every week. Until one makes a special study of the work of the service he does not realize the importance of it and the good it is doing.

Mr. DENISON. They do a good deal of splendid work in connection with municipal sanitation all over the country.

Mr. MAPES. All over the country; yes. It must be a matter of great gratification to the Public Health Service to get the indorsement and the approval it did get from the public-health officials of the States before the committee in the hearings which the committee held.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Officers of the Public Health Service are now detailed to foreign ports, are they not, in connection with immigration inspection work?

Mr. MAPES. Officers are detailed to foreign ports; they are detailed to consulates in foreign countries to examine prospective immigrants, and the service examined between nine hundred thousand and one million prospective immigrants in foreign countries in the year 1927.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the custom or the policy about transferring these officers so as not to keep any one group of medical inspectors in a particular foreign country too long?

Mr. MAPES. I can not answer the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is a matter of policy of the bureau that is not provided for here.

Mr. MAPES. We did not go into that. That is a matter of policy.

Doctor Armstrong, of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., who is in charge of the public-health work of that company, testified before the committee as to the inception of this legislation and the people who have indorsed it. He stated that such men as Doctor Welch, of Johns Hopkins University; Doctor Williams, of the National Tuberculosis Association; Doctor Crumrine, of the American Child Health Association; Doctor Park, of the New York City department of health; Doctor Farrand, the president of Cornell University; and representatives of similar groups of outside agencies, outside of Government circles, came to Mr. Fiske and Doctor Frankel, of the Metropolitan Co., and asked them to cooperate in the passing of legislation along the line that is presented in this bill.

Doctor Welch, State health officer of Alabama, states that—the bill represents the compromise opinion, crystallized into a bill, of the National Tuberculosis Association, the Red Cross, the New York Academy of Medicine, the International Health Board, the American Public Health Association, American Medical Association, and the Association of State Health Officers of the United States.

In fact, as I answered the question of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE], I do not know of any organized group. I do not know of any outstanding public-health worker, who is not in favor of this legislation and when I say that, to be sure I am not misunderstood, I want to say that all of the witnesses before the committee did not indorse the legislation, but

those witnesses who opposed it did not represent any organized public-health group, and they did not, the committee thought, go to the merits of the legislation, but rather complained because of some individual activity, some specific finding of the Public Health Service which in no way affected the general merits of the legislation, or the broad scope of the work of the Public Health Service. It is really surprising that there are so few people who are dissatisfied with the work of the service.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. LOWREY. I have not had an opportunity to read the report. What is the estimate on the question of cost or what is the situation when viewed from an economic standpoint?

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi I have gone into that already in response to a question from another Member, and I am sure the gentleman would not want me to go over it again.

Mr. ANDREW. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDREW. There are public-health activities in a good many of the divisions and bureaus of the different departments of the Government. Has any consideration been given to the possibility of amalgamating the work of such bureaus with the work of the Public Health Service?

Mr. MAPES. That question was given a good deal of consideration and a good deal of attention, I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have also discussed that question already; but, briefly, I will say the original Parker bill authorized the President upon Executive order to transfer any public-health activity in any other department of the Government to the Public Health Service upon his discretion, and it also authorized the detail from the Public Health Service of any of the personnel of the Public Health Service to any bureau conducting public-health activities in any of the departments.

Mr. ANDREW. Is that provision in the bill?

Mr. MAPES. The committee decided to eliminate both of those provisions of the original bill. Some witnesses considered them important and some did not. The committee felt that inasmuch as there was opposition to them in the House by a substantial number of the Members, it was not desirable to jeopardize the passage of the entire legislation by keeping those two provisions in the bill.

Mr. ANDREW. So there is no provision now to allow the President to reduce or amalgamate any other bureaus?

Mr. MAPES. As a practical proposition some of the members of the committee feel that the existing provision will accomplish to all intents and purposes the same thing as the original provisions. One who studies the operations of the Government will come to the conclusion, I think, that as a practical proposition no bureau is going to be transferred unless it is transferred upon the consent of the head of the department in which it is located. The heads of the departments affected have got to unite in a request to the President for the transfer before the President will ever issue the order; and the committee also felt that there is weight to be given to the argument which is made that these agencies in the different departments having been created and assigned to the departments by statutory authority can not be picked up bodily by an Executive order and put into another department from that to which they were assigned by statute.

Mr. ANDREW. If I understand the gentleman correctly there, there is no such provision in the bill as would allow the President to take, for example, the Children's Bureau and incorporate it in the Public Health Service?

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman's understanding is correct. [Applause.]

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including therein the report of the committee on the bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 11026:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11026) to provide for the coordination of the public-health activities of the Government, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that the bill be amended as follows:

Page 2, line 24, correct the spelling of the word "health."

Page 4, line 11, insert after the word "officers" a comma.

Page 4, line 16, insert after the word "Service" a comma.

And as thus amended that the bill pass.

The bill aims better to coordinate the public-health activities of the Government, especially of the Public Health Service; to give more specific statutory authority for certain activities of the Public Health Service and, to a limited extent, to broaden others; to improve its administrative procedure; to establish a nurse corps in the service; to

change the name, increase the personnel, and enlarge the functions of the Hygienic Laboratory Board and to authorize the establishment of new divisions in the Hygienic Laboratory; to increase the pay of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; and to place the dental and certain other scientific and technical personnel of the service upon the same permanent and commissioned basis as the medical officers in it now are.

Public-health work is carried on, and necessarily so, to a greater or less extent by a great many different branches of the Government as an incident to their major activities. It is often found desirable for the other departments, in establishing or reorganizing their health activities or in doing advanced research work, to have the assistance and advice of the Public Health Service. In certain cases the law now authorizes the detail of personnel from that service to other departments for such purposes, as, for example, to the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Fisheries, the Bureau of Immigration, the Consular Service, and in connection with the pure food and drug activities in the Department of Agriculture.

The first section of the bill would authorize such detail of personnel to any department or independent establishment of the Government carrying on public-health activities, upon the request of the head of such department or independent establishment. It would simply extend the policy already adopted by Congress in certain cases and followed in others without express authority of law. If enacted into law, it is believed that it would tend to bring about a better correlation of health activities of the Government and to produce economies. It seems the part of wisdom to give the other branches of the Government the opportunity, if desired, to take advantage of the superior knowledge and experience of the personnel of the Public Health Service.

Section 2 (a) would authorize the detail of public-health personnel to educational and research institutions for the purpose of making special studies of scientific problems relating to public health and for the dissemination of information relating to the same. The paragraph would also give the reciprocal right to public-health officials and scientists engaged in special studies outside of the Public Health Service to use the facilities of the Hygienic Laboratory. As scientific research is perhaps the most important public-health function of the Federal Government, the desirability of this provision seems apparent.

Section 2 (b) would authorize the establishment of new divisions in the Hygienic Laboratory. The act of 1902 reorganizing the Hygienic Laboratory established three divisions in it, namely, chemistry, zoology, and pharmacology, in addition to the division of bacteriology and pathology, the only division in the laboratory up to that time. No new divisions have been established since that date. There is need for additional divisions to permit of greater specialization in research. Problems arising since the passage of the act of 1902 require new divisions, such as industrial hygiene, sanitary engineering, physiology, and the like. As stated by one of the witnesses before the committee, "As knowledge grows, various branches of scientific study are developed." The service would, of course, be controlled and limited as to the number of divisions established by the appropriation, as it is in all other respects.

Section 3 provides that the administrative offices and bureau divisions in the District of Columbia shall be administered as a part of the departmental organization, and the scientific offices and research laboratories, including the Hygienic Laboratory, whether in the District of Columbia or not, as a part of the field service. That is the present practice, but there is fear that the Comptroller General may hold that the practice can not be continued under existing law. This section would make certain the continuance of the present practice and is deemed necessary to insure the most efficient administration by enabling the ready transfer of personnel between the central and field laboratories as occasion requires.

Sections 4 (a), (b), and (c) would put dentists, sanitary engineers, pharmacists engaged on comparable duties, and other scientific personnel on the same basis as to appointment, pay, promotion, disability privileges, etc., as medical officers. This is one of the major objects of the bill. Public-health work is, or should be, a career service. It has come to be quite as dependent upon these other professions for its success as upon the medical profession. For the good of the service and to encourage members of these other professions to engage in it, it is considered necessary that they should be put upon the same basis as the doctors. Surgeon General Cumming testified (p. 14 of the hearings):

"The greatest single administrative need of the Public Health Service is uniformity of method of appointment and status of this scientific personnel."

Other witnesses before the committee expressed the same thought. Such appears to be the general opinion of those familiar with the service.

The Public Health Service now has 224 regular medical officers in the regular corps. In addition, there are 24 sanitary engineers, 29 dentists, 150 physicians, and 23 scientists, all of whom are on full-time duty and available for general service. The sanitary engineers and other scientific and technical officers, other than the medical officers of the regular corps, as well as certain medical officers of the

reserve corps, are on civil-service status and are not commissioned, while the dental officers have temporary reserve commissions. Under the provisions of this section these other officers as well as the medical officers may be transferred to the regular corps after examination and with due regard to their present salaries.

Section 4 (c) would also increase the pay of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. It would give him the pay and allowances of a major general of the Army, the same as the Surgeon General of the Army receives, instead of that of a brigadier general which he now receives. In dollars and cents this would raise his total pay and allowances from \$7,500 to \$9,700 per year, or an increase of \$2,200 per year. The present Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Dr. Hugh S. Cumming, is an outstanding figure in public-health work. He has been in the service over 33 years and has an international reputation. Your committee believes that he should receive the same compensation as the Surgeon General of the Army. He has a responsibility not exceeded by any other bureau chief in the Government.

The provision for commissioning of a former Surgeon General is similar to existing laws relating to persons who have served as Commandant of the Coast Guard and Surgeon General of the Army and of the Navy.

Section 4 (a), paragraph 3, would authorize the appointment of specialists in scientific research, in case of special need, to grades higher than that of assistant surgeon.

The appointment of persons to the regular corps is limited by law now to the minimum grade. Occasions often arise when it seems necessary to engage persons with special training in scientific research at salaries more nearly commensurate with their attainments than the minimum salary. The method of appointment under this provision is the same as that now provided by law for entrance into the regular corps, except that it authorizes appointments to be made to grades above the minimum. Under existing law the employment of such persons has to be in accordance with the civil-service laws, which makes their appointment necessarily temporary and without any prospect of a career service.

Section 4 (c) provides for the promotion of officers, after due examination, according to the same length of service as officers of corresponding grade of the Medical Corps of the Army. In order to be promoted to the next higher grade, an officer must have given satisfactory service, must have passed a mental and physical examination, and must have served as follows: Three years as assistant surgeon, nine years as passed assistant surgeon, eight years as surgeon, and six years as senior surgeon.

Section 4 (d) would make effective the provisions of section 4 (c) by repealing existing law which limits the number of senior surgeons to 10, outside of two authorized by special act of Congress because of distinguished service during the construction of the Panama Canal. There are now 12 senior surgeons in the service on active duty, including the two just mentioned.

There are altogether 22 doctors, 10 besides the 12 already commissioned, in the service eligible to take the examination for the grade of senior surgeon and who, if found qualified, might be appointed senior surgeons if the present limitation is removed. A medical officer must have served at least 20 years in the service before being eligible for appointment as senior surgeon and 26 years before being eligible for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General. All original appointments in the service must be made under existing law to the lowest grade, namely, assistant surgeon. An assistant surgeon receives the same pay and allowances as a first lieutenant in the Army. To be eligible for such appointment a person must be a graduate of a regular medical college and must have had at least one year in hospital work or two years in the general practice of his profession.

Section 4 (e), as a matter of convenience and brevity, would change the designation of Assistant Surgeon General on field service, now called "Assistant Surgeon General at large," to "medical director."

Section 5 would correct an administrative difficulty. Under a recent ruling of the Comptroller General a field officer must await the official approval of the Secretary of the Treasury before placing a laborer, nurse, doctor, or any other employee on duty. In cases of emergency, such as the recent outbreak of plague in New Orleans, it is necessary under that ruling to await telegraphic or other instructions from the Secretary of the Treasury before emergency employees can be put to work. The section would make the appointment of such employees effective as of the day on which they go on duty. It is obvious that the delay caused under such conditions seriously handicaps efficient administration and causes unnecessary expense, especially at stations abroad and other distant stations. The necessity for this corrective provision is evident.

Section 6 would establish a nurse corps in the Public Health Service with the same pay and allowances as the members of the Nurse Corps of the Army receive.

There are 354 nurses in the Public Health Service. The Surgeon General and others in the service say that it is necessary now to pay the Public Health Service nurses somewhat more than members of the

Nurse Corps of the Army receive and that the labor turnover in that service is great because of the uncertainty of being able to make it a career service. The nurses favor this provision of the bill and it is believed that it would give a more efficient nursing service. It is estimated that it would actually result in an economy of \$8,990 per year in the pay and allowances of the nurses now engaged in the service.

Section 7 would change the name of the advisory board for the Hygienic Laboratory to that of national advisory health council and would authorize the appointment by the Surgeon General of five additional members. It would also broaden the functions of that board, authorizing it to advise the Surgeon General in respect of public-health activities generally, in addition to the strictly laboratory problems to which it is now limited.

It is considered desirable to have the board enlarged so as to include a greater number of specialists. The board has always had among its membership some of the most distinguished men in the profession, and it undoubtedly will continue to have the benefit of the advice of men of the same standing. The members receive \$10 per day and expenses for attending the meetings of the board. The meetings of the board have not averaged one per year for many years past.

It is the opinion of the officials of the Public Health Service that the increase in cost that this legislation will entail, if any, will be more than offset by resulting economies and efficiencies. It is difficult to estimate with exactness just what the increase in salaries and allowances under the bill will be. The best estimate of the Treasury Department is that it will be \$17,185.

The public-health agencies of the country are practically unanimous in their support of the legislation. It is indorsed by the Association of State Health Officers of the United States, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Engineering Council, the American Public Health Association, the National Tuberculosis Association, the National Health Council, which includes in its membership all of the national volunteer health agencies, the New York Academy of Medicine, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the American Federation of Labor.

Health officers, public-health workers, and others, from different sections of the country, appeared before the committee to urge its passage.

A few individuals appeared before the committee in opposition to the legislation. The committee felt, however, that their objections did not go to the real merits of the legislation but rather to certain activities or regulations of the Public Health Service which are not in any way affected by the legislation.

Among others who appeared before the committee in advocacy of the bill were:

Dr. H. N. Bundensen, commissioner of health, Chicago, Ill., vice president American Public Health Association.

Dr. William H. Welch, director emeritus of the School of Hygiene and Public Health of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Dr. E. H. Lewinski-Corwin, executive secretary public health relations committee, New York Academy of Medicine, New York City.

Dr. S. W. Welch, State health officer of Alabama.

Dr. M. J. Rosenau, former director of the hygienic laboratory, now a member of the Harvard Medical School, occupying the chair of preventive medicine and hygiene.

Dr. William C. Woodward, formerly health officer of the District of Columbia and Boston, Mass., now of Chicago, Ill., who represents the American Medical Association.

Dr. F. D. Patterson, of Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. James A. Tobey, New York City, representing the American Public Health Association.

Mr. Edgar Wallace, Washington, D. C., representing the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. George W. Fuller, New York, a civil engineer, representing the American Society of Civil Engineers and the American Public Health Association.

Dr. Homer C. Brown, New York, chairman legislative committee, American Dental Association.

Dr. Arthur T. McCormack, State health officer of Kentucky.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to this bill. If anyone on the committee claims the time on account of being opposed to the bill, of course, I would be compelled to yield to him.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill. I have no disposition to claim the time, although I may be entitled to it technically, provided I can get the time I need to oppose the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the gentleman claims the time, of course, he is entitled to it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the gentleman is willing to yield me enough time to oppose the bill—

Mr. RAYBURN. How much time does the gentleman want?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama would be entitled to one hour if he claims it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I really know very little about this bill. Perhaps there are those who will say that is why I am opposing it. It may be that they are right, but I prefer to believe that I oppose it out of my natural conservatism and my hidebound distrust of new things. [Laughter.] Not long ago I remarked to a fellow member of my committee, who is also an ironclad conservative, that the reason why he and myself were not oftener together in our views was that he threw back to 1890, whereas I threw back to about 1820. [Laughter.]

Being a natural-born conservative, I view with some misgivings the extension of bureaucracy and the activities of government into new fields, and to the consolidation of powers which the Federal Government has previously laid violent hands upon.

The purpose of this bill is stated with some degree of fairness in the committee's report, by which it is said that—

The bill aims better to coordinate the public health activities of the Government, especially of the Public Health Service; to give more specific statutory authority for certain activities of the Public Health Service, and, to a limited extent, to broaden others; to improve its administrative procedure; to establish a nurse corps in the service; to change the name, increase the personnel, and enlarge the functions of the Hygienic Laboratory board and to authorize the establishment of new divisions in the Hygienic Laboratory; to increase the pay of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; and to place the dental and certain other scientific and technical personnel of the service upon the same permanent and commissioned basis as the medical officers in it now are.

That is a very favorable and moderate statement. I think that its purposes might perhaps be better stated from the standpoint of the opposition as being, to use a military expression, to "consolidate" the powers and authority which the Public Health Service has succeeded in gaining for itself during the past 100 years.

Bureaus never consent to reduce their powers and never to reduce their prerogatives or their emoluments. They always work only one way, like a ratchet, toward more dignity, more stability, more power, and more pay. This bill is ideal from that standpoint.

Probably I ought to try to excuse myself for knowing so little about the bill. The truth is, that the committee held no hearings on the bill. It was sent into a corner for consideration by a subcommittee, a subcommittee which was altogether friendly to it. There was no opposition in the subcommittee. Everything went along smoothly and harmoniously toward what was desired by those who appeared before it. The bill was not tested by adverse criticism or by hostile consideration.

All that our committee knows about the bill is what the particular subcommittee chose to tell us.

We held no hearings, we had no opportunity to see witnesses or to ask them questions. We had no opportunity to test them on the provisions of the bill. The subcommittee contented themselves with confining the hearing to the particulars of the bill before it.

If you choose to read the report of the committee, you will get very little idea of the Public Health Service or what really is going to be accomplished by the bill. You have no opportunity by reading the bill and the report on it to know what the effect of it is going to be.

The subcommittee apparently was not interested; they did not develop what existing law is; they did not bring out in the hearings what powers the Public Health Service already had. The report of the committee gives no light whatsoever upon these points.

So you see why I know so little about the bill. My only excuse for speaking upon the bill at all in my state of ignorance is that I suspect that there are others who know even less about the bill than I do.

I feel like an opposition ought to oppose, and that every measure of any real importance that comes before the House ought to be tested by a real opposition. I feel that it is the duty of the opposition members of a committee when a bill of importance comes out, unless it is clear beyond doubt that it is advantageous, to turn the other side of the picture and give the House an opportunity to see the seamy side of the garment.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] tells us that the bill did not originate with the Public Health Service. Mr. MAPES is an "honorable man." I would accept his word to any extent that he might choose to go. But let me say to you that if

he is correct, and this bill did not originate with the Public Health Service, some one who knew the minds of the Public Health Service, knew their desires, knew what they wanted, and was anxious to give it to them wrote this bill.

This is a typical bureau bill. It is just such a bill as all these governmental bureaus put out. Prizing for a little more power, reaching for a little more dignity, trying to strengthen themselves, and always with an exaggerated idea of their importance and the function which they perform, grasping for more authority, and, incidentally, for more pay. The one thing that is dearer to the heart of a bureaucrat than more dignity and more power is more pay, and do not you be made to believe that, along with increased power and dignity, this bill does not carry an increase in material emoluments of a financial nature. If you vote for this bill with the idea that it will promote economy and that there will be more money in the Treasury with this bill in operation than there would be without it, let me say that you will soon be undeceived.

One thing about the bill makes me laugh. It comes from the same committee that reported the maternity bill. Many of the members of that committee supported that bill with misgiving and extreme reluctance. Because it had a partisan political import which they did not dare to ignore, we were finally able to bring them up and get them to "lick the log." But they did it most unwillingly, and they found it a most distasteful duty.

In principle certain provisions of this bill are identical with the maternity bill, yet these same gentlemen who gagged when they swallowed the other dose, take this one down with a smile. [Laughter.] Of course, I do not think that they have changed their principles. I think they still hold that the Federal Government ought not to meddle with such things. I think they are just as devoted to that principle as they ever were. They just simply do not know just what this bill does. They are like me, merely ignorant, and that is the trouble. [Laughter.]

Now, I voted for the maternity bill. Those features are not exceedingly distasteful to me. I felt that if the Government could afford to spend money and attention on the raising of colts and pigs, it could certainly afford to put in a little something on babies, and I have never apologized for my support of the maternity bill. But I ask gentlemen who opposed the maternity bill, with tears streaming down their faces in their devotion to principle, how they are going to defend similar provisions of this bill.

The chief purpose in what I am now saying is to take away from the gentlemen who opposed the maternity bill, yet are for this bill, the plea of incompetency which they otherwise might make. I point out that section 2 of the bill provides:

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized to detail personnel of the Public Health Service to educational and research institutions for special studies of scientific problems relating to public health, and for the dissemination of information relating to public health.

"For the dissemination of information relating to public health." That means that an officer of the Public Health Service can be detailed, we will say, to a woman's college for the purpose of teaching its students the functions of motherhood and how to care for babies. If that clause is not for such purposes, what is it for? Of course, the health officers may teach many other things and probably very proper things. But can any man distinguish in principle between sending an agent of the Public Health Service into a college to teach its students about matters of health and sending another agent to teach individual women here and there things relating to their health as mothers and how to care for their babies?

Of course, with my natural conservatism, I believe in organized medicine. I believe in the prevailing school of the regular doctors. I believe in the same system and philosophy of health and treatment of disease that are adhered to by the Public Health Service. Therefore, I have no qualms about their spreading and propagandizing their particular system of healing, although they may do it at the expense of all other forms of healing and at the expense of those who do not believe in their systems.

I believe in vaccination and in injecting decaying animal matter into the veins of a man in order to protect him against smallpox and typhoid and whooping cough and diphtheria and every other ailment—in short, in all that the medical profession has gone mad on. All you have to do nowadays is to find out just exactly the right kind of poison, only it must be rotting animal matter, because nothing else will answer the purpose; find just exactly the right kind of a calf to get it out of, and then take some of this decaying animal matter and inject it into the veins of a man, and behold, health comes!

It is the modern miracle! It is the new religion. The miracle works and lepers rise and their skins are clean! And

those lying at the point of death with tuberculosis and fevers and all other ills are cured when the magic hand reaches out and thrusts them with the hypodermic. They spring up cured and whole. It is no longer necessary to believe in Jesus—it is no longer necessary to have your faith in a God. All you need to do is to have faith in some little, fat-faced, empty-headed doctor and let him squirt a lot of filth into your system and be made whole.

When my children get sick, I send for the doctor and I have him squirt his stuff into the poor, little helpless things and they yell and the fever rises in them and I fear they are going to die. But I will say to you that when they are saved it is not through my faith in the doctor, because I can not produce the faith. Of course, I know that I am ignorant, and I am just doing the best I can. I hope the doctor may know a little more than I do, and he has had more experience and, therefore, in my anxiety, I put some of my burden and responsibility on him. If there is one thing that the modern world has gone crazy about, it is medicine, and in particular the immunization of human beings from almost every kind of disease by the injection of poison into their veins.

The chief protagonist of the modern madness of immunization is the Public Health Service of the United States. To those who believe in all that sort of thing of course this bill is water on their wheel. But to those who do not there is not much for them, for not only will their children in colleges be taught, but the communities around them will be taught, that healing comes only by the methods they prescribe. The system is an immense success. It is perfect; but occasionally the patient dies. [Laughter.]

How many ex-soldiers have written to each of the Members of the House present here to this effect: "I have never had a well day since I had the injection of some serum or some other kind of poison injected into my system when I entered the service." I have the suspicion that our veterans' hospitals, in a large measure, are filled with patients as the result of the ignorance and superstition of the medical profession.

Now, not only were the members of the subcommittee friendly to this bill, but all those who appeared and spoke with any degree of authority were also in favor of it. Perhaps I should qualify my statement that this is just exactly the kind of bill that the Surgeon General would have written by saying that it is just the kind of bill he would have written having in mind the requirement that he must put into it only what he could get by with. He realized that he can not pass against the opposition of the American Medical Association, or of the dental organization, or of the pharmacists' organization; or with anything that is going to operate against the dairy interests, and the butter and cheese interests, and one selfish interest and another.

All these interests had agreed upon the bill; it was a compromise between their views. But at the hearing nobody represented the common welfare.

Only men representing selfish interests were there. I do not question that they are entirely honest. Doctors have all the faith in the efficacy of their remedies that they desire others to have, because one of the first qualifications of a doctor is to believe in his own remedy. His patients believe in it only because he believes it himself. But the gentlemen connected with this business of healing enormously magnify their own importance and the importance of their functions. When they write a bill and submit it to us, and there is nobody on the other side, nobody to criticize, and nobody to say "no," how can you expect that the bill will be the right kind of a bill?

I am bound to oppose a bill presented under such conditions, even though I am forced to rely merely on a "hunch"; I know that such a bill must be wrong. One of my sayings is that practically everything that Congress does is wrong. It is wrong because we do it at the demand of selfish interests; the public welfare is not consulted or heard before committees, and arguments representing the public welfare are not presented. If a Member should choose to come into this House at roll calls and vote "No," "No," "No," on every roll call, he would bat at least 900, possibly even 999, out of 1,000. If ever there is anything that has been done in Congress which was altogether right, I do not know what it was. Certainly nothing of the kind has occurred since the Republican side went into power. [Laughter.] I do not even mean to say that they are trying to do right.

That is the way all bills are passed. Old man Vox Populi is busy at home trying to make a living—Sans-Culotte is driving nails or holding the plow—they are not organized, no high-priced lobbyist speaks for them. But the organized interests are heard through their lobbyists, and those who want to aggrandize and dignify their callings are here through their organizations. If you allow the organized doctors to write the laws of this country, I will tell you that the practice of medicine

will be the finest and most profitable occupation that a man ever followed since the beginning of time. The same thing applies to lawyers, and to teachers, and to every other calling and class. They are not fit to decide what is right as between themselves and the general public.

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

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman speaks of all that has been done since he has been in Congress as having been done wrong.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I qualified that by saying "since our friends on the Republican side came into power." [Laughter.]

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think anything right was done by Congress before he came?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Seriously, since I have been here and have seen the influences that are at work and the pressure of selfish interests which is brought to bear upon Congress and have seen how helpless Congress is in the face of this coercion, I doubt very much that anything is ever done with an eye single to the general welfare of the people of the United States. I can but wonder how long our Government can stand up under such conditions. What we do is wrong, of course, because we do it under either the influence of party spirit, in order to win at the next election, or under the influence of some organized interest that promises to make our future secure as Members of the House. How could it be otherwise?

Mr. DENISON. Does not the gentleman think some of these influences are organized for the public good? For instance, take the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The American Federation of Labor is organized to protect the interests of wage earners.

Mr. DENISON. Is not that a good purpose?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not more so, perhaps, than an organization of employers of labor. Those organizations do not represent the public. How is it possible for a man of the gentleman's intelligence to ask such a question? [Laughter.]

Mr. DENISON. I think the wage earners are organized naturally for their own good, and that in the long run that will be for the good of the whole country, for the good of the people generally.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I have had entirely too much experience and have too much knowledge of life and of human nature to be willing to intrust the common good to any particular class or calling, much less any organization formed to promote the interest of any group. It is true that sometimes the labor unions do defend the public welfare and that the interests of their members are identical with the public interest, but primarily a labor union is organized to care for its members and to promote their economic and class interests.

Now, then, take subsection (b) of section 2 of the bill:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to establish such additional divisions in the Hygienic Laboratory as he deems necessary to provide agencies for the solution of public-health problems, and facilities for the coordination of research by public-health and pharmaceutical officials and scientists, and for demonstrations of sanitary methods and appliances.

Now, we have "demonstrations of sanitary methods and appliances" added to the powers of the Public Health Service. The "demonstration of sanitary methods and appliances." What is to hinder the Public Health Service from sending an agent into the home of any citizen to demonstrate to his wife, who is about to become a mother, "sanitary methods and appliances" whereby she can safeguard her health and that of the child? Far be it from me to say that is an improper activity, but you gentlemen who "gagged" on the "maternity bill," let me invite you to gag again.

The trouble about this is that there is no limitation on these agencies. There is no limitation upon how far the bureau may go. There is no limitation on the number of its personnel. They can have an unlimited number of agents, nurses, doctors, cooks, dishwashers, or whatever they choose to have, and send them throughout the length and breadth of this country, teaching the people how to live.

There is no limit upon them, except the power of the Committee on Appropriations, and if the appropriation should be passed, giving the Public Health Service \$100,000,000, they could, if they could organize quickly enough to get the benefit of it, absorb the whole of it. Do you want to vote for that kind of a bill? Well, you financiers may do it. I have not any money myself, so I do not mind the cost. It is going to do good, so just let the good work go on. [Laughter.]

Let me go on further. These public-health officials are to be of the rank similar to Army and Navy rank. They are to be of the same pay. They are to have the same dignity; they are to have the stability; their nominations are to be confirmed by the Senate; they are to be officers of the United

States. Nobody can turn them out without a court-martial or something. I do not know what. Yet the gentlemen have the boldness to tell us that the bill does not mean an increase in expenditures.

It means an increase not only in expense to the Government in the ways I have mentioned, but it means an increase in prestige and influence to the Public Health Service and to its teachings and methods. It means that they will come back here again next Congress and the Congress after and ask for new powers and for new activities as well as for increased pay. They will come back time and again; who ever saw a bureau that thought it had received enough? No one has ever seen it around Washington, and I doubt whether it was ever seen in any other capital.

One other point. Section 6 of the bill provides that:

There is hereby established in the Public Health Service a nurse corps, which shall consist of a superintendent and such nurses as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary.

How many? One hundred, one thousand, or one million? There is no limit. It is wide open. Give us a Secretary of the Treasury who thinks the country needs the nurses, and give him an appropriation and let him go to it. And that is the bill you gentlemen are asked to support. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I admit the soft impeachment that I was a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill. I will go further and cheerfully admit that I approached the consideration of this bill with a friendliness toward the purposes of the Public Health Service.

The hearings of the subcommittee that are being distributed about the House are not the complete hearings. At the last session of Congress the committee went into great detail in its hearings with members of the Public Health Service and with representatives of the public health services of various States. The subcommittee also spent considerable time in listening to the objections of those opposed to this bill.

I concur with the gentleman from Alabama when he states it is the common practice for bureaus to come here in seeking more power, more money, and more salaries. As a member of the committee, when the representatives of these bureaus came before us, I naturally am inclined to weigh their statements. I want to say in fairness to this particular subcommittee that we were willing to properly discount statements made in behalf of the Public Health Service. In a number of instances we refused to place in the bill the things requested in behalf of the Public Health Service. So while we were friendly to this great service of the Government I hope we were not unduly unfriendly. The subcommittee did not fail in its duty to the House of Representatives or in its duty to use diligence to protect the public interests.

The gentleman from Alabama makes some critical references to the application of the germ theory of disease. I find no reason for reflecting upon the Public Health Service for any experiments it may make in reference to the germ theory of disease. The germ theory of disease is still a matter of experimentation in the medical profession. The combatting of germ diseases is one of the greatest studies of medical scientists, one of the most important duties of the medical profession.

The discovery of germs as the origin of most diseases from which men suffer was one of the great discoveries of modern times. So far as I am concerned, the money of the United States Treasury will be devoted to no purpose that I approve more heartily than that of investigation and research for the purpose of discovering better methods of treating, alleviating, and terminating the diseases that come from germs.

The gentleman refers specifically to the case of lepers and, in a light and half-joking way, to the disease of the leper. The United States in the last 15 years or so has developed a remedy for leprosy. That disease has been one of the most awful curses of humanity from the beginning of time. For many centuries past the poor leper by the law of the land was required to raise his hand and cry out "unclean" whenever he was approached by a fellow being. After all these ages of that hopeless human suffering, the United States has made this great contribution to the medical science of the world.

I rejoice. I rejoice that this great Nation has the wealth, the will, the charity, and the intelligence to devote its money to accomplishing such purposes. Many centuries ago in the old pagan days some philosopher said that in nothing do men so resemble the gods as when doing good to their fellow men. Here is a great service of this Government devoted to such purposes. In no aspect of all the activities of Uncle Sam does he appeal more to me than when engaged in this service of doing

good to afflicted humanity, not only of our own country, but of the world.

The gentleman refers to the number of nurses. This bill removes no bar to the appointment of nurses. There is no limit to-day that is not there after this bill is enacted. We have a few hundred nurses in the service of the Federal Government. Suppose some great calamity like an epidemic comes, would it be wise to have in this bill a limitation that the total number of nurses in the United States should be 300 or 400, where to-day we have 354? That would not be a wise thing to do. The only practical limit that can be placed in a service of this kind is such as the bill prescribes and the limitation is with the Appropriations Committee.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has made a good presentation of the details of this bill. I will not attempt to impose upon you by repeating the substance of what he has said.

But, generally speaking, this bill does what was done by the Coast Guard bill in the last Congress. It legalizes services that have been going on for several decades, and in some instances with questionable authority.

It gives a grade to certain personnel of the Health Service by which they acquire a permanent status and a permanent rating. This is true, for instance, in the case of the nurses.

The information furnished the committee tended to show that the nurses in the Public Health Service to-day are being paid more than in some other services of the Government. The reason for this discrimination is that the Public Health Service is unable to give nurses any assurance of a career in their profession. This bill makes it possible for that to be done.

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

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand the gentleman favors this legislation?

Mr. LEA. Yes; I do.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand the legislation seeks to aid the various States and to cooperate with the health officers of the various States of the Union?

Mr. LEA. Yes; but that is in line with what is already being done. There is nothing particularly new in that respect.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What other benefits does the bill give the various States?

Mr. LEA. The service cooperates with the local health authorities in its research and investigational work and in the control of epidemics, and in its educational work. Its work is more or less scattered through the States. It conducts hospitals in connection with the marine service. The United States Public Health Service has hospitals at main ports. It gives a service to the public in taking care of American sailors.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I may say to the gentleman that our State health department is very much in favor of the bill, and I assume other States have been heard from in the same way.

Mr. LEA. So far as I recall, the authorities of every State that expressed any opinion about it favor this bill.

There is only one feature of the bill that makes a distinct raise from a financial standpoint and that is the salary of the Surgeon General. The raise, as I recall, is about \$2,200 per year. It places the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in the same status as the Surgeon General of the Army.

The men in the Public Health Service who have commissions are subject to longevity rules. They must serve a long time before they get their promotions. The subcommittee went into that pretty thoroughly. We became satisfied that if the personnel perform the duties assigned them they will earn their salaries. In fact, the increases in this bill are comparatively small. With probably six or seven hundred employees the total estimated increase is only about \$17,000 or \$18,000 a year.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS. I notice in the bill there is a provision which would seem to indicate it is expected that possibly the President might go outside of the regular health corps to appoint a Surgeon General.

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. Personally, I feel, and I am sure the gentleman feels the same way, the Surgeon General ought to be chosen from the personnel of the service. Has the gentleman ever considered—

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

Mr. MAPES. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. BYRNS. Has the gentleman considered whether a provision in the bill directing the appointment of a Surgeon General from the regular health corps would be valid?

Mr. LEA. We did not particularly consider the legality of doing so, but we did consider the policy. It was the unanimous judgment of our committee that the appointment should

not be confined to the service. It frequently happens that in the civilian population disconnected from the Government, men of high type, with unusual executive as well as scientific ability, will be developed. We thought it would be a bad policy to limit the appointment to the service. Sometimes it is good to bring in new blood and a new viewpoint, with perhaps a broader experience which may come from outside.

Mr. BYRNS. My own idea was that it would not only be an element of justice to those who have given their life to the service, but it would operate as a sort of encouragement to those if they had the possibility of becoming a head of the service in view.

Mr. LEA. To a degree that is true, but that incentive applies to those outside as well as those in. Personally I am not inclined to favor making Government employment a closed corporation. There is a tendency in Government to create too much of an official or employee class. The importation of new blood and broader views is sometimes helpful to the public service.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] five minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Alabama says he does not know very much about this bill. I have not asked for time in order to discuss the provisions of the bill. I think it is rather gratifying that any measure shall be opposed by one who is honestly in a position to do so, so that both sides may be presented.

I have asked for this time for another purpose. There has been something said about the effort on the part of the bureaus to increase their powers. I presume I have known the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service longer than any man on this floor. I met him 35 or 40 years ago. I have known him fairly well—I might say intimately—and a close personal friendship existed between the Surgeon General and his brother and myself. That friendship has continued from that time to this. It is my solemn conviction that there is no man in the service of the Government who is more impelled with patriotic desire to render honest and efficient public service than the present Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. There has been in all his career no effort, so far as I have ever been able to discover, to promote or push himself, no personal aggrandizement, or anything of that character.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I will.

Mr. LEA. I hope the gentleman did not construe my remarks as any personal criticism of Surgeon General Cumming.

Mr. BLAND. I heard no word from the gentleman from California that reflected on the Surgeon General. My remarks are directed more particularly to the criticism which our good friend from Alabama made on the part of bureaus to increase their powers, and I desired simply to add this testimonial to my friend of many years' standing. I feel that I should be untrue to our personal friendship if I were not to give this testimonial in his behalf, and it comes from one who claims to know him well. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FAUST). All debate has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4 (a) Hereafter sanitary engineers, medical, dental, and other scientific officers, including pharmacists engaged on comparable duties of the Public Health Service, selected for general service and subject to change of station, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, subject to the same conditions and limitations as commissioned medical officers of the regular corps of the Public Health Service, except that—

(1) Examinations shall be in the several branches of the profession of the person to be appointed;

(2) Any sanitary engineer, medical, dental, or other scientific officer, or pharmacist engaged on comparable duties, in the Public Health Service upon the date of passage of this act, except commissioned officers of the regular corps, after examination by a board of officers convened by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and upon the recommendation of such board and the Surgeon General, may be appointed to any grade specified by such board and approved by the Surgeon General, having due regard to the salary received by such officer at the time of such appointment; and in computing longevity pay and pay period the service of any officer appointed under the provisions of this paragraph who was in the Public Health Service on June 30, 1922, shall be counted in the same manner as provided for regular commissioned officers in the Public Health Service on that date;

(3) Whenever in the opinion of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service commissioned officers are not available for the performance of permanent duties requiring highly specialized training and experience in scientific research, including the duties of chiefs of

divisions of the Hygienic Laboratory, any person, after examination by a board of officers convened by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and upon the recommendation of such board and the Surgeon General, may be appointed to any grade specified by such board and approved by the Surgeon General.

(b) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall designate the grades of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service other than medical officers corresponding to the grades of medical officers.

(c) Hereafter commissioned officers of the Public Health Service shall be promoted, after examination as now provided by law for commissioned medical officers of the Public Health Service, according to the same length of service as officers of corresponding grades of the Medical Corps of the Army; except that for purposes of future promotion any person whose original appointment in the regular corps is in a grade above that of assistant surgeon shall be considered as having had on the date of appointment service equal to that of the junior officer of the grade to which appointed. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall hereafter be entitled to the same pay and allowances as the Surgeon General of the Army; and, if selected from the commissioned officers of the regular corps, he shall, upon the expiration of his commission, if not reappointed as Surgeon General, revert to the grade and number in the regular corps that he would have occupied had he not served as Surgeon General.

(d) The limitation now imposed by law upon the number of senior surgeons of the Public Health Service on active duty is hereby repealed.

(e) Hereafter officers of the Public Health Service in the grade of assistant surgeon general on field service shall be designated and known as medical directors.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question as to page 2, line 23, the phrase "including pharmacists engaged on comparable duties." As I understand it is the intention to commission only certain pharmacists. What is the thought back of that phraseology?

Mr. MAPES. There are in the Public Health Service some pharmacists who have important administrative responsibilities. They are not engaged in research work, and those interested in the service felt that their administrative responsibilities were of sufficient importance to warrant giving them the same status as some of the scientists and sanitary engineers and others engaged in research work. Such an administrative official is the pharmacist in charge of the supplies at Perryville, who handles all of the drugs and supplies of the Public Health Service, and whose position is permanent. He has been there a great many years. The service feels that he is entitled to a commission. It is not, however, the intent of the legislation to give a commissioned status to the pharmacist who is engaged in clerical work. That would be left to the examining board and the Surgeon General to determine. That board and the Surgeon General will determine who shall receive commissions and who shall not.

Mr. NEWTON. And the positions of the pharmacists doing what is ordinarily termed mere clerical work will be the same as it is now?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON. And later if some of them should be promoted to the same status such as is intended within this phrase a commission could be granted to them.

Mr. MAPES. That is correct.

Mr. NEWTON. But not otherwise.

Mr. MAPES. No.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Michigan a question. On page 3, in line 24, I find that whenever in the opinion of the Surgeon General there are not officials available, then the selection may be made in the way provided. There is nothing, however, to indicate whether men so appointed shall be officials permanently employed or only temporarily to meet an emergency. It would be very easy, it seems to me, and occasions might arise where men upon whom certain duties devolved and of whom certain things were expected are not available for the time being, and somebody, of course, should be assigned to do the work. That might create new and additional officials, and a number of them might be appointed, more than are necessary and more than are proper. It struck me that something should be put in the bill here to indicate that this provision is to take care of emergencies, and that it provides for temporary appointments only. I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] for his opinion on that matter, if he feels that it deserves consideration.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, it is not the purpose of that paragraph to provide for temporary emergencies. That is taken care of as I understand it under the general authority of the Public Health Service now. The purpose of the paragraph to

which the gentleman calls attention is to provide for situations that arise like this. The Public Health Service may be engaged in a line of research work or investigation that requires the services of some specialist along a certain line, skilled in some particular line of research or investigation. Under existing law the service employs such an individual where it can, in cases of necessity, under the regular civil-service provisions of the law. Under existing law the service is not able to offer such a man a permanent career service with the Public Health Service, and it makes it doubly difficult to get such an expert to give up his profession or private work to do this particular work for the Public Health Service. The service feels that if it could assure such a man a permanent commission with pay commensurate with his qualifications, it would be easier to employ him, and really in many cases that he could be engaged at a less salary and that it would be to the advantage of the service. It is not thought that it will take in very many people, but in cases of necessity it is considered to be very desirable.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I may say I think that is all right, and there should be such a provision.

Mr. MAPES. And let me say in further explanation that under existing law all medical officers who are taken into the commissioned service must come in at the lowest grade as an assistant surgeon, and receive the compensation corresponding to that of a first lieutenant of the Army. They must be graduates of a regular medical institution. They must have had either two years' general practice in the profession or have had one year's hospital experience. So that if they need men of advanced standing in the profession there is no way to employ them at present except to employ them as regular civil-service employees.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am entirely satisfied with what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] says about it, but it struck me that if it is intended that these men should be taken in to hold permanently, there might very well be something to indicate that; and it also seemed to me that as it is it might open the door to permanent appointments, whereas a regular place is vacant only temporarily or perhaps because some official is absent or at the time incapacitated. This, as it now reads, might authorize the Surgeon General or others whose authority it is to make the selection to appoint additional officers who would continue permanently and the roll might in that way be loaded up and a lot of unnecessary men employed. But the statement of the gentleman satisfies me, and officials whose duty it will be to apply and interpret this law will be governed in this matter by that statement.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, of course, we must leave something to the administrative head of this department. I think it is a violent assumption to assume that the department will take on some one for temporary work and give him a permanent position after his temporary work has ceased. As the gentleman knows, all of these matters are limited by the appropriation and by the Committee on Appropriations, and that committee requires a showing of necessity before it grants the appropriation every year.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. Hereafter the Advisory Board for the Hygienic Laboratory shall be known as the National Advisory Health Council, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to appoint, from representatives of the public-health profession, five additional members of such council. The terms of service, compensation, and allowances of such additional members shall be the same as the other members of such council not in the regular employment of the Government, except that the terms of service of the members first appointed shall be so arranged that the terms of not more than two members shall expire each year. Such council, in addition to its other functions, shall advise the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in respect of public-health activities.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: Page 6, line 4, after the word "council," insert the words "at least one of whom shall be a specialist in mental hygiene."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am generally in favor of this legislation, but I rather think that the scope of the activities provided by this bill is too limited. It seems to consider only physical health. It is my idea and it has been so for some time, that the Federal Government, after its lessons in the draft and since the war, could give a little of its thought to the subject of mental health.

Desiring to induce the Government to take a substantial interest in mental hygiene, I have introduced the bill H. R. 7936, to create the United States board of alienists, which reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created the United States board of alienists, to be composed of 20 physicians of 10 years' experience in the study and care of mental diseases, to be appointed by the President for terms of five years. Each member of the board shall receive a salary of \$25,000 per annum. The board shall select from its number a chairman and shall draw such regulations as to it may seem necessary for the purposes of this act. The board shall employ all necessary help, clerical and professional.

SEC. 2. The board shall diagnose and prescribe treatment for all mentally deranged veterans in the care of the United States and all other veterans of the United States who will submit their cases to the United States board of alienists. The Veterans' Bureau shall cooperate with the board.

SEC. 3. The board shall make a comprehensive study of mental diseases and treatments for the same and shall prepare and have printed a complete treatise on the same with its recommendations.

SEC. 4. The board may consult with nonmembers of the board and pay such nonmembers so consulted reasonable fees for their services.

SEC. 5. The board shall recommend to the commissioners for the promotion of uniformity in legislation a code of ethics to govern the appearance of alienists as expert witnesses in litigations.

SEC. 6. The board shall inquire as to methods for the chartering of insurance companies against insanity with a view to drafting a policy of insurance that will provide treatment for the insured who becomes mentally diseased and compensation for his dependents.

SEC. 7. The board shall annually report to Congress.

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000,000 for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect immediately.

The word "alienists" has been used because that is the common expression denoting scientists skilled in the study of mental diseases. I do not insist on a retention of the title. These scientists have divided themselves into many classes, but as my purpose is broadly remedial, I do not care to adopt any special viewpoint subject to controversy. I would have the cooperation of all anxious to reduce mental disease.

The general motive for the bill lies in the great expense to the public caused by mental diseases, with the humanitarian purpose of devoting portions of our governmental resources to the relief of the affected and threatened.

The Department of Commerce has published a preliminary report of the results of the census of State hospitals for mental disease and feeble-minded and epileptics for 1926. From it I read:

CENSUS OF INSTITUTIONS, 1926—HOSPITALS FOR MENTAL DISEASE—30 STATES MAKE PRELIMINARY REPORT

Complete returns have been received from 30 States, covering 105 hospitals out of a total of 165 State hospitals for mental diseases which are included in the census. These 105 hospitals had a total of 36,936 first admissions during the year 1926, as compared with 34,362 in 1922, or an increase of 7.5 per cent. These first admissions represent patients received during the year, who had not previously been under treatment in any hospital for mental disease.

For the 30 States represented, there were 47.3 first admissions per 100,000 of the general population, as compared with 46.8 first admissions per 100,000 in 1922. In other words, the number of first admissions in these States has increased only a little more rapidly than the general population.

The extent to which public provision has been made for the treatment of mental diseases is, perhaps, best indicated by the number of patients present in the hospitals on a given date. In the 30 States covered by this statement the number of mental patients under institutional care shows a steady increase, as indicated by the figures for the dates at the beginning and the end of the two most recent years for which data are available, which are as follows: January 1, 1922, 156,454; January 1, 1923, 161,566; January 1, 1926, 173,602; and

January 1, 1927, 178,353. The number of such patients under care per 100,000 of the general population increased from 218.5 on January 1, 1923, to 226.9 on January 1, 1927. For the most part, also, the figures for the individual States show increases.

CENSUS OF INSTITUTIONS, 1926—INSTITUTIONS FOR FEEBLE-MINDED AND EPILEPTICS—36 STATES MAKE PRELIMINARY REPORT

Complete returns have been received from 36 States, covering 60 institutions out of a total of 75 State institutions for feeble-minded and epileptics which were in operation in 1926. These 60 institutions had a total of 7,203 first admissions during the year 1926, as compared with 6,633 in 1922, or an increase of 8.6 per cent. These first admissions represent patients received during the year who had not previously been under treatment in any institution for feeble-minded and epileptics.

For the 36 States represented, there were 7.6 first admissions per 100,000 of the general population, as compared with 7.4 first admissions per 100,000 in 1922; in other words, the number of first admissions has increased only a little more rapidly than the general population.

In comparing the figures for first admissions in individual States, which are given on pages 2 and 3, it should be noted that the number of admissions for a given State is affected not only by the number of feeble-minded and epileptic persons in the State, but also by such factors as the capacity of the institutions in the State and the effectiveness of the local machinery for bringing mental defectives under the care of the institutions. Where a State shows a large increase in the number of first admissions, or in the number under care at a given time, the increase usually represents an expansion of the capacity or facilities of the institutions.

The extent to which provision has been made for the institutional care of feeble-minded and epileptics is perhaps best indicated by the number of patients in the institutions on a given date. In the 36 States covered by this statement the number of feeble-minded and epileptic patients under institutional care shows a steady increase, as indicated by the figures for the dates at the beginning and the end of the two most recent years for which data are available, which are as follows: January 1, 1922, 39,596; January 1, 1923, 42,164; January 1, 1926, 49,788; and January 1, 1927, 52,043. The number of such patients under care per 100,000 of the general population increased from 47 on January 1, 1923, to 54.7 on January 1, 1927. For the most part the figures for the individual States show similar increases.

Both the number of first admissions to institutions for feeble-minded and epileptics and the number of patients present in the institutions are shown for the 36 States separately in the tables presented on pages 2 and 3 of this statement. The figures are based on reports furnished to the Bureau of the Census by the institutions, through the cooperation of the State agencies in charge of such institutions. The figures for 1926 are preliminary and subject to correction.

Similar preliminary statements covering State hospitals for mental disease—"insane hospitals"—and State penal institutions will be issued shortly. Upon the completion of the canvass final statements will be issued covering all institutions in each of the three classes.

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

Mr. BLACK of New York. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 10 minutes more.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. In round numbers there are at the present time in institutions for the insane in the United States about 300,000 patients, and the Department of the Census in the preliminary report of institutions for the feeble-minded and epileptics presents the figures I have just read.

So I think when we are considering a public health bill, we should consider it with a view to seeing what the National Government can do to alleviate this very serious condition.

I have here a pamphlet by Dr. H. Douglas Singer, professor of psychiatry, University of Illinois, alienist, department of public welfare, State of Illinois, in which he says:

Yet this problem, which I believe to be larger than that of tuberculosis, has received little or no consideration from any Government agency, central or local, until now, when it has compelled attention from the Army and the agencies dealing with disabilities of ex-service men and women.

In the New York State hospitals for the year ending September, 1927, there were over 47,000 patients, an increase of 2,600 in the course of a year. It has also been pointed out by experts that over 80 per cent of those mentally afflicted are unable to take care of themselves or have no relatives to take care of them, and they become public charges.

I can not gather the figures of the real-estate values and the personal-property values of the institutions that are devoted by the various States to the care of the insane, but they are grow-

ing every year. They represent a very substantial amount, and I think that the United States should take into consideration the fact that some of the States are finding it hard to bear this load and that the Federal Government should devote some of its resources to assist them to procure scientific help.

The Society for Mental Hygiene reports that the economic loss to the country, due to mental disease in the course of a year, is about \$300,000,000, a sum sufficient to make it a great and serious national problem which might be considered in this bill. So much is required in the way of real and personal property, food and attendants, that the States have not been in a position to properly compensate science under the existing conditions. In other words, the Federal Government is in a position to pay scientists skilled in this study a sufficient sum of money to attract alienists to this service. They could disseminate their ideas and communicate them to the States.

The Federal board would be of aid as a central consultant in this problem of mental diseases, which some claim to be greater than tuberculosis and which affects the great motive power of progress, the human mind. This board would conduce toward economy in their work, for it would serve as an accessible exchange for scientific views and discoveries.

The Federal board would furnish a reliable incentive to specialization in the cure of mental disorders, and as William L. Russell, M. D., superintendent of the Bloomingdale Hospital, said:

In no class of case is the necessity for specialists more pressing.

The sensational murder cases which have presented a ghastly clash of alienists demand that a code of ethics be provided for experts. They have discouraged by their contradictions the confidence of the public in their profession, yet it is very necessary that there should be a popular faith in mental-disease experts if they expect patients to submit to preventive treatments.

Massachusetts has a law requiring those charged with homicide and second offenders in felony cases to submit to a State board of alienists, and by that method they do away with this clash of alienists that has brought so much disrepute to the medical profession engaged in the line of the treatment of mental diseases. A Federal board which would specialize in that line of work would be available in the Federal courts, and they could be called upon as well by the States, in order to get the most recent data in neurological situations.

The Federal board might advise a proper code of ethics, or it might encourage the States to adopt the Massachusetts system of State experts, who report to the court on the mental condition of those charged with capital offenses. This does away with the grotesque debates between alienists.

I was attracted to this problem by some veteran situations that were presented to me, and at this point I want to digress for just a second to pay my respects to General Hines, the present head of the Veterans' Bureau. I have seldom come in contact with any man at the head of a bureau who has put such real heart and sympathy in his work and who has given such real personal attention to the cases which come before his bureau. [Applause.] I have a letter from General Hines, dated February 8, 1928, which would be interesting at this point:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington February 8, 1928.

Hon. LORING M. BLACK, Jr.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BLACK: With reference to your letter of February 1, 1928, requesting information in regard to mental diseases among veterans under the supervision of the Veterans' Bureau, you are advised that the data furnished herewith are as of December 31, 1927.

There were on this date 53,808 veterans receiving compensation for neuropsychiatric disabilities, which is 21.52 per cent of the total compensable cases.

The neuropsychiatric figure includes veterans suffering from diseases of the nervous system, as well as those definitely psychotic or insane. This latter group numbers 24,493, of which on this date 11,101 were under treatment in hospitals by the Veterans' Bureau.

Of further interest to you might be the fact that there were approximately 7,120 veterans of the World War from New York State drawing compensation for neuropsychiatric disabilities, while approximately 1,544 were hospitalized.

Every effort is made by the Veterans' Bureau to hospitalize a veteran in his home State, and this has been very successful in the case of New York veterans, where approximately 94 per cent of those psychotic or insane are hospitalized in the home State.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Director.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HAWLEY). The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I am very proud to say that this letter from the Veterans' Bureau is a commentary on the situation in my own State. After the war our governor, Governor Smith, with the help of our legislature, on a nonpartisan basis and without any thought of politics saw to it that there were large institutions, modern, up-to-date, and having the approval of scientists, in the State of New York for the care of neurological veterans, and this had its result as shown by this letter from the Director of the Veterans' Bureau.

I do not know whether you gentlemen care to adopt my amendment because it has not been considered in committee, but I suggest that something should be done.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. I yield.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment proposes the creation of a separate board?

Mr. BLACK of New York. My amendment calls for the appointment of at least one member on this advisory board skilled in the study of mental diseases.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But the statements made by the gentleman seemed to suggest that he was in favor of a separate board.

Mr. BLACK of New York. I was referring to my own bill. The amendment would be the foundation for the larger thing that the Federal Government ought to do. The Federal Government has a tremendous problem of its own in this situation, and I think this should be done as the first step so that this new public health council might advise the Congress as to whether the Government should go into this scientific work on a broad scale or not.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman would be in favor of placing a Federal health bureau there?

Mr. BLACK of New York. No; the gentleman is in favor of the creation of a board of advisers to study the question of mental diseases, getting the latest data available on this subject, disseminating it to the States, and informing the States on the care and cure of the insane.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. You would make this a permanent institution, would you not?

Mr. BLACK of New York. They would have no direct contact but would simply act in an advisory capacity. That is my proposition.

I have offered the amendment, as the committee must realize, largely for the purpose of discussing the general topic, and if the committee does not care to adopt it or if it interferes with the committee's plan I will be glad to withdraw it.

Mr. PARKER. I suggest that the gentleman withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen of the committee, I desire to take up but a very little time because I know the committee is anxious to vote on this bill. I simply rise for the purpose of saying I am very heartily in favor of the passage of this bill. My main purpose in rising, however, is to pay a short tribute to what I regard as the inestimable value to the people of America of the activities of the United States Public Health Service. I have taken occasion to say upon this floor at other times that in my opinion the very best of money spent for any purpose out of the Treasury of the United States from the standpoint of humanity and the public welfare is that which is appropriated for the maintenance of the United States Public Health Service. [Applause.]

My attention to the value of this work was first attracted by an experience in my home county in Alabama some 10 or 12 years ago. At that time we had in that county what might be called an epidemic of typhoid fever that had been going on for several years. The Public Health Service appointed a delegation of some four or five young physicians, detailed from that

service, to go to Walker County, Ala., and to make a survey of the situation, with the idea of undertaking to eradicate that dread disease. The year before those young doctors made their survey of that county there were 35 deaths from typhoid fever in that one county alone. They came into the county; they made a house-to-house survey of every home in that county, both white and colored; they made recommendations as to sanitation, the water supply, the screening of houses, and so forth, and the year after they were there and made their recommendations for health preservation there was not a single death in that whole county from typhoid fever, and there has not been any typhoid fever to any appreciable extent since that time.

As I understand this bill it in nowise undertakes to interfere with the present structure of this great organization. It merely undertakes to coordinate its activities and in some particulars to extend them so as to make their investigations and their surveys more valuable to the American people. And, gentlemen, I want to say to you there is no subject, economic or otherwise, that ought to be of more importance and that ought more to engage the solicitude of the Congress of the United States than the preservation of the public health.

I took occasion a few years ago to make some investigation as to the economic loss to the country in dollars and cents caused by absolutely preventable human disease and those figures were astounding. As a matter of fact, I think one of the very great achievements of our modern times has been the advance in the preservation of the health of our people by the investigations of the Public Health Service and allied agencies.

Alabama, my home State, is, of course, very proud of the achievements of that great humanitarian, General Gorgas, who was one of the leaders along the line I am now indicating, and so greatly am I impressed and have I been impressed by actual observation of the value of the work of the Public Health Service that if I had my way about it I would increase by ten times the existing appropriation for the activities of the United States Public Health Service, particularly along the lines of rural sanitation.

Gentlemen, do you know that for a long period of time the actual appropriation made for rural sanitation in the whole Government of the United States was only \$50,000 a year?

I am glad this bill is before the committee for its consideration, and I am very pleased to have had an opportunity to pay this short tribute to the great service of the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I simply wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], in charge of the bill, whether this bill in any way affects the pure food bureau of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. MAPES. Not in any way.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It does not touch that matter at all?

Mr. MAPES. It does not touch it. The Department of Agriculture was a little fearful about the original bill, which contained a provision authorizing the President to transfer public-health activities from departments outside of the Public Health Service to the Public Health Service. The committee considered it wise to eliminate that provision from the bill entirely, and now the bill simply authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the head of any department, to detail personnel from the Public Health Service to any other department that is carrying on public-health work, as an incident of the major purpose of the department to cooperate in such work, but such detail is made only in case of a request by the head of such department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So, therefore, it would be competent for the Secretary of Agriculture to ask a detail from this bureau to deal with some matter arising within the bureau?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; to cooperate and advise with the men in the pure-food bureau only. The committee thought other branches of the Government should be given the privilege, if desired, of having the advice and opinion and benefit of the experience of the Public Health Service.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As I understand the gentleman, then, his first statement that it had nothing whatever to do with the pure-food bureau is modified to the extent that they can have something to do with that bureau if it prefers the request.

Mr. MAPES. Only upon the request of the pure-food bureau itself or the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAWLEY, 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. 11026) to provide for the coordination of the public-health activities of the Government, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FORMER SPEAKER CHAMP CLARK

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, this is March 7, the birthday of ex-Speaker Champ Clark, who served his district, State, Nation, and the House so ably, faithfully, honestly, and conscientiously for a long period of years. His career was a notable one.

We may well pause a moment to pay tribute both in thought and word to his memory. He was a strong character and a ready debater. His views on all public questions were well known. He was an able, conscientious presiding officer. He was a loving father, devoted husband, loyal friend, and an honest, patriotic public servant. He was a close student of the lives of public men who have served the Nation from its foundation. No man was better equipped to give advice as to the qualities necessary for leadership here or in the Nation. He loved his work here in the House and was beloved by every Member. He defended the House on all occasions against unjust criticism.

In the mature years of his life, in the twilight of reflection, on March 16, 1916, he made a notable address to the new Members of Congress, of whom I was one, at the Press Club, emphasizing the value of experience of Members of Congress to themselves, the House, their district, and the Nation. [Applause.]

The address is as follows:

[Printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 17, 1916]

THE MAKING OF A REPRESENTATIVE

REMARKS OF CHAMP CLARK AT THE WASHINGTON PRESS CLUB RECEPTION, THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1916

It is a high honor to be a Representative in Congress, if for only one term, and with the number of terms the honor increases in geometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion. A Member's usefulness to his country should increase in the same proportion. A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

"Poeta nascitur non fit"—a poet is born, not made—says Horace; but Congressmen—that is, useful and influential Congressmen—are made largely by experience and practice.

The old Charlotte district in Virginia knew this and kept John Randolph of Roanoke in the House till he became a great national figure. Then the Old Dominion sent him to the Senate and General Jackson sent him to St. Petersburg. There are sporadic cases of similar action in other districts.

It is an unwise performance for any district to change Representatives at short intervals. A new Congressman must begin at the foot of the class and spell up. Of course, the more brains, tact, energy, courage, and industry he has the quicker he will get up. If he possesses these qualities, and if his constituents will keep him in the House, he is as certain to rise as the sparks are to fly upward. No human power can keep him down. It is only fair and rational to assume that every Representative's constituents desire to see him among the "top-notchers."

Let us take the present House and see how long the men who hold the high places have served. I can not name all, but will cite a few as samples.

Mr. Speaker Cannon is serving his fortieth year. He holds the record, or, in pugilistic parlance, "he holds the belt," for length of service in the House in our entire history. In several Congresses he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and then was Speaker eight years, only one man, Henry Clay, having been Speaker longer.

I am serving my twenty-second year; Minority Leader Mann is serving his twentieth year; Mr. Kitchin, chairman of Ways and Means, his sixteenth; Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of Appropriations, his eighteenth; Mr. Moon, chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads, his twentieth; Mr. Jones, chairman of Insular Affairs and "father of the House," his twenty-sixth; Mr. Flood, chairman of Foreign Affairs, his sixteenth; Mr. Hay, chairman of Military Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Glass, chairman of Banking and Currency, his sixteenth; Mr. Adamson, chairman of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, his twentieth; Mr. Stephens, chairman of Indian Affairs, his twentieth; Mr. Slayden, chairman of the Library, his twentieth; Mr. Henry, chairman of Rules, his twentieth; Mr. Lever, chairman of Agriculture, his sixteenth; Mr. Padgett, chairman of the Navy, his sixteenth; Mr. Lloyd, chairman of Accounts, his twentieth; and Mr. Sparkman, chairman of Rivers and Harbors, his twenty-second. There are other big chairmanships, but these will suffice to show that as a rule the big places go to old and experienced Members, for most of the men who rank close to the chairmen are old-timers. The same thing holds good with reference to members of the minority. As an illustration, Messrs. Gillett and Cooper, who are serving their twenty-fourth year, are the ranking Republicans on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs, almost certain to be chairmen thereof should the Republicans ever again have a majority in the House, as in that event, in all probability, Mr. Mann will be Speaker, unless he is nominated for President next June.

Go through the whole list and you will find, with few exceptions, that the men of long service have the high places.

New England and the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh have understood the value of long service all along, and having elected a fairly good man to Congress they keep him in the harness.

The Member of longest consecutive service is called "the father of the House." Five Philadelphians in immediate succession bore that honorable title—Randall, Kelly, O'Neil, Harmer, and Bingham. Then it went to Mr. Dalzell, of Pittsburgh. When General Bingham announced the death of General Harmer, his immediate predecessor as "father of the House," he stated that the five Philadelphia "fathers of the House" had served a total of 147 years, and he served 8 or 10 years after making that interesting statement.

In the second and third Congresses in which I served, Maine, with only four Members, had the Speakership and the chairmanship of the great Committees on Ways and Means, Navy, and Public Buildings and Grounds—a most remarkable circumstance, giving the Pine Tree State an influence in the House and the country out of all proportion to her population and wealth. These four men—Reed, Dingley, Boutelle, and Millikin—each served in the House 20 years or more. Other States might profit by her example.

No man should be elected to the House simply to gratify his ambition. All Members should be elected for the good of the country.

The best rule, it seems to me, is for a district to select a man with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him here so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps him amazingly in doing things.

I can speak freely on this subject without violating the proprieties, for my constituents have kept me here 22 years, and for 20 years have given me nominations without opposition, for all of which favors I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Their generous action and unwavering friendship have enabled me to devote all my time to the public service. I have not been compelled to spend any portion of my time in "mending my fences." My constituents have attended to that. God bless them!

One other thing. I do not know what committee assignments you new Members secured. If they are good, you are to be congratulated. If bad, do not be cast down. No congressional tenderfoot ever had poorer assignments than I had—Claims and Old Pensions—but I never complained or kicked. I went to work as though those committees suited me exactly. Here is an illustration of what may happen and how luck plays an important part: I was next to top Democrat on both Foreign Affairs and Patents for eight years—never advanced a peg so far as committees went. Just when, at the beginning of the ninth year on those two committees, I was about to become top Democrat on Foreign Affairs, Hon. John Sharp Williams, then minority leader, assigned me to the foot of Ways and Means, and at the end of four years through the happenings of politics in five different States I jumped from the foot to the head of the Democratic minority on Ways and Means. So it may be with you. Events over which you have no control may advance you more rapidly than you dreamed of or hoped for. My advice is this: "Whatever your hand finds to do, do it with your might."

BRIDGE ACROSS POTOMAC RIVER AT OR NEAR GREAT FALLS

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9830) authorizing the Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Great Falls.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the Postal Service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Potomac River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation from a point at or within 1 mile above or below Great Falls, in the county of Fairfax, in the State of Virginia, to a point at or within 1 mile above or below the Great Falls, in the county of Montgomery, in the State of Maryland, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act: *Provided*, That in addition to the authority vested in the Secretary of War, the location and design of said bridge shall be subject to the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission: *And provided further*, That no railway shall be operated on and over said bridge.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the States in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such States, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such States.

SEC. 3. The said Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Virginia, the State of Maryland, any public agency or political subdivision of either of such States within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and its approaches and any interest in real property necessary therefor by purchase or by condemnation or expropriation in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation or expropriation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge the same is acquired by condemnation or expropriation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and its approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in value, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion costs, not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches and acquiring such interest in real property, and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall be taken over or acquired by the States or public agencies or political subdivisions thereof, or by either of them, as provided in section 4 of this act, and if tolls are thereafter charged for the use thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the date of acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. The Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, shall within 90 days after the completion of such bridge file with the Secretary of War and with the Highway Departments of the States of Virginia and Maryland a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing the bridge and its approaches, the actual cost of acquiring any interest in real property necessary therefor, and the actual financing and promotion costs. The Secretary of War may, and upon request of the highway department of either of such States shall, at any time within three years after the completion of

such bridge, investigate such costs and determine the accuracy and the reasonableness of the costs alleged in the statement of costs so filed, and shall make a finding of the actual and reasonable costs of constructing, financing, and promoting such bridge; for the purpose of such investigation the said Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, shall make available all of its records in connection with the construction, financing, and promotion thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to the reasonable costs of the construction, financing, and promotion of the bridge shall be conclusive for the purposes mentioned in section 4 of this act, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

During the reading of the bill the following took place:

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENISON. In this connection I want to call attention to the provisions in the bill—that there are not only the usual provisions that we place in these bills, that plans, specifications, and location of the bridge must be approved by the Chief Engineer and the Secretary of War, as provided in general bridge law—but there is a special provision that the plans and locations of the bridge must be approved by the National Park and Planning Commission, and a further provision that the location and design of the bridge shall be such as not to interfere with any power development of the Potomac River under specific authorization of Congress or under the provisions of the Federal water power act. These special provisions have been put in to meet any possible objection that might be urged to a bridge at that location.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, as to the amendment on page 2 of the bill, in which the committee have stricken out the language, "*And provided further*, That no railway shall be operated on and over said bridge," and substituted for its language, as I understand, which inserts the word "highway."

As the gentleman well knows there has been an attempt made during recent years to construct a railroad bridge across the Potomac at or near Great Falls for the purpose of building a belt line through Arlington County, Va., and Montgomery County, Md. The residents of that section who have built beautiful homes have been opposed to that proposition. The federation of citizens of Montgomery County have stated that they have no objection to this bill provided their rights as to maintaining a residential zone are protected. I would like to know whether this language will protect them and prohibit the use of the bridge for railroad purposes?

Mr. DENISON. I wish to state on behalf of the committee that the committee has adopted certain forms for various bridge bills. We have a special form for all railroad bridge bills and a form for highway bridge bills. The committee thought that in conformity to the custom adopted by the committee and the forms adopted by the committee we would make this bill conform to our usual custom. Therefore we struck out the language and inserted "highway," so that the bill reads "construct, maintain, and operate a highway bridge and approaches thereto." Certainly the permittees would not under any law be allowed to use the highway bridge for railroad purposes, or to construct a railroad bridge under a bill to authorize them to construct a "highway" bridge. Therefore, I think I can assure the gentleman that the bridge could not be used or constructed for any purpose but a "highway" bridge, and could not be used for any purpose except highway purposes. I will say that I am in entire accord with the views of the gentleman from Maryland in regard to the advisability of constructing a railroad bridge across the river in that vicinity, and the committee that reported the bill was not in favor of the construction of such a bridge there.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has the gentleman looked up the definition of highway to see whether it includes trains and trolley cars?

Mr. DENISON. I do not have to look up the definition of highway. I think I understand what it means.

Mr. LINTHICUM. May it not include trains?

Mr. DENISON. No; a highway means a highway for vehicular traffic, and a railroad bridge means a bridge for railroad purposes only.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We speak of railroad highway. I was going to ask the gentleman whether it would be out of order to place after the word "highway" the words "for pedestrians and vehicular traffic"?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I want to call attention to the fact that the present Highway Bridge is used by the Virginia & Old Dominion Railroad Co. for electric trains.

Mr. DENISON. Yes. And you will find that the franchise for this bridge either grants them the right to build a railroad bridge, or merely authorize a general bridge without any limitation as to its use. Certainly, consent to build a "highway" bridge would not include consent to build a railroad bridge.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am as much opposed to a railroad bridge at that point as anyone else. The question has been brought up here as to the construction of the term "highway." Suppose that question should come before a court. The court would look to the report of the committee, which makes clear that the committee intended the word "highway" to be construed as excluding the construction of a railroad bridge. The court would go further and consider the statements made on the floor here now on behalf of the committee to show that that is the intent. I have not the slightest doubt as a lawyer that an injunction would be granted on that basis to prevent the use of the bridge for railway purposes.

Mr. BURTNESS. And supplementing what the gentleman from Virginia has said, let me make this suggestion: So far as the legislative intent is concerned, it seems to me that that would be very easily shown by the fact that there has been provided before by the Congress in acts specifically passed language showing exactly what has been used where we intended to have the construction of a railroad bridge; and where we intend to approve a bridge for vehicular and pedestrian uses we have used particular language, so that there would be no difficulty in ascertaining the legislative intent.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if the committee would have any objection to retaining the language prohibiting the use of this bridge as a railroad bridge?

Mr. DENISON. The committee considered this bill as it did every other bridge bill. I know of no reason why we should give any special treatment in this case different from any other bill, except where there are certain conditions which require special treatment, and we merely amended this bill to conform to the accepted custom of the committees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The sponsor of the bill inserted in it a provision that the bridge should not be used for railroad purposes. Therefore, the opponents of the bill withdrew their opposition. I can not see any reason why that language should not be retained now.

Mr. HERSEY. How could it possibly be used as a railroad bridge when you are asking toll?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Oh, the railroad companies could make a contract with the bridge company that would not prohibit them from doing that.

Mr. HERSEY. But a railroad train crossing over a bridge can not stop to pay toll.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. But the railroad company could make a contract with the bridge company. I am relying upon the language of the bill to protect the interests of the people of Montgomery County, Md., who are opposed to this if it is to be used for a railroad bridge. I ask that the language of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] as originally proposed in the bill be accepted by the committee.

Mr. DENISON. Personally, I have no objection to leaving the language in there, except that it makes it different from other bills.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after the article "a" insert the word "highway."

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the request made by the gentleman from Maryland, on behalf of the committee

and with the approval of the chairman of the committee, we ask leave to withdraw that committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the committee amendment just read will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "point," strike out the words "at or," and after the word "mile" strike out the words "above or," and in line 3, after the word "point," strike out the words "at or," and after the word "mile" strike out the words "above or."

Page 2, line 8, after the word "act," strike out the semicolon and the words "Provided that," and insert a colon and the words "Provided that."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "commission" strike out the comma and the words "and provided further that no railway shall be operated on and over said bridge."

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, to carry out the agreement or suggestion, on behalf of the committee I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the last amendment, striking out that language.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendment just read will be withdrawn. The Clerk will continue the reading of the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "bridge," in line 13, on page 2, insert a colon and the words: "Provided further, That the location and design of said bridge shall be such as not to interfere with any power development of said Potomac River that, under specific authorization of Congress or under the provisions of the Federal water power act, may be made in accordance with the project set forth in Senate Document 403, Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, or appropriate modification thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the last committee amendment. I would like to get some information.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is not entitled to the floor in opposition to any amendment. If the gentleman desires time, I yield him five minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, am I not entitled to recognition in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. SNELL. Not in the House.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] would be entitled to recognition by the Chair at any time to move the previous question. Therefore, in effect, the gentleman from New York is in charge.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this amendment, but rise in opposition to same in order to obtain information. I notice that the pending bill, H. R. 9830, grants to the Great Falls Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to operate and construct a toll bridge at Great Falls. I also note that the committee report indicates that the Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture recommends against favorable action on the bill. No printed hearings on this bill are available and I do not find a report from the Federal Power Commission incorporated in the committee report. Can the gentleman from Maryland inform me just what people constitute the Great Falls Bridge Co.?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not sponsor the bill. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore] can probably give you the information.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The corporation was organized under the laws of the State of Delaware. I can not inform the gentleman who the directors or stockholders are.

Mr. SCHAFER. Then it is possible that the stockholders and incorporators may be related to the power interests who are opposing the development of the Great Falls power site by the Government.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. On that point the information which I have obtained and on which I rely with a great deal of confidence is that there is no such thought in the mind of anybody connected with this project.

Mr. SCHAFER. The great power interests seem to be getting their fingers on every water-power site in the country. In view of the fact that the power interests are opposing the development by the Government of the power site at Great Falls, I shall oppose this bill. We should at least know who are behind it and who are interested in the Great Falls Bridge Co.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman need have no apprehension on that point. No power interest is sponsoring this bill or in any way connected with it.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to vote against this bill. I am opposed to granting to private corporations right to construct toll bridges, especially when the bridge to be constructed has a connection with the proposed Great Falls power development site.

Mr. DENISON. The committee did not want that amendment put in, but some members of the committee who had given attention to this matter, particularly the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], asked that it go in, and we put it in out of respect to his judgment.

Mr. SCHAFER. I am opposed to the entire bill, even though the pending amendment is incorporated. I shall vote for the amendment however. There has been under consideration for some time the proposed development of the power site at Great Falls, and a great deal of opposition to the development by the Federal Government has been created by those closely allied with the great power monopoly of this country. I therefore do not believe that we should grant a private corporation the right to construct a toll bridge on the power site, especially since we know not who or what are the financial interests in the corporation. I am opposed to this bill, and if it is within my power, under the parliamentary situation, I will obtain a record vote.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SCHAFER. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 112, noes 4.

Mr. SCHAFER. I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the passage of the bill. As many as are in favor of the passage of the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 321, nays 12, answered "present" 1, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]
YEAS—321

Abernethy	Canfield	Driver	Hale
Ackerman	Cannon	Dyer	Hall, Ind.
Adkins	Carew	Elliot	Hall, N. Dak.
Allgood	Carley	England	Hardy
Almon	Cartwright	Englebright	Hare
Andresen	Casey	Eslick	Hastings
Andrew	Celler	Estep	Haugen
Arentz	Chalmers	Evans, Calif.	Hayley
Arnold	Chapman	Evans, Mont.	Hersey
Aswell	Chase	Fenn	Hickey
Auf der Heide	Chindblom	Fish	Hill, Ala.
Bacharach	Clancy	Fisher	Hill, Wash.
Bachmann	Clarke	Fitzgerald, Roy G.	Hoch
Bacon	Cohen	Fitzpatrick	Hoffman
Bankhead	Cole, Iowa	Fletcher	Hogg
Barbour	Cole, Md.	Fort	Hooper
Beedy	Collier	Frear	Hope
Beers	Colton	Free	Houston, Del.
Bell	Connelly	Freeman	Howard, Nebr.
Black, N. Y.	Cooper, Ohio	Fulmer	Hudson
Bland	Corning	Furrow	Hudspeth
Bloom	Cox	Gambrill	Hughes
Bohn	Crail	Garber	Hull, Tenn.
Bowles	Crisp	Gardner, Ind.	Jeffers
Bowling	Crosser	Garner, Tex.	Jenkins
Bowman	Crowther	Garrett, Tenn.	Johnson, Ill.
Box	Cullen	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, Ind.
Boylan	Curry	Gasque	Johnson, Okla.
Brand, Ga.	Dallinger	Gibson	Johnson, Tex.
Briggs	Davenport	Gifford	Jones
Brigham	Davis	Gilbert	Kahn
Browne	Deal	Glynn	Kearns
Browning	Dempsey	Golder	Kemp
Buchanan	Denison	Goldsborough	Kent
Buckbee	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodwin	Kerr
Bulwinkle	Dickinson, Mo.	Gregory	Ketcham
Burdick	Dickstein	Green, Fla.	Kincheloe
Burtness	Dominick	Green, Iowa	Kopp
Burton	Doughton	Greenwood	Korell
Bushong	Doutrich	Griest	Kurtz
Byrns	Drane	Guyer	Kvale
Campbell	Drewry	Hadley	Lanham

Lankford	Moore, N. J.	Rogers	Thurston
Lea	Moore, Va.	Rowbottom	Tillman
Leavitt	Moorman	Rubey	Tilson
Leibach	Morehead	Rutherford	Timberlake
Letts	Morgan	Sanders, N. Y.	Tinkham
Lindsay	Morin	Sanders, Tex.	Treadway
Linthicum	Morrow	Sandlin	Tucker
Lowrey	Murphy	Sears, Nebr.	Underwood
Lozier	Nelson, Mo.	Seger	Vestal
Luce	Nelson, Wis.	Shallenberger	Vincent, Mich.
McClintie	Newton	Shreve	Vinson, Ga.
McDuffie	Niedringhaus	Simmons	Vinson, Ky.
McFadden	Norton, Nebr.	Sinclair	Ware
McKeown	O'Brien	Sinnott	Warren
McLaughlin	O'Connell	Smith	Wason
McLeod	O'Connor, La.	Snell	Watres
McMillan	Oldfield	Somers, N. Y.	Watson
McReynolds	Palmer	Speaks	Weaver
McSwain	Palmisano	Spruiell, Ill.	Welch, Calif.
McSweeney	Parker	Spruiell, Kans.	Weller
MacGregor	Parks	Stalker	Welsh, Pa.
Maas	Peavey	Steagall	White, Kans.
Madden	Peery	Steele	White, Me.
Magrady	Perkins	Stevenson	Whitehead
Major, Ill.	Porter	Stobbs	Whittington
Major, Mo.	Prall	Sullivan	Williams, Ill.
Manlove	Pratt	Summers, Wash.	Williams, Mo.
Mansfield	Purnell	Summers, Tex.	Wilson, La.
Mapes	Quin	Swank	Wilson, Miss.
Martin, La.	Ragon	Swick	Wolverton
Martin, Mass.	Rainey	Swing	Wood
Mead	Ramseyer	Tarver	Woodruff
Merritt	Rankin	Tatgenhorst	Wright
Michener	Ransley	Taylor, Colo.	Yates
Miller	Rayburn	Taylor, Tenn.	Yon
Monast	Reece	Temple	Zihlman
Montague	Reed, Ark.	Thatcher	
Mooney	Robinson, Iowa	Thompson	
Moore, Ky.	Robinson, Ky.		

NAYS—12

Blanton	Cooper, Wis.	Huddleston	Lampert
Cochran, Mo.	Hammer	Kading	Schafer
Collins	Holaday	LaGuardia	Schneider

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wyant

NOT VOTING—100

Aldrich	De Rouen	James	Quayle
Allen	Douglas, Ariz.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rathbone
Anthony	Douglass, Mass.	Johnson, Wash.	Reed, N. Y.
Ayres	Dowell	Kelly	Reid, Ill.
Beck, Pa.	Doyle	Kendall	Romjue
Beck, Wis.	Eaton	Kiess	Sabath
Begg	Edwards	Kindred	Sears, Fla.
Berger	Faust	King	Sirovich
Black, Tex.	Fitzgerald, W. T.	Knutson	Spearing
Boies	Foss	Kunz	Stedman
Brand, Ohio	French	Langley	Strong, Kans.
Britten	Frothingham	Larsen	Strong, Pa.
Busby	Fulbright	Lenthewood	Strother
Butler	Gallivan	Leech	Sweet
Carss	Graham	Lyon	Taber
Carter	Griffin	Menges	Underhill
Christopherson	Hall, Ill.	Michaelson	Updike
Clague	Hancock	Milligan	Wainwright
Cochran, Pa.	Harrison	Moore, Ohio	White, Colo.
Combs	Howard, Okla.	Nelson, Me.	Williams, Tex.
Connally, Tex.	Hull, Morton D.	Norton, N. J.	Williamson
Connolly, Pa.	Hull, Wm. E.	O'Connor, N. Y.	Wingo
Cramton	Igoe	Oliver, Ala.	Winter
Darrow	Irwin	Oliver, N. Y.	Woodrum
Davey	Jacobstein	Pou	Wurzbach

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
Until further notice:

Mr. Begg with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Christopherson with Mr. Black of Texas.
Mr. Anthony with Mr. Gallivan.
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Faust with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. Cramton with Mr. Davey.
Mr. Hancock with Mr. Connolly of Texas.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Fulbright.
Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Milligan.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Pou.
Mr. Reid of Illinois with Mr. Wingo.
Mr. Kiess with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Sweet with Mr. Busby.
Mr. Underhill with Mr. Woodrum.
Mr. French with Mr. Edwards.
Mr. Dowell with Mr. Spearing.
Mr. Clague with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Beck of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lyon.
Mr. Kendall with Mr. O'Connor of New York.
Mr. Leech with Mr. Romjue.
Mr. Darrow with Mr. Larsen.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Quayle.
Mr. Foss with Mr. Igoe.
Mr. Graham with Mr. Oliver of New York.
Mr. Johnson of Washington with Mr. Carss.
Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stedman.
Mr. Moore of Ohio with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. King with Mr. White of Colorado.
Mr. Wainwright with Mr. Sears of Florida.
Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Howard of Oklahoma.
Mr. Allen with Mr. Oliver of Alabama.
Mrs. Langley with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Brand of Ohio with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. Cochran of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jacobstein.

Mr. James with Mr. Douglass of Massachusetts.
Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Combs.
Mr. Strother with Mr. De Rouen.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Berger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. PARKER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT—ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10286) making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message in writing from the President of the United States was presented to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on the following dates the President had approved bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 2, 1928:

H. R. 83. An act to approve Act No. 24 of the Session Laws of 1927 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within Hanapepe, in the district of Waimea, island and county of Kauai"; and

H. R. 3144. An act for the relief of Augustus C. Turner.

On March 3, 1928:

H. R. 48. An act to erect a tablet or marker to the memory of the Federal soldiers who were killed at the Battle of Perryville, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8282. An act to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands bordering on and adjacent to Summit Lake, Nev., for the Paiute, Shoshone, and other Indians;

H. R. 8281. An act to provide for the withdrawal of certain described lands in the State of Nevada for the use and benefit of the Indians of the Walker River Reservation;

H. R. 8291. An act to amend section 1 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L. 855), "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes";

H. R. 8292. An act to reserve 120 acres on the public domain for the use and benefit of the Koosharem Band of Indians residing in the vicinity of Koosharem, Utah;

H. R. 8527. An act for the relief of the International Petroleum Co. (Ltd.), of Toronto, Canada; and

H. R. 9037. An act to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands in Inyo County, Calif., for Indian use.

On March 5, 1928:

H. R. 9994. An act to reimburse certain Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., for part or full value of an allotment of land to which they were individually entitled;

H. R. 10635. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes;

H. R. 482. An act to provide relief for the victims of the airplane accident at Langin Field, Moundsville, W. Va.; and

H. R. 5925. An act for the relief of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

On March 6, 1928:

H. R. 10298. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La.;

H. R. 121. An act authorizing the Cairo Association of Commerce, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 5679. An act authorizing the Nebraska-Iowa Bridge Corporation, a Delaware corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River between Washington County, Nebr., and Harrison County, Iowa; and

H. R. 9036. An act to increase the salary of the Librarian of Congress.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the day be yielded to the Committee on Agriculture without the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce losing the call; in other words, that next week, or on the next Calendar Wednesday, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the balance of the day may be occupied by the Committee on Agriculture, without prejudice to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be no objection, but let us get the matter clear. The Committee on Agriculture will have the rest of the afternoon, amounting to something like 1 hour and 40 minutes, if we adjourn around the usual time. Is it the purpose to give the Committee on Agriculture this extra time and then let that committee have its regular day?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will only ask for one other day?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. In other words, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce simply yields the remainder of the time to-day to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, let us have this perfectly clear. If the Committee on Agriculture were to take the floor in its own right to-day, it would have only one other day, but I understand it is the purpose to permit that committee to have this time and two other days. Is that the understanding?

Mr. TILSON. The only purpose is that the Committee on Agriculture may use the remainder of the afternoon without prejudice either as to the two days due that committee or as to another day for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT PROVISIONS OF LAW NOT IN NEW CODE

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Record a list which I have just received from the legislative reference service, prepared by Mr. McClenon, showing the number of permanent provisions of law not in the new code. I have spoken on the subject of the code several times and a few Members have complained that there were quite a number of omissions. Mr. McClenon has made a thorough search of such omitted provisions and has furnished me with a list of them. I think it would be of value to the Members and also to others on the outside interested in the code to have this list in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will say that this list has already been furnished to the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, and that committee with its expert helpers is going over and checking this list, with the idea of using whatever there is of value in this list in the further codification of our laws and to free the code in so far as that is possible of all errors.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does not the gentleman think it would be very valuable to have that printed as a House document, in order that it might furnish a sort of supplement to the code, pending the revision of the code?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I thought I would first have it inserted in the RECORD, so that gentlemen can go over it in the RECORD, and then if they deem it of sufficient importance to have it printed as a House document, that can be attended to later.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the list just referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following list prepared by Mr. McClenon, of the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress, showing the number of permanent provisions of law not in the new code:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, March 7, 1928.

Hon. C. WILLIAM RAMSEYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMSEYER: Mr. McClenon tells me that some time ago you asked him if he had made any list of permanent provisions not in the code. He has just completed such a list. I am sending you a copy, herewith inclosed.

Very respectfully,

H. H. B. MEYER,
Director Legislative Reference Service.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE.

PERMANENT PROVISIONS NOT IN THE CODE

(Suggested locations in code given in parenthesis)

R. S. 18, 19 (2: 1a, 1b).

R. S. 55 (2: 71a).

R. S. 176 (5: 371a, 524a).

- R. S. 485 (35: 17a).
 R. S. 504 (44: 139a).
 R. S. 908 (1: 29a).
 R. S. 1009 (34: 1145a).
 R. S. 1109 (10: 196a).
 R. S. 1126 (10: 238a).
 R. S. 1139 (10: 1301a; doubtful).
 R. S. 1144, 1149 (10: 1237, 1238).
 R. S. 1152 (10: 185a).
 R. S. 1211, second clause (10: 522a; doubtful).
 [R. S. 1225, see 25 Stat. 491, below.]
 R. S. 1235 (10: 642a).
 R. S. 1236 (10: 640).
 R. S. 1239 (10: 165; doubtful).
 R. S. 1269 (10: 901).
 R. S. 1273, last clause (10: 741a).
 R. S. 1277 (10: 781a; doubtful).
 R. S. 1293 (10: 716a).
 R. S. 1295 (10: 781b; doubtful).
 R. S. 1299 (10: 879; doubtful).
 R. S. 1301 (10: 875a; doubtful).
 R. S. 1447 (34: 283a; doubtful).
 R. S. 1531 (34: 451a; doubtful).
 R. S. 1579, 1595 (34: 901a, 901b).
 R. S. 1618 (34: 711a).
 R. S. 1624, art. 18 (34: 1200; doubtful).
 R. S. 1662-1664 (50: 50, 50a, 50b).
 R. S. 1687 (22: 128a; doubtful).
 R. S. 1741 (22: 124).
 R. S. 1786 (5: 14a).
 R. S. 1842 (48: 1453a).
 R. S. 1845-1852, 1854 (48: 1455a, 1455b).
 R. S. 1856 (48: 1457a).
 R. S. 1859 (48: 1459a).
 R. S. 1862-1865, 1867 (48: 1462a, 1462b).
 R. S. 1869-1877 (48: 1463a).
 R. S. 1885 (48: 1468a).
 [R. S. 1889, see 24 Stat. 171, sec. 5, below.]
 R. S. 1891 (48: 1480b).
 R. S. 1912 (48: 1464a).
 R. S. 2043-2045 (25: 24a).
 R. S. 2256 (43: 120).
 R. S. 2527, 2568 (19: 28a, 28b; doubtful).
 R. S. 2618 (19: 27; doubtful).
 R. S. 2752 (14: 17a; doubtful).
 R. S. 3048, last sentence (19: 152c).
 R. S. 3073 (46: 136).
 R. S. 3112 (19: 282a).
 R. S. 3313 (26: 246a; doubtful).
 R. S. 3592, 3594 (31: 476a, b).
 R. S. 3655, 3656 (31: 479a).
 R. S. 3666 (31: 608).
 R. S. 3781 (44: 216a).
 R. S. 3804 (44: 192a).
 R. S. 3810 (44: 215a).
 R. S. 3811 (44: 280a).
 R. S. 3819 (44: 47a).
 R. S. 4229-31 (46: 147-149).
 R. S. 4242-44 (14: 93a; doubtful).
 R. S. 4246 (14: 94a).
 R. S. 4247 (14: 103a; doubtful).
 R. S. 4249, proviso (14: 95a).
 R. S. 4594, 4595 (46: 550, 551; doubtful).
 R. S. 4631-34 (34: 955-958).
 R. S. 4836 (24: 155).
 R. S. 4852 (24: 211a; doubtful).
 18 Stat. 23, ch. 57 (5: 11a).
 18 Stat. 70, sec. 2, 3 (22: 59; doubtful).
 18 Stat. 113, sec. 2 (1: 29b).
 18 Stat. 288, No. 12 (44: 187a).
 18 Stat. 296, sec. 3 (31: 403a).
 18 Stat. 372, par. 4 (33: 729a).
 18 Stat. 375, par. 9 (16: 657a).
 18 Stat. 388, last paragraph (47: 16; doubtful).
 18 Stat. 398, last paragraph (12: 42; 26: 6).
 18 Stat. 449, sec. 5 (25: 32a).
 18 Stat. 455, sec. 1 (50: 58a).
 18 Stat. 477, sec. 3 (8: 138a).
 19 Stat. 64, sec. 6 (12: 16; doubtful).
 19 Stat. 149, par. 5 (31: 400).
 19 Stat. 212, last sentence (10: 196b).
 19 Stat. 243, par. 5 (10: 831a).
 19 Stat. 244, par. 6 (34: 303).
 19 Stat. 269, sec. 4 (1: 29c).
 19 Stat. 347, proviso (24: 201a).
 20 Stat. 27, ch. 26 (1: 29c).
 20 Stat. 140, ch. 259 (39: 602a).
 20 Stat. 165, sec. 11 (14: 104a; doubtful).
 20 Stat. 166, ch. 267 (34: 276a).
 20 Stat. 187, last par. (26: 40a).
 20 Stat. 193, second proviso (48: 1455c; doubtful).
 20 Stat. 258, ch. 5 (16: 361a).
 20 Stat. 386, par. 2 (19: 539a).
 20 Stat. 390, second proviso (31: 604a).
 20 Stat. 470, sec. 1 (38: 91a).
 21 Stat. 27, par. 2 (26: 46a; doubtful).
 21 Stat. 30, sec. 3 (38: 76).
 21 Stat. 275, first proviso (24: 190).
 21 Stat. 276, proviso (5: 523a).
 21 Stat. 289, sec. 3 (16: 360).
 21 Stat. 290, sec. 7 (16: 367a).
 21 Stat. 308, No. 44 (1: 29d; 44: 193a, doubtful).
 21 Stat. 312, ch. 7 (48: 1455b).
 21 Stat. 474, par. 1 (33: 647).
 22 Stat. 2, ch. 7 (40: 191a).
 22 Stat. 119, last proviso (10: 804a; doubtful).
 22 Stat. 325, last proviso (40: 185a; doubtful).
 22 Stat. 309, par. 7 (33: 494a).
 22 Stat. 382, No. 28 (2: 148a).
 22 Stat. 391, No. 63 (44: 250a).
 22 Stat. 405, sec. 6 (5: 637a).
 22 Stat. 457, first proviso (10: 948).
 22 Stat. 457, last proviso (31: 214a).
 23 Stat. 108, last proviso (10: 1231a).
 23 Stat. 209, par. 2 (40: 163a).
 23 Stat. 233, par. 7 (22: 20a; doubtful).
 23 Stat. 237, first sentence, (22: 85a).
 23 Stat. 329, par. 10 (22: 20a; doubtful).
 24 Stat. 80, secs. 1, 2 (46: 552).
 24 Stat. 171, sec. 5 (48: 1470a).
 24 Stat. 246, par. 1 (31: 607).
 24 Stat. 329, sec. 2 (33: 404a; doubtful).
 24 Stat. 371, sec. 3 (38: 263; doubtful).
 24 Stat. 372, sec. 6 (38: 263a).
 24 Stat. 441, sec. 5 (7: 369).
 24 Stat. 442, sec. 10 (7: 381a).
 24 Stat. 444, sec. 4 (24: 74a; doubtful).
 24 Stat. 515, par. 4, first clause (31: 405 or 406).
 24 Stat. 540, proviso (24: 92a).
 24 Stat. 637, secs. 13, 14 (48: 1480a).
 24 Stat. 641, sec. 26 (48: 1480a).
 25 Stat. 43, ch. 18 (39: 602a).
 25 Stat. 346, par. 1 (39: 14).
 25 Stat. 491, ch. 1037 (10: 1182; 34 Stat. 1127a; doubtful).
 25 Stat. 533, par. 4 (40: 42a).
 25 Stat. 750, ch. 309 (19: 28c; doubtful).
 25 Stat. 787-788, secs. 23, 25, 27 (25: 215a).
 25 Stat. 831, par. 6 (24: 18a).
 25 Stat. 831, last proviso (10: 1239).
 25 Stat. 844, end of runover par. (39: 41a).
 25 Stat. 955, par. 4 (31: 335; cited but not adequately set forth).
 25 Stat. 971, first sentence (5: 195a; doubtful).
 25 Stat. 1019, No. 3 (22: 266a).
 26 Stat. 50, sec. 3 (1: 29e).
 26 Stat. 56, ch. 85 (39: 600).
 26 Stat. 154, par. 3 (24: 18a).
 26 Stat. 259, last proviso (44: 283).
 26 Stat. 289, sec. 2 (31: 410a).
 26 Stat. 313, ch. 728 (27: 52a).
 26 Stat. 333-336 (16: 421a-k; doubtful).
 26 Stat. 400, last proviso (10: 861a).
 26 Stat. 455, sec. 11 (33: 413a).
 26 Stat. 653, sec. 1, last clause, 654, sec. 9, first clause (31: 606a).
 26 Stat. 716, ch. 70 (10: 1182; 34: 1127a).
 26 Stat. 769, proviso (50: 75a).
 26 Stat. 1077, par. 3 (24: 240a).
 26 Stat. 1079, ch. 547, 2 (39: 692; doubtful).
 27 Stat. 178, par. 1 (10: 7716b).
 27 Stat. 336, sec. 1, proviso (10: 502a).
 27 Stat. 349, sec. 2 (38: 313; doubtful).
 27 Stat. 446, sec. 6 (46: 196; doubtful).
 27 Stat. 479, second proviso (10: 880).
 27 Stat. 500, par. 3 (22: 264a; doubtful).
 27 Stat. 730, last paragraph (34: 154; doubtful).
 28 Stat. 32, sec. 4 (39: 728a).
 28 Stat. 75, sec. 10 (16: 31a).
 28 Stat. 102, sec. 2 (15: 222).
 28 Stat. 225, ch. 202 (14: 95b; doubtful).
 28 Stat. 237, par. 1 (10: 750a).
 28 Stat. 252, last paragraph (40: 84a).
 28 Stat. 357, par. 2 (33: 601a).
 28 Stat. 587, No. 37 (22: 266b).

- 28 Stat. 588, sec. 6 (5: 461a; doubtful).
 28 Stat. 597-599 (16: 421m-t; doubtful).
 28 Stat. 607, sec. 44 (44: 39a).
 28 Stat. 614, par. 9 (44: 193b).
 28 Stat. 623, sec. 94, first clause (44: 219).
 28 Stat. 651-653 (16: 421u-cc; doubtful).
 28 Stat. 959, second proviso (2: 131a).
 29 Stat. 21, proviso (16: 4210; doubtful).
 29 Stat. 60, proviso (10: 870a).
 29 Stat. 96, ch. 120 (34: 515, 155).
 29 Stat. 136, ch. 241 (48: 1464b).
 29 Stat. 316, par. 14 (31: 610).
 29 Stat. 459, No. 1 (44: 267a).
 29 Stat. 628, sec. 8 (26: 418).
 30 Stat. 43, par. 5 (16: 4211; doubtful).
 30 Stat. 44, par. 1 (16: 421dd; doubtful).
 30 Stat. 316, sec. 4, reference to Revised Statutes (44: 193c).
 30 Stat. 329, ch. 75 (16: 362a).
 30 Stat. 415, sec. 14 (19: 456a).
 30 Stat. 418, sec. 1 (43: 1176).
 30 Stat. 455, secs. 14-16 (26: 907a-e; doubtful).
 30 Stat. 475, sec. 4 (34: 36a; doubtful).
 30 Stat. 605, second proviso (31: 177).
 30 Stat. 616, proviso (30: 80; doubtful).
 30 Stat. 673, par. 7 (16: 554a).
 30 Stat. 721, ch. 583 (10: 16).
 30 Stat. 751, No. 56 (2: 148b).
 30 Stat. 764, sec. 26 (46: 714).
 30 Stat. 841-843 (16: 421ee-ll; doubtful).
 30 Stat. 1006, sec. 10, part of first sentence (34: 81a).
 30 Stat. 1009, sec. 23 (34: 691).
 30 Stat. 1253-1343 (48: 122, etc.; doubtful).
 31 Stat. 152, sec. 64 (48: 621).
 31 Stat. 206, first proviso (10: 214).
 31 Stat. 206, second proviso (48: 50).
 31 Stat. 322, sec. 3 (48: 66a; doubtful).
 31 Stat. 330, sec. 29 (48: 51; doubtful).
 31 Stat. 333-552 (48: 40a, etc.; doubtful).
 31 Stat. 612, par. 9 (40: 166a).
 31 Stat. 719, No. 33 (40: 186a).
 31 Stat. 750, sec. 12 (10: 240).
 31 Stat. 928, par. 1 (7: 416a; doubtful).
 31 Stat. 1000, par. 5 (40: 164).
 32 Stat. 51, sec. 4 (13: 5a).
 32 Stat. 282, ch. 941 (24: 150).
 32 Stat. 484, ch. 1303 (14: 124a; doubtful).
 32 Stat. 696-706 (48: 1227, etc.).
 32 Stat. 711, sec. 85 (31: 473a).
 32 Stat. 735, No. 5 (2: 132a).
 32 Stat. 744, last par. (25: 842a).
 32 Stat. 929, first proviso (5: 102a).
 32 Stat. 934, par. 4 (10: 861b).
 32 Stat. 1198, par. 5 (34: 691).
 33 Stat. 191, last proviso (25: 52a).
 33 Stat. 225, ch. 1403 (10: 1182; 34: 1127a).
 33 Stat. 396, par. 3 (19: 539a).
 33 Stat. 529-534 (48: 40a, etc.; doubtful).
 33 Stat. 692-697 (48: 1227, etc.).
 33 Stat. 832, proviso (10: 177).
 33 Stat. 986, ch. 1416 (32: 39a).
 33 Stat. 1049, last proviso (25: 272a).
 33 Stat. 1170, par. 1 (48: 41a).
 33 Stat. 1211, par. 3 (20: 144).
 34 Stat. 5, sec. 3 (48: 1307a).
 34 Stat. 56, ch. 631 (24: 281a; doubtful).
 34 Stat. 250, first proviso (10: 861c).
 34 Stat. 328, par. 5 (25: 142a).
 34 Stat. 373, par. 1 (25: 391a).
 34 Stat. 417, par. 7 (2: 35a).
 34 Stat. 556, proviso (34: 916a).
 34 Stat. 595, sec. 9 (49: 46a).
 34 Stat. 879, sec. 3 (38: 325a; doubtful).
 34 Stat. 1163, second proviso (10: 1081a).
 34 Stat. 1168, last proviso (10: 711a).
 34 Stat. 1217, par. 2 (31: 611a; doubtful).
 34 Stat. 1282, ch. 2908; (48: 1181; doubtful).
 35 Stat. 64, sec. 3 (38: 197a; doubtful).
 35 Stat. 155, par. 3 (34: 691).
 35 Stat. 255, proviso (7: 395; doubtful).
 35 Stat. 256, par. 2 (7: 416b).
 35 Stat. 400, sec. 4 (32: 80).
 35 Stat. 432, proviso (10: 1161a; doubtful).
 35 Stat. 603-605, secs. 10-18 (48: 52, etc.; doubtful).
 35 Stat. 667, first proviso (39: 635a).
 35 Stat. 754, par. 3 (31: 609a).
 35 Stat. 776, proviso (34: 973a).
 35 Stat. 888, lines 3-4 (25: 24b).
 35 Stat. 1065, secs. 2-6 (19: 50a).
 35 Stat. 1164, No. 11 (33: 423a).
 35 Stat. 1166, No. 15 (10: 1120).
 36 Stat. 293, ch. 149 (16: 421e; doubtful).
 36 Stat. 297, sec. 1 (34: 1092).
 36 Stat. 508, par. 3 (5: 458a).
 36 Stat. 593-596 (33: 465).
 36 Stat. 603, ch. 370 (32: 39b).
 36 Stat. 658, first proviso (33: 643).
 36 Stat. 352, ch. 424 (48: 46a).
 36 Stat. 858, sec. 12 (25: 373a).
 36 Stat. 1104, sec. 62-64 (28: 123a-c).
 36 Stat. 1150, sec. 212 (28: 48a).
 36 Stat. 1151, sec. 213 (49: 46b).
 36 Stat. 1167, sec. 294 (28: 432a).
 36 Stat. 1214, par. 3 (38: 9).
 37 Stat. 80, sec. 3 (42: 192a).
 37 Stat. 113, sec. 4 (38: 268a; doubtful).
 37 Stat. 319, ch. 309 (2: 148c).
 37 Stat. 320, sec. 3 (31: 711).
 37 Stat. 344, par. 4, 345, par. 2 (34: 53).
 37 Stat. 346, last proviso (34: 531a).
 37 Stat. 350, par. 11 (34: 691).
 37 Stat. 502, sec. 13 (16: 643a).
 37 Stat. 699, ch. 90 (27: 52b).
 37 Stat. 706, second proviso (10: 78).
 37 Stat. 816, proviso (33: 26a).
 37 Stat. 881, sec. 10 (40: 101a).
 37 Stat. 1019, ch. 169 (38: 268b).
 38 Stat. 110, ch. 10 (22: 34a).
 38 Stat. 225, par. 5 (33: 730).
 38 Stat. 233, sec. 3 (36: 13).
 38 Stat. 347-351 (10: ch. 20a).
 38 Stat. 378, ch. 91, 92 (22: 34b, 34c).
 38 Stat. 393, second proviso (34: 891a).
 38 Stat. 395, second proviso (34: 204; doubtful).
 38 Stat. 410, second proviso (34: 977).
 38 Stat. 657, par. 10 (20: 152; cited but not incorporated).
 38 Stat. 780, No. 49 (24: 74).
 38 Stat. 948, second proviso (34: 691).
 38 Stat. 1066, provisos (10: 79).
 [39 Stat. 9, sec. 3, see 42 Stat. 389, sec. 2, below.]
 39 Stat. 224, sec. 3 (34: 691).
 39 Stat. 232, ch. 158 (48: 521).
 39 Stat. 336, sec. 4 (31: 582a).
 39 Stat. 612, par. 2 (34: 691).
 39 Stat. 800, sec. 900 (15: 78; 19: 107).
 39 Stat. 810, last paragraph (32: 165; doubtful).
 39 Stat. 821, par. 7 (31: 583a).
 39 Stat. 986, sec. 18 (25: 353a).
 39 Stat. 1189, par. 9 (34: 971a).
 40 Stat. 37, sec. 7 (12: 143a, 462a).
 40 Stat. 411-426, 460, par. 2 (50: 25, etc.; doubtful).
 40 Stat. 597, par. 3 (48: 1056; doubtful).
 40 Stat. 646, par. 1 (50: 25, etc.; doubtful).
 40 Stat. 753, sec. 3 (39: 117a).
 40 Stat. 889, ch. XVII, sec. 2 (10: 627a).
 40 Stat. 891, sec. 10 (10: 1393).
 40 Stat. 966, sec. 5, 1020-21 (50: 25, etc.; doubtful).
 40 Stat. 1057, sec. 1 (26: 1273; doubtful).
 40 Stat. 1292, sec. 5 (13: 2a).
 40 Stat. 1313, sec. 9 (15: 366; doubtful).
 [41 Stat. 35-36. See 42 Stat. 1511-16; below.]
 41 Stat. 364, sec. 3 (40: 76a; doubtful).
 41 Stat. 452, ch. 88 (14: 40; doubtful).
 41 Stat. 499, sec. 502 (49: 80).
 41 Stat. 506, proviso (14: 130; doubtful).
 41 Stat. 531, sec. 4 (23: 52a; 24: 30).
 41 Stat. 817, par. 3 (34: 836; doubtful).
 41 Stat. 834, sec. 2 (34: 2a; doubtful).
 [41 Stat. 977, ch. 241. See 42 Stat. 1511-16; below.]
 41 Stat. 1025, par. 5 (48: 1057; doubtful).
 41 Stat. 1181, par. 1 (44: 297).
 41 Stat. 1384, par. 2 (20: 80a).
 42 Stat. 223, sec. 4 (27: 65).
 42 Stat. 389, sec. 2 (35: 2a).
 42 Stat. 600, par. 13 (22: 84d).
 42 Stat. 646, last proviso (40: 18a).
 42 Stat. 771, last proviso (40: 18b).
 42 Stat. 1007-11, secs. 5-9, 12-22 (48: 1359, etc.; doubtful).
 42 Stat. 1013, ch. 401 (10: 881).
 42 Stat. 1281, ch. 101 (43: 611).
 42 Stat. 1374, ch. 174 (19: 5a).
 42 Stat. 1510, sec. 11 (36: 131a).
 42 Stat. 1511-16 (50: 25, etc.; doubtful).

- 43 Stat. 17, sec. 2 (12:1016).
- 43 Stat. 112, ch. 136 (22:269).
- 43 Stat. 146-152 (2:60, etc.).
- 43 Stat. 175, sec. 4-6 (40:76b; doubtful).
- 43 Stat. 473, ch. 277 (44:298).
- 43 Stat. 665-666, sec. 2, 4 (36:14).
- 44 Stat. 159, first proviso (39:667).
- 44 Stat. 208, sec. 1, 2 (20:164-167).
- 44 Stat. 210, sec. 10 (24:263).
- 44 Stat. 210, sec. 12 (20:172).
- 44 Stat. 283, last paragraph (10:343; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 288, par. 1 (24:277).
- 44 Stat. 289, par. 4 (16:421 1; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 295, par. 6 (48:1316a; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 305, par. 4 (3:45).
- 44 Stat. 314, par. 2 (50:155).
- 44 Stat. 351, par. 1 (15:195; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 365, par. 7 (35:16).
- 44 Stat. 403, ch. 246 (36:11a).
- 44 Stat. 406, ch. 252 (50:25, etc.; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 529, par. 1 (5:547).
- 44 Stat. 542, par. 1 (2:72).
- 44 Stat. 545, par. 2 (40:206).
- 44 Stat. 551, par. 1 (44:145).
- 44 Stat. 551, par. 2 (44:120).
- 44 Stat. 627, ch. 372 (40:53).
- 44 Stat. 754, sec. 7 (43:612).
- 44 Stat. 754, ch. 623 (22:269).
- 44 Stat. 762, ch. 660 (40:173a).
- 44 Stat. 774, ch. 698 (40:216a).
- 44 Stat. 814, sec. 5 (40:53).
- 44 Stat. 834, ch. 760 (40:69a; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 835, sec. 3 (40:76).
- 44 Stat. 890, ch. 777 (43:569; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 924-926 (48:1358a-c; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 926, sec. 6 (48:1307a; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 927-931 (48:1358d-s; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 931, ch. 20 (40:216b).
- 44 Stat. 938, par. 2 (5:496).
- 44 Stat. 979, par. 3 (7:367).
- 44 Stat. 979, par. 4 (7:419).
- 44 Stat. 991, par. 3 (16:572a).
- 44 Stat. 1005, last par. (21:129).
- 44 Stat. 1023, ch. 52 (48:1358f, etc.; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 1034, first proviso (26:73).
- 44 Stat. 1037, par. 3 (3:53).
- 44 Stat. 1038, par. 4 (8:176).
- 44 Stat. 1045, first proviso (40:25).
- 44 Stat. 1049, last proviso (39:667).
- 44 Stat. 1073, par. 2 (5:636).
- 44 Stat. 1075, par. 1 (30:15a; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 1110, par. 5 (10:1431, 1460, 1461).
- 44 Stat. 1114, last par. (10:1206).
- 44 Stat. 1117, par. 5 (10:77).
- 44 Stat. 1120, second proviso (10:307).
- 44 Stat. 1121, last proviso (10:727).
- 44 Stat. 1131, par. 1 (10:1138).
- 44 Stat. 1131, last par. (10:1121a, 1145).
- 44 Stat. 1134, second proviso (38:461).
- 44 Stat. 1136, par. 1 (10:74).
- 44 Stat. 1138, par. 7 (24:277).
- 44 Stat. 1140, par. 1 (16:421; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 1146, par. 5 (48:1316a; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 1152, par. 1 (2:72).
- 44 Stat. 1154, par. 13 (40:206).
- 44 Stat. 1160, par. 1 (44:145).
- 44 Stat. 1160, par. 2 (44:120).
- 44 Stat. 1193, par. 6 (5:299, 300).
- 44 Stat. 1196, par. 4 (5:315).
- 44 Stat. 1199, par. 2 (5:593).
- 44 Stat. 1201, last par. (15:195; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 1215, par. 9 (16:747).
- 44 Stat. 1217, par. 1 (35:16).
- 44 Stat. 1219, third proviso (40:115a).
- 44 Stat. 1314, par. 10 (5:76; 10:914; 34:1000).
- 44 Stat. 1317, proviso (5:214).
- 44 Stat. 1386 (5:461b; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 1390, ch. 360 (48:1058; doubtful).
- 44 Stat. 1421, ch. 504 (24:141).

NOTE: The above list does not include references to provisions which have been added or noted in the galley proofs of the "Code Supplement." Explanations as to most of the provisions listed are contained in my statements of November 18 and December 28, 1926, and November 22, 1927. [W. H. McClenon, February 24, 1928.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL GENERAL TO LIBERIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State recommending legislation authorizing an increase in the salary of the minister resident and consul general to Liberia from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per annum.

I am in full accord with the reasons advanced by the Secretary of State why the increase should be allowed, and I strongly urge upon the Congress the enactment of legislation authorizing it.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 7, 1928.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—
Mr. CRAMTON (at the request of Mr. MAPES), for one day, on account of illness.

Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. EDWARDS, for one day, on account of illness.

ADDRESS OF HON. FINIS J. GARRETT

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last evening the minority leader, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], spoke over the radio for about eight minutes. I would like the permission of the House to insert his remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made over the radio by Hon. FINIS J. GARRETT, minority leader of the House, on Tuesday evening, March 6, 1928:

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION IN CONGRESS

When the Seventieth Congress convened for its first session on December 5, 1927, the general belief seemed to be that a constructive program of legislation of a major character was not only possible but highly probable.

This program embraced:

First. A reduction of internal revenue taxes, the chief feature of this being revision downward of the corporation income tax, which practically all familiar with the subject knew to be just and proper.

Second. Some character of legislation relative to agriculture which would, in so far as legislation can, alleviate the distress of this basic industry, whose suffering has been cumulative over a period of several years, since the Republican Party took charge of all branches of the Government on March 4, 1921.

Third. Legislation for the control of flood waters of the Mississippi River Valley, recognizing the national obligation in this particular.

Fourth. A disposition, in some proper way, of the Muscle Shoals power and nitrate properties, in the State of Alabama.

No one of these questions legitimately involved any factor of partisan politics, but, as is well known to all familiar with congressional procedure, the obligation and responsibility of initiating the measures to deal with them rested upon the majority party. Our Republican friends organized both branches of Congress, electing their officers and naming their committees. At no time has the minority approached the program in any save a constructive spirit.

We have been in session now three months, and it can not be said that any proposal as to any one of these matters has reached a stage which encourages the slightest hope of final enactment.

True, a tax reduction bill passed the House in December, but it was put to rest in the Senate Committee on Finance. Just what the exact state of mind of those of the inner circle of the majority party's organization is on this subject has not been fully disclosed to the public, but the belief very generally obtains that the bill is permanently shelved, so far as the present session of Congress is concerned.

For some reason which has never been explained the House Committee on Agriculture did not even begin hearings on agricultural legislation until six weeks of the session had elapsed, and they have been having hearings almost all the time since. Very little that was new has been presented at these hearings, and the best information now obtainable appears to be that that committee of the House, following the example of the Senate committee, will report a bill which there is every reason to feel assured will, if it passes Congress, meet an Executive veto.

That Republican presidential politics has entered as a chief factor into the consideration of this question is so manifest as to admit of no doubt.

An informed and discriminating people who remember the President's veto of the so-called McNary-Haugen bill at last Congress and the

fundamental economic and constitutional grounds upon which he based it will readily understand that any bill containing the equalization-fee principle must meet with similar action at his hands. There has never been from any source even an intimation that his convictions upon the subject have undergone any change. No one believes that there is a remote chance of passing the measure over a veto and, to some of us at least, it seems worse than childish to trifle with this most serious interest, as it now appears to be the purpose to do.

Differences between the executive and legislative branches over the question of local participation in future flood-control work have placed that legislation in a precarious situation, and Muscle Shoals seems destined to continue a thing idle, with its consequent byplay of local and national politics.

The appropriation bills are, of course, being passed as rapidly as necessity dictates, but these are the only measures of consequence that are being passed or that now seem likely to be enacted.

Speaking circumspectly and respectfully, and basing my words upon known existing cross currents of thought in the Congress, I feel fully justified in saying that the present outlook is that this session of Congress is to pass into history as well-nigh a blank page.

Should these brief remarks have a tendency to bring about anything different, I shall feel that they have not been vainly uttered.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about 5 or 10 minutes on the subject of the participation of the American group in the Interparliamentary Union conference in Paris last year.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to address the House for 5 or 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, my primary purpose in appearing here now is to get permission to insert in the RECORD correspondence indulged by some of my colleagues who attended the Interparliamentary Union's conference in Paris last year. I shall not attempt now to make anything in the nature of an official report of our doings over there, preferring to leave that to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, who was the president of our group; and I dare say that soon or late he will make an extended report of our participation therein.

The fact of the matter is that we did not participate very much. [Laughter.] They have a queer system over there. We met in the Senate Chamber in the Palace of Luxembourg, and we worked under the rules of the French Senate.

It may be interesting to you gentlemen to understand, or at least to hear, a comparison between the rules of the French chamber and our own rules. You know all of you, and some of you particularly, that I have never been overly in love with our own House gag rules, and yet I much prefer them to the French system. [Laughter.]

In the French chamber, if it be true that the rules they gave us for our guidance were really the rules of the French Senate, no gentleman is permitted to so much as rise on the floor and say, "Mr. President." He must first walk around behind the throne and get the ear of the president, and then get his name on the president's slate. I did not like that. [Laughter.] The fact of the matter is I did not ask for it. I did not speak but once in the conference at large, and then I spoke, having forgotten to get my name on the slate.

I did speak another—just a little bit at another—time. You know they had 22 interpreters and stenographers over there, said to have ability to interpret every language spoken. Many, many times our American delegation asked for the privilege of having the addresses of other gentlemen employing foreign tongues interpreted to us in our American language—and there is an American language, gentlemen. Many times we heard gentlemen speak representing the British Parliament, and if they spoke in the English language, then I do not know it. [Laughter.]

But oftentimes we were denied our request for interpretations, and once I became angered. I am ashamed of it. A Quaker should never become angry. But I was angry for a moment, and so I spoke in the Santee Indian language for another minute, and immediately after I had spoken all of those interpreters and stenographers gathered around me and said, "The copy, monsieur?" I told them to find it. [Laughter.]

Everything is very queer over there from our standpoint. I want every one of you to understand, if I shall speak this afternoon in a tone or in illustration of seeming criticism of anything that we saw in France, I do not mean it. I am speaking now from the standpoint of a diplomat, and I want you to know and I want my French friends to know that I speak critically not at all, but thanking every one of them for all of the courtesies conferred upon us.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Surely.

Mr. MADDEN. And I suppose a diplomat is a man who uses words to conceal thought; is that the purpose of the gentleman this afternoon?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Not exactly. I trust my language from this time on will be so clear that my ordinarily alert friend from Illinois may have no trouble at all in understanding it. [Laughter.]

There are some queer conditions over there. I saw one habit the French people have, and I wish to direct it to the attention of all my American folks, because it was a beautiful habit.

During the month of August last, 150 people were killed by automobiles on the streets of Paris, and yet no child among them all. When you see a person start across the street in Paris carrying or leading a little child, all the traffic stops as if by magic. Little children are scarce in Paris. They do not have as many of them as they used to. I marveled at so many of the ladies I saw carrying poodles, but they tell me that it is due to the lack of other pets. [Laughter.]

I like that sweet consideration for little children as I saw it, but I did not always like the consideration they gave the dogs. With one of my colleagues I was at breakfast one morning in a prominent café, and near our table were two French ladies, and each had a dog. One of the ladies had a little chair, like the baby chair in American homes. Her pet dog was in the baby chair and she was feeding the dog. She would take one morsel from the fork and the dog would take another. The other lady held her dog in her lap. One of the dogs got sick, and I want to tell you that a sick dog in Paris does just like a sick dog in our country. [Laughter.] I never had any particular understanding of certain queer words in our American tongue, but when I saw that sick poodle at the breakfast table I pronounced vociferously that word "wow," and disappeared. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, my primary purpose was to get permission to incorporate in the RECORD in connection with my remarks some correspondence that had been carried on between two members of the American group of delegates to the Interparliamentary League, and I ask unanimous consent that I may insert that correspondence.

Mr. MADDEN. Have the letters been interpreted into English language?

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Not wholly. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD] interpreted the Czechoslovakian note to me, and I think his interpretation is reasonably perfect.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following correspondence between two members of the American group of delegates to the Interparliamentary League:

UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE,
BUREAU INTERPARLEMENTAIRE,
Geneve, 16, September 14, 1927.

Congressman FITZGERALD,

Hotel de la Bourdonnais, Paris.

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: Your observations in the debate in Paris on codification of international law, and the talk we had afterwards, have been constantly in my mind and I am anxious to clear up what I think is a misunderstanding as to the interpretation you put on the Zaleski report and the resolution voted by the council of the league in June last. I have read it very carefully and I do not find any trace of that intention of "limitation" which you had found there. The word "limitation" only occurs in one connection, on page 5, where M. Zaleski discusses the possibility of restricting the program of the first conference on codification. He is anxious, it seems, that this program should not be too ambitious and therefore tries to limit the agenda to three points only, instead of five, as the committee had suggested. I am sending you by the same mail a copy of the minutes of the council and I think that you will agree that there is no intention on M. Zaleski's part, or on the part of the council, as a whole, to set themselves up as the masters of the work of the conference with power to limit the program. The fact is that the conception of the work of codification has been considerably developed through the work of the experts committee. Everybody who has gone into this problem at all realizes that it would be a most foolish undertaking to think that the whole field of international law can be codified by one or even two or three successive conferences. The method must be a far more modest one and the work will really extend over generations. Chapters of international law must be studied one after the other. The problem is to find which chapters are most mature and that is the work the committee and also the council of the league have had in

view. This does not at all mean, as far as I can see, that the conference for the codification of public international law, even if called by the league (it will probably, I take it, sit at The Hague), would be under the supervision of the league. Like all international conferences it would be sovereign as to its method of work and any State asked to participate would be free to suggest additions to the agenda, or omissions. As a matter of fact, the preparatory work would, to a very large extent, decide the agenda, but even here I take it for granted that States outside the league would be invited and most welcome to participate.

I discussed these matters with Senator BURTON while he was here and mentioned your remarks to him. It is at his suggestion that I am writing these lines in order to explain how I look at the matter.

Hoping that you have only pleasant memories of our meetings in Paris,

I remain, dear Mr. Fitzgerald,

CH. L. LANGE.

COMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE LAWS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1928.

DR. CHARLES L. LANGE,
Secretary General Union Interparlementaire,
Geneva, Switzerland.

DEAR DOCTOR LANGE: I have before me a copy of your letter of September 14, 1927, addressed to me at Paris, and I regret that travel and press of affairs have prevented my replying earlier. I note that you talked with Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, chairman of our American group of delegates to the Interparliamentary Union Conference, and wrote me at his suggestion.

I also note that you do not regard the Zaleski report of the committee of experts on international law of the League of Nations as advocating a limitation or restriction on the propositions of international law to be considered by the proposed conference of representatives of nations interested in the preparation and adoption of a code of international law.

I have shared with some of my associates the impression that it was the advice of the committee to limit the conference to action upon the seven subjects which it deemed ripe for consideration.

Your long and intelligent interest in the promotion of international law is well known and appreciated, and the work of the Committee of Experts of the League of Nations is recognized as valuable and, of course, we do not expect a complete code of international law from a single or even from a few international conferences.

What the delegates from the United States had in mind was the establishment of periodic conferences of all the nations for the constant and scientific promotion of the principles of international law, persistently working toward the formation of a complete code and earnestly pressing for acceptance by the nations.

We can not be insensible to the possibility that much can be accomplished in a short time; witness, the convention which prepared the Constitution of this country, the two Hague conferences, and the Covenant of the League of Nations.

We can not understand from the Zaleski report that these ideas were considered.

We recognize that no desirable or permanent peace can rest upon any foundation but that of justice—that justice between nations and their peoples can be defined only in terms of international law; that the peace and security of nations and the well-being of their peoples require the extension of the empire of international law; that such an extension requires restatements, amendments, reconciliations of and additions to existing rules of international law; that in recent years new relations between nations have developed and new problems have arisen not now adequately regulated by international law; that for these, the interests of international justice require that rules of law shall be declared and accepted; that learned societies in various parts of the world are rendering marked service to the understanding and development of international law, notably:

The Institute of International Law.
The American Institute of International Law.
The Union Juridique Internationale.
The Iberian Institute of Comparative Law.
The American Society of International Law.
The International Maritime Society.
The Société de Législation Comparée.

that an international conference of American states, meeting in Brazil in 1906, advocated establishing an international commission of jurists for the purpose of preparing a draft of codes of both private and public international law; that the advisory committee of jurists at The Hague in 1920 recommended a conference of the nations in continuance of the first two conferences at The Hague for the following purposes:

1. To restate the established rules of international law especially and, in the first instance, in the fields affected by the events of the recent war;

2. To formulate and agree upon the amendments and additions, if any, to the rules of international law shown to be necessary or useful

by the events of the war and the changes in the conditions of international life and intercourse which have followed the war;

3. To endeavor to reconcile divergent views and secure agreement upon the rules which have been in dispute heretofore;

4. To consider the subjects not now adequately regulated by international law, but as to which the interest of international justice require that rules of law shall be declared and accepted;

And that such progress has been made toward codes of both private and public international law by conferences of representatives of the 21 American republics, as to make it expedient to urge the immediate necessity for action lest the very success of the American codes obstruct and defer the adoption of general codes of international law.

The Sixth Pan American Conference is now in session at Habana, Cuba, organized to act upon the 12 projects of public international law and the complete code of 439 articles of private international law prepared by the International Commission of Jurists.

You will note that the questionnaire concerning a limited number of subjects of public international law deemed by the committee of experts of the League of Nations as ripe for such a conference submitted to our Department of State invited and provoked differences which would have been avoided had a selection of subjects not been made.

In view of the above, it seems that a series of general conferences of all nations should be arranged, and in no way limited or restricted, and among other benefits to accrue would be a code of international law.

We are delighted to learn that the league has decided to call such a conference at The Hague in the near future.

A serious obstacle to the adherence of the United States to the Court of International Justice and to the extension of the usefulness of that court is the lack of a code of international law. This lack excites apprehension among some people that the court's decisions may be based upon political expediency and compromise rather than upon those principles of justice and equity which control courts in settling the disputes between individuals.

There are many of us in the United States who will always cherish the hope that by persistent efforts a way may yet be found whereby all the nations, including our own, may participate collectively and effectively toward the maintenance of peace and well-being in the world.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROY G. FITZGERALD.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. At a later day I am told that the president, Mr. BURTON, of Ohio, will make a splendid report of our doings over there. I want to say to you that I feel that the interparliamentary conferences might be made of vast value to our country and to the world. It is true that they carry no weight at all, only the weight of recommendation. The object of the conference is to see if we can not agree upon some measures for presentment to our own parliamentary bodies over the world in an effort to get the consent of all countries to unite in a common cause for the welfare of the world.

The American delegates went there with the sincere desire in our hearts to do what we could to promote the cause of peace among nations. [Applause.] We earnestly endeavored to promote that desire while we served in the conference. On the day of our departure I tried to convey to those delegates from the parliaments of the world about such sentiment as I felt that my colleagues here in our Congress might wish me to convey. Bidding good-by to our friends, I addressed them in substance as follows: "I ask permission to speak to you a bit of American sentiment, as I understand it, in the ever-so-earnest hope that when we shall have returned to our America you will be thinking kindly of us and of our spirit in behalf of disarmament and peace. We came here hoping earnestly that we might hear more frequently than any other voice the soft cooing of the dove of peace. We do not complain because that sweet voice so often gave way to the raucous voice of the red rooster of war. But, even so, we are going back to our homes to tread again our own avenues of peace, and I am pleading with each of you to often cast your mental eyes westward to discover our devotion to our American ideals in affairs of government. We of America have many ideals, and we are particularly proud of one of our ideals, and that one is our ideal American soldier of peace. Always his feet are incased in the sandals of humility; always upon his head is the helmet of truth; always upon his bosom the breastplate of a righteous cause; always in his good right hand the gleaming sword of justice, tipped with the diamond of mercy; in his heart one dear desire—the steadfast service of the living God and all God's children on the earth."

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN Q. TILSON

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks made over the radio last evening by the majority leader [Mr. TILSON] may be incorporated in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address delivered over the radio from station WRC last evening by the majority leader of the House, the Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON, of Connecticut:

POLITICAL ISSUES

In order to avoid confusion of ideas in speaking of political issues, let us for a moment consider what is an issue in a controversy. The common acceptance of an issue in law is the point or points upon which the controversy hinges or upon which the contending parties divide, each party taking an opposing position. Apply this test to the present stage of the political controversy, and what do we find to be the situation? Candidates will try to push into the foreground such issues as each may think most advantageous to his own candidacy. Political parties may be expected to emphasize or minimize proffered issues according to the anticipated effect upon party success.

In a free country like ours, where everyone has at least the privilege of doing his own thinking, and where in the last analysis public opinion controls, the people have a way of deciding for themselves what shall be the issues in a great presidential election, party platforms, candidates' promises, and campaign orators to the contrary notwithstanding. It will be so in the coming campaign. It may be taken for granted that the coming contest will be between the two time-honored major parties, because there is no serious talk of a third party injecting itself into the equation, and the history of third-party movements during the last 60 years is not such as to encourage their undertaking, so that any concerted defection from either of the great parties will be, in fact, an effort to aid the other party. It is, therefore, quite certain that either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party will be charged with the responsibility for conducting governmental affairs during the next four years. What will be the issue or the issues upon which will turn the verdict of the electorate as between these two contestants?

The one question most universally talked about is prohibition. There is no other public question about which the public generally feel more deeply or talk more vehemently. But what are the probabilities of prohibition becoming the deciding issue between the two great parties? Everyone knows that a very sharp division on this subject exists in both parties, and it is almost a certainty that neither party will make adherence or opposition to the cause of prohibition the test of party loyalty, or that either party will disregard other issues, and, by accepting support only upon this ground, alienate all those former members of the party who do not agree to this program. The chance of either party taking this course is probably nil, and yet, unless one party or the other does just this, what is to be gained, so far as the practical solution of this problem is concerned, by a victory at the polls?

It is contended by many that if Governor Smith is nominated at Houston a religious issue will enter into the campaign, which is, of course, the most difficult and disturbing of all issues to deal with. Doubtless there are bigots among both Catholics and Protestants whose political judgment may be warped by the fact that a candidate professes one religion rather than another, but it is hard to believe that with all our professions of religious liberty and tolerance the American people will permit such an issue to be controlling on either side.

If these two interesting subjects be eliminated as party issues, the superficial may inquire what is left upon which to base a campaign. Quite enough to call forth the best thought and judgment of the electorate. In my judgment the people of the country will demand something that is, in fact, an issue between the two contending parties, something upon which the successful party may be called to make good, and something which affects directly their well-being. The Republican Party should win handsomely upon its record since it came into power in all branches of the Government in 1921, for I think it can be readily demonstrated that the Republican administration of public affairs for the last seven years supported by a Republican Congress has been such as to command the confidence and approval of the people.

In 1921 we had but recently emerged from a great war. Our foreign affairs were in an unsettled state and headed straight for world entanglements that would have proved irksome and dangerous for the future. The country has been saved from this embarrassment, and we have been brought into a state of peace with honor with all the nations of the world.

Our domestic situation was in no respects better. In 1921 the public debt amounted to twenty-five billions. More than a billion a year was required to pay the interest alone on the public debt. Even credit was impaired to the extent that Liberty bonds were selling for 85 cents on the dollar. Two years after the war had closed governmental expenditures amounted to five billions a year, and a tax burden sufficient to pay this enormous expenditure was upon the shoulders of the people. We have since paid nearly eight billions of the debt, reduced the annual interest charge to three-quarters of a billion, and restored the credit of the Government until Liberty bonds are now selling above par. We have adopted a budget system that has brought greater efficiency as

well as economy. We have reduced governmental expenses by more than two billions annually, and by three successive acts have reduced the annual tax burden in the aggregate by two billions of dollars.

In 1921 the Republican Party found a low tariff act on the statute books, and under it foreign-made goods were pouring into American markets, with the result that 5,000,000 men and women were walking the streets seeking employment. An emergency tariff law for agricultural products was passed in 1921, and a general tariff act, protective in principle, was passed early in 1922, the effect of which has been to eliminate in large measure unemployment, and restore general prosperity.

In short, the Republican Party in 1921 took up the great and difficult task of reconstruction after a demoralizing, as well as destructive, war, and has persistently continued in the performance of that task in the face of opposition, with great credit to those who have carried the burden of responsibility, and with the continued approbation of the American people.

In making the record thus briefly sketched, both the legislative and executive branches of the Government have worked together, but the task could not have been accomplished without the consistent, persistent firmness, and courage of the man in the White House constantly insisting upon a program of efficiency and economy.

Under his leadership a record for governmental efficiency and economy has been and is being written that merits the approval and commendation of thinking men everywhere. It is a record calculated to inspire such confidence as should make certain the continuance in power during the next four years of the party that will carry on the policies of the Coolidge administration.

What do our Democratic friends offer as an alternative? First—and they are in earnest about this—they would like very much to return to power, so that this, at any rate, may be set down as a bona fide issue. Further than this, what do they propose? Some of their spokesmen have begun to inform us in doleful speeches that things are not what they seem, and that prosperity is not quite so great or so universal as everyone would like to have it. Conceding that we have not yet reached the millennium, and that there is always room for improvement, what do our time-honored opponents propose to do about it? The only remedy thus far advanced is the old familiar one of destroying the protective tariff, and lowering duties to a tariff-for-revenue-only basis. If only those who believe this to be the proper remedy, with those who believe that the Democratic Party will more wisely and efficiently administer the affairs of the Government than the Republican Party, will vote the Democratic ticket in November, the result of the election can be now predicted with a considerable degree of certainty. The American people are not yet ready to turn their backs upon the principle of protection to American industry and labor, nor are they ready, in the light of recent past experience, to again entrust the reins of government to Democratic control. The approaching contest will be an interesting one fought out along familiar lines between the two time-honored parties and as usual the Republicans will win because they deserve to win.

FULL EQUALITY FOR THE NEGRO

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I hold in my hand a newspaper which is called the Afro-American, published in the city of Baltimore. This particular issue was published on March 3. I desire to read to you from an article appearing on the front page which declares for African equality. It is as follows:

HOWARD PREXY DECLARES FOR FULL EQUALITY—SCIENTISTS AGREE, HE SAYS, THAT NO HARM CAN COME FROM INTERMARRIAGE

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, stands for full race equality, including amalgamation and social equality.

Doctor Johnson expressed his views before the Community Church in New York recently.

Speaking in New York, Doctor Johnson said he did not believe in intermarriage just for the sake of a negro marrying a white woman, but he thought that when two sane persons wanted to marry, there should be no law to prevent them, and that while he could not stop amalgamation of the races, he did not believe that negroes should wait for amalgamation to give him full manhood rights.

It is too long a process, he said. He wanted his rights black, just as he is, which included social equality without equivocation or retreating a single inch, which, in turn, included intermarriage.

Doctor Johnson emphasized the fact that anthropologists and other scientists are agreed that no harm can come from intermarriage.

This damnable doctrine which I have read is that promulgated by the man at the head of Howard University, to which

a few days ago you appropriated the sum of \$390,000. He is going around about the country spreading among the members of the Negro race, and, of course, among the students of Howard University, this rotten, indecent doctrine on marriage between the white and African races.

On the 28th of February, in this Hall, 253 Members of this House voted for an appropriation of \$390,000 to the institution, of which this negro is the head, and it goes without saying that every dollar of that appropriation which directly or indirectly goes to the furtherance of the propaganda that I have referred to is an injury to the Negro race instead of a benefit.

On the front page of this paper, almost side by side with the article that I have read, appears the news that southern Members of Congress voted for that appropriation. May God have mercy on them! [Applause.] In a short while the House will be called upon to vote upon H. R. 279, which provides for the legalizing of appropriations of this character in the future, they having been heretofore made in violation of the law. I call attention to this fact in order that every fair-minded man may study the situation and determine for himself whether or not he wants to vote in favor of a law legalizing appropriations to a university whose head is engaged in teaching among the members of the Negro race the damnable doctrine of social equality and of intermarriage with the white people.

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

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Did the gentleman make any effort to check up and find out whether the doctor is correctly quoted or not?

Mr. TARVER. I have not; but he is quoted in an organ published by a member of his own race, and certainly I do not conceive it to be my duty to confer with the alleged doctor with reference to whether or not he made the statement attributed to him. Personally, in using the word "doctor" in connection with his name, I wish it to be understood it is because it is used in that connection in the news article, and I say that, in my judgment, any almost-white negro, as he is, who is going about the country advocating the intermarriage of the races and the alleged right of negroes to marriage with white women, should not be designated by any decent white man with the term "doctor" in connection with his name.

GIFTS OF LAND IN CLAYTON COUNTY, IOWA, FOR WILD-LIFE PURPOSES

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 215, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept a gift of certain lands in Clayton County, Iowa, for the purposes of the upper Mississippi River wild-life and fish refuge act.

The Clerk reported the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. This is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the resolution in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and hereby is, authorized to accept on behalf of the United States from James B. Munn, of New York City, N. Y., a gift of certain lands in Clayton County, Iowa, described as Government lot 1, section 23, township 94 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 58.50 acres; north half Government lot 2, section 23, township 94 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 24.30 acres; part of Government lot 1, section 11, township 94 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 11 acres; Government lot 4, section 11, township 94 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 45.45 acres; Government lot 3, section 35, township 95 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 68.40 acres; Government lot 4, section 35, township 95 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 35 acres; south part Government lot 2, section 35, township 95 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 28 acres; part of north half, section 27, township 95 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 136.76 acres; part of southwest quarter, section 22, township 95 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 49 acres; part of east half, section 22, township 95 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, 31.59 acres. Total area, 488 acres, including all the buildings and improvements thereon and all rights, easements, and appurtenances thereunto appertaining; and upon acceptance of said lands by the Secretary of Agriculture they shall become a part of the upper Mississippi River wild-life and fish refuge established pursuant to the authority contained in the upper Mississippi river wild-life and fish refuge act approved June 7, 1924.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

WOOL STANDARDS

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 7459, to authorize the appropriation for use by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain funds for wool standards, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say in this connection that the purpose this afternoon is to call up only bills that have been considered by the House. I believe nearly all these bills have been unanimously approved by the House in a former Congress. Also to call up bills which do not carry appropriations.

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

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. The gentleman said that these bills have already been approved by the House?

Mr. HAUGEN. The bill that I am offering now was approved by the House at the last session of Congress. It is my purpose only to bring up bills that have been considered by the House and passed by the House, and bills of small importance carrying no appropriation.

Mr. ASWELL. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to bring up the farm extension bill this afternoon?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. I do not want to bring up any controverted matters.

Mr. ASWELL. That is not controverted. Is the gentleman going to bring up the Capper-Ketcham bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not have that in mind.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Secretary of Agriculture, for the purposes herein-after stated, all funds heretofore or hereafter collected by suit, or otherwise, pursuant to appropriations for the completion of the work of the domestic-wool section of the War Industries Board, and for enforcing Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the Bureau of Markets, now a part of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, and for continuing as far as practicable the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918, which he finds it impracticable to distribute among said growers, provided that not to exceed \$50,000 may be expended in any fiscal year.

SEC. 2. Said funds may be used for the purpose of acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the standardization, grading, preparation for market, marketing, utilization, transportation, handling, and distribution of wool, and of approved methods and practices relative thereto, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of grades for wool in accordance with standards therefor which the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to establish. Said funds may be used for the grading of wool, and for such grading or other service rendered hereunder reasonable fees may be charged, and provided further that hereafter reasonable charges may be made for practical forms of grades for wool.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture may make such rules and regulations as he deems advisable for carrying out any of the provisions of this act. All receipts hereunder shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

The SPEAKER. This is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. 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. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

WOOL

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill being considered authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to standardize grades of wool, and appropriates a part of the undistributed excess profits of the 1918 wool clip for the purpose of acquiring and diffusing among the growers and the wool trades in general useful information relative to grading, preparing for

market, and educational activities in connection with marketing, utilization, transportation, handling, and distribution of wool, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of wool, in accordance with standards to be established. The funds proposed to be appropriated are due in small amounts to growers on the Government-commandeered clip of 1918, who can not be located.

The Agriculture Department, through the Bureau of Markets, and later through the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, has been working for some time on the development of standard grades for wool. The original request to establish standard grades for wool came in the form of a resolution passed by the National Wool Growers' Association in 1914. The department advises that the first attempts at standardization were to try to set up a group of grades that corresponded with the then American terminology.

These standards were prepared and distributed throughout the country.

Their commercial practicability was tested out and in every case where any investigation was conducted and where the graded lots were followed through the market centers there was complete satisfaction with regard to grades. When those grades were presented at the final hearing in Washington for the consideration of the entire industry, it was suggested by members of the industry, including, of course, manufacturers and wool producers, that some consideration be given the development of standards and the correlation of the existing standards to the numerical standards generally used by the trade in England. The necessity for the adoption of such standards is due to the established standard grades of imported wool according to numbers, which were confusing, concerning the value of the scoured product, to not only country dealers but to the producers. The grades established in the United States are according to terms that can not be specifically compared by the majority of country dealers and producers to the grades imported.

It was therefore deemed essential, from the standpoint particularly of the producer, to have grades established that would give him not only the information as to the value of the grade he produces in competition with foreign grades but more nearly the true market value of his product.

Under the present system of marketing in many cases the producer does not secure the full value of his clip because in the main there is a general average price for fine, one-half blood, three-eighths blood, one-fourth blood, and so forth, whereby the farmer who has a clip that may grade 90 per cent of delaine may not receive much if any more for his clip than the producer whose clip does not contain over 50 per cent or 60 per cent delaine, and, according to present market quotations, delaine is quoted at 8 cents per pound more than clothing. Therefore a clip containing 90 per cent delaine, based on present market prices, is worth 2.7 cents per grease pound more than a clip containing 60 per cent delaine. The benefit of definite information to the producer as to not only the true market value but the influence of the higher prices he received in encouraging the production of a higher-grade product is apparent.

The grades of our domestic clip are designated as delaine, clothing, one-half blood, three-eighths blood, one-fourth blood, and so forth, while the imported numerical designated grades refer to the amount of yarn that can be spun from the scoured product.

In order that I may illustrate the difference between the designation of domestic grades and imported grades, I will state that our "fine" corresponds with the imported "64s to 80s"; our "one-fourth blood" corresponds with imported "58s to 60s"; our "three-eighths blood" with "50s to 56s"; our "one-fourth blood" with "46s to 50s"; our "low one-fourth blood" with "40s to 46s"; and our "low cross-breds" with "36s to 40s."

The spinning numbers indicate the number of hanks of yarn of 560 yards each that can be spun from a pound of scoured wool; therefore, in the case of 64s there could be spun 64 hanks of yarn from a pound of the cleaned product.

The only designation that a producer, as a rule, can give his clip is that it is either "fine" or "crossbred"—more generally called "medium."

It perhaps will be of interest to those who do not have the information to learn the amounts and percentages of the different classes of wool produced in the United States; also the amounts and percentages of the different grades imported, and our total domestic consumption. They are approximately as follows:

Grade	Domestic		Foreign		Total	
	Pounds	Per cent	Pounds	Per cent	Pounds	Per cent
Fine.....	91,866,425	35.7	28,286,192	31.1	120,152,617	34.5
One-half blood.....	45,670,210	17.8	10,597,412	11.6	56,267,622	16.2
Three-eighths blood.....	56,371,471	21.9	10,950,942	12.0	67,322,413	19.3
One-fourth blood.....	52,618,021	20.5	15,329,619	16.8	67,947,640	19.5
Low one-fourth blood.....	7,581,166	3.0	15,667,626	17.2	23,248,792	6.7
Common.....	1,353,808	.5	-----	-----	1,353,808	.4
Braid.....	1,643,416	.6	-----	-----	1,643,416	.5
Lincoln.....	-----	-----	10,263,698	11.3	10,263,698	2.9
Total.....	257,104,517	100.0	91,095,489	100.0	348,200,006	100.0
Carpet.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	128,918,165	-----
Total, including carpet.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	477,118,171	-----

It may also be of interest to you to learn the approximate loss in scouring of the different grades of our domestic product for the Central States and Territories. It is as follows:

CENTRAL STATES

Numerical terminology	American terminology	Shrinkage	
		Strictly combing	Clothing
64s-70s-80s.....	Fine.....	Per cent 58-65	Per cent 61-67
58s-60s.....	One-half blood.....	53-68	56-60
56s.....	Three-eighths blood.....	45-49	46-50
48s-50s.....	One-fourth blood.....	42-45	43-47
46s.....	Low one-fourth blood.....	40-44	-----
36s-40s-44s.....	Common, braid.....	42-44	-----

THE RANGE IN SHRINKAGE OF TERRITORY WOOLS

64s-70s-80s.....	Fine.....	59-66	62-70
58s-60s.....	One-half blood.....	57-64	58-66
56s.....	Three-eighths blood.....	54-60	57-62
48s-50s.....	One-fourth blood.....	50-58	53-58
46s.....	Low one-fourth blood.....	48-55	-----
36s-40s-44s.....	Common, braid.....	52-58	-----

Consumption of wool in the United States by grades, 1927

Grade	Domestic		Foreign		Total	
	Pounds	Per cent	Pounds	Per cent	Pounds	Per cent
Fine.....	91,866,425	35.7	28,286,192	31.1	120,152,617	34.5
One-half blood.....	45,670,210	17.8	10,597,412	11.6	56,267,622	16.2
Three-eighths blood.....	56,371,471	21.9	10,950,942	12.0	67,322,413	19.3
One-fourth blood.....	52,618,021	20.5	15,329,619	16.8	67,947,640	19.5
Low one-fourth blood.....	7,581,166	3.0	15,667,626	17.2	23,248,792	6.7
Common.....	1,353,808	.5	-----	-----	1,353,808	.4
Braid.....	1,643,416	.6	-----	-----	1,643,416	.5
Lincoln.....	-----	-----	10,263,698	11.3	10,263,698	2.9
Total.....	257,104,517	100.0	91,095,489	100.0	348,200,006	100.0

		Pounds
Domestic.....		257,104,517
Foreign.....		91,095,489
Carpet.....		128,918,165
Total.....		477,118,171

The additions to domestic-wool prices in the grease pound, according to the existing tariff rate of 31 cents on the scoured pound, are as follows:

Fine: Losing 60 per cent in scouring, 40 per cent clean wool; tariff, 31 cents; 12.8 cents increase.

One-half blood: Losing 56 per cent in scouring; 44 per cent clean wool; tariff, 31 cents; 13.64 cents increase.

Three-eighths blood: Losing 50 per cent in scouring, 50 per cent clean wool; tariff, 31 cents; 15.5 cents increase.

One-fourth blood: Losing 44 per cent in scouring, 56 per cent clean wool; tariff, 31 cents; 18.36 cents increase.

The approximate average increase is 14 cents.

The actual increase cost per suit of clothes in case the full amount of the tariff on wool is added would be \$1.03½ on a 14-ounce winter weight and 74 cents on a 10-ounce summer weight.

The average suit of clothes contains $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of cloth.

It requires $3\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of clean wool to make $3\frac{1}{2}$ yards of 14-ounce cloth. Tariff at 31 cents per pound would amount to \$1.08 $\frac{1}{2}$; less 5 cents, the approximate salvage value of card

waste, would be \$1.03½ net. A 10-ounce cloth would require 2½ pounds of wool; tariff 31 cents would amount to 77½ cents per pound, less 3 cents, approximate value of card waste, would be 74 cents net.

Comparison of American Woolen Co. prices

No.	Weight	Fall, 1928	Spring, 1928	Fall, 1927	Fall, 1926	Fall, 1925	Fall, 1924	Fall, 1923	Fall, 1922	Fall, 1921	Fall, 1920	Fall, 1919	Fall, 1918	Fall, 1917	Fall, 1916	Fall, 1915	Fall, 1914	Fall, 1913	Fall, 1912
WASHINGTON SERGES																			
3554	12 ounces	\$2.21	\$2.32½	\$2.32½	\$2.47½	\$2.72½													
3213	do.	2.02	2.22½	2.10	2.25	2.50		\$2.65											
3486		2.77		2.90	3.20														
3487		3.02	3.20	3.15	3.50														
3488		3.21	3.40	3.35	3.75														
WASHINGTON CHEVIOT																			
12061	18½-19 ounces	2.03		2.00	2.17½	2.40	\$2.17½	2.12½		\$1.50			\$3.22½	\$1.97½	\$1.00	\$1.27½			
816-34	18½-16 ounces	1.75		1.77½	1.72½	1.97½	1.75	1.45	\$1.15	1.20	\$2.57½	\$1.37							
812-32	18½-12 ounces		1.45	1.45	1.55	1.65	1.47½	1.22½	1.00	1.05	2.20	1.57½							
414-1	18½-14 ounces	1.86	1.87½	1.87½	2.05	2.27½	2.12½												
3657	do.	1.72	1.70	1.70	1.90	2.05	1.95												
3756	18½-12 ounces	1.54	1.52½	1.52½	1.72½														
3631		1.72	1.72½	1.70	1.87½														
3657		1.72	1.70	1.67½	1.87½														
3756		1.54	1.52½	1.50	1.70														
WASHINGTON UNFINISHED WORSTED																			
614½-2	14½ ounces	2.95	3.12½	3.12½	3.42½	3.77½	3.67½	3.55	3.20	3.25	6.20								
WOOD SERGES																			
9629	13 ounces	2.27	2.35	2.35	2.57½	2.92½	2.80	2.67½	2.27½										
9627	16 ounces	2.96	3.07½	3.07½	3.40	4.00	3.77½	3.57½	3.27½										
9625	do.	2.88	3.00	3.40	3.32½	3.87½	3.62½	3.42½	3.10										
9526	12 ounces	3.03	3.20	3.20	3.27½	3.90	3.52½	3.50	3.20										
9841	12½-13 ounces	2.21	2.32½		2.52½	2.57½													
9115-14		2.87	3.02½	3.02½	3.25														
9070		2.28	2.32½	2.32½	2.60														
9075		2.14	2.17½	2.17½	2.35														
9308		2.40	2.52½	2.52½	2.70														
9540-13		2.49	2.57½																
9606		2.70	2.80																
9627		2.96	3.07½	3.07½	3.40														
9748		2.05	2.12½																
9771		2.91	3.07½	3.07½	3.02½														
9975		1.82	1.87½	1.87½	2.07½														
WOOD FINISHED WORSTEDS																			
9812-1	12 ounces	2.28	2.37½	2.37½	2.60	2.92½	2.67½	2.62½	2.32										
9613-1	13 ounces	2.07	2.12½	2.12½	2.32½	2.75	2.37½	2.27½	2.00	2.10	4.12½	2.50	3.12½	1.75	1.37½	1.20	\$1.07½		
9813-7	do.	2.33	2.45	2.45		3.10	2.75	2.70	2.35	2.35	4.35								
9591-1		2.31	2.42½	2.42½	2.65														
9812-1		2.28	2.37½	2.37½	2.60														
9814-7		2.41	2.52½	2.52½	2.80														
9816-7		2.58	2.70	2.70	3.09														
9884		2.70	2.85																
FULTON SERGES																			
3192	11 ounces	2.16	2.27½	2.27½	2.52½	2.75	2.67½	2.67½	2.35	2.42½	4.50	2.62½						\$1.60	\$1.47½
3194	14 ounces	2.51	2.65	2.65	2.95	3.27½	3.17½	3.20	2.80	2.85	5.50	3.20	3.77½	2.35	1.95	1.50	1.35	1.72½	1.60
4077	16 ounces	2.70	2.85	2.85	3.20	3.52½	3.42½	3.50	3.02½	3.07½	6.10	3.52½	4.17½	2.60	2.05	1.62½	1.47½	1.82½	1.70
3844	do.	3.00	3.17½	3.17½	3.50	3.95	3.82½	3.87½	3.32½	3.37½	6.45	3.72½	4.37½	2.75	2.17½	1.72½	1.55	1.65	1.50
5048	15 ounces	2.51	2.67½	2.67½	2.92½	3.30	3.20	3.12½	2.72½	2.77½	5.12½	3.17½	3.80	2.42½	1.95	1.62½	1.40		
4078	13 ounces	2.91	3.07½	3.07½	3.50	3.80	3.70	3.80	3.30	3.35	6.70	3.82½	4.57½	2.82½	2.20	1.75	1.60		
200	14 ounces	2.77	2.92½	2.92½	3.22½	3.62½	3.50	3.50	3.05										
681	13 ounces					3.25	3.05	2.95	2.67½										
364	14 ounces	2.86	3.02½	3.02½	3.25	3.75	3.57½	3.50	3.20										
744		3.35	3.52½	3.52½	3.50														
AYER MILL SERGES																			
690	13 ounces	2.25	2.35	2.35	2.50	2.85	2.70	2.75	2.20	2.40	4.80	2.90							
6192	11 ounces	2.16	2.27½	2.27½	2.50	2.70	2.62½	2.62½	2.35	2.42½	4.50	2.57½							
1814-44	14 ounces	2.56	2.70	2.70	2.95	3.22½	3.10	3.07½	2.67½	2.75	5.50	3.30	3.70	2.27½	1.77½	1.45	1.25	1.55	
FRENCH BACKS																			
9116-58	16 ounces	3.82	3.90	4.05	4.30	4.95	4.67½	4.62½	4.37½	4.45	7.65								
994	do.	3.34	3.50	3.50	3.77½														
9116-58	do.	3.82	4.05	4.05	4.30														
9733	do.	3.67	3.85	3.80	4.00														
9816-3	do.	3.67	3.90	3.90	4.10														
9782	do.	3.73	3.95	3.95	4.12½														
SHAWSHEEN SERGES																			
8020	15 ounces	2.53	2.70	2.70	2.95	3.25	3.10	3.55											
8066	do.	2.02	2.10																
8095	do.	2.44	2.60																
FURITAN SERGES																			
35	15 ounces	3.46	3.57½	3.57½	3.52½														
36	do.	3.40	3.60	3.60	3.57½														
WOOD CHEVIOT																			
9036	15 ounces	1.63	1.60	1.60	1.77½														

In a study made by the National Bank of Commerce in New York of the 10 great commodities which occupy an important place in the economic life of the United States and in the international trade of the world wool was included in this group. According to alphabetical order the commodities in this study were:

Coal, cotton, iron and steel, lumber, petroleum and products, rubber, silk, sugar, wheat, and wool.

While wool was named last in this alphabetical order, from the standpoint of importance to humanity it would doubtless command a relatively high position in the list. It is probable that substitutes for practically all of these commodities can be found, but in the case of wool nothing has been discovered which takes its place as the raw material for the manufacture of clothing for the warmth and comfort of the people.

Wool has played the most important part in the advancement of civilization and in extending the frontiers suitable for habitation to the farthest points. It is one of the greatest national assets to our country from the standpoint of revenue to agriculture. The pockets of the wool producers are enriched by approximately \$150,000,000 annually. It is also one of the most important and essential products in the successful conduct of war.

Some world-noted economists state that the distribution of wool supplies during the war was largely responsible for the course and final results. All kinds of commodities have received Government attention, and much has been done for those engaged in industries, agriculture, and commerce, but so far very little attention has been given to any of the important work which this bill may have for its object, namely, instructing woolgrowers in the production of the best kinds and qualities of wool, the proper marketable preparation of the clip, and the establishment of standard grades for wool in order to place the woolgrower on an equality basis with producers in the more important wool-producing countries of the world.

There is in the division of livestock, meats, and wool of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics a small section devoting its attention primarily to work on the standardization of wool and the preparation of physical representations of the standards that have thus far been established. I understand that only \$15,000 to \$16,000 has been set aside annually for work on this important agricultural product.

When the work of establishing standards for farm products was first actively taken up by the bureau it was realized that, as in the case of other farm products, it was highly important that wool be marketed according to definite, uniform grade descriptions. The use of definite standards is particularly applicable for wool because wool does not change its form from the time it leaves the producer until it reaches the manufacturer.

Grades were first formulated for American wools and according to the terminology used in the marketing of wool in this country. It was soon realized, however, that if grades were to be of maximum benefit to the wool industry they should be recognized in an international way. Accordingly, we have been working with representatives of the British wool trade, and a committee consisting of a representative of the Department of Commerce, a representative of the Associated Organizations of Wool Manufacturers in this country, and a representative of the Department of Agriculture, conferred with a committee composed of members of the British Wool Federation authorized to act for the several wool and wool textile organizations of England, carefully considering the matter of uniform standards for wool, with the result that agreement has been reached on 12 grades of wool expressed and defined according to the numerical count system. These grades were exhibited and discussed with the committee when it had before it in the last session H. R. 15476, which is identical with the bill now before you. The grades which have been worked out and agreed to by the industry in this country and in England are set forth in detail in Service and Regulatory Announcement 100 of the Department of Agriculture, which establishes these grades as the official standards of the United States for wool and recommends them for use in the marketing of the product.

After the research work necessary to the establishment of the grades had been completed, it was necessary to adopt means to make them of practical use. The bureau has therefore prepared and distributed more than 600 sets of the wool grades. These grades have been placed in the hands of growers, cooperative wool-marketing associations, wool dealers, manufacturers, agricultural colleges, county agents, etc. Considerable progress has been made in informing the grower as to the grades and how they may be applied so as to give him a return for the value he produces. A number of instances have been brought to our attention where the grades

have increased the return to the grower on an average of several cents per pound without resulting in a higher price to the consumer.

The important thing now is to intensify this educational work so that the grower will have adequate knowledge of the qualities and value of the wool he produces. The bill before you would make it possible not only to increase the distribution of the wool sets but would enable us to increase the work done in demonstrating the grades to producers by holding schools which would be attended by producers for the purpose of teaching them to grade wool according to the grades. It would also make it possible for a definite grading service to be established similar to the grading services on some other important farm products. The bill also provides for the charging of fees for the grading of wool according to the official standards.

The wool standards so far established have been limited to diameter of fiber only. Much work remains to be done in the standardization of wool; and studies should be made of other grading factors, such as length of fiber, strength of fiber, and the presence of foreign material, all of which factors are important in determining the commercial value of wool. Studies should also be made with respect to questions of shrinkage, to determine the amount of moisture present in and absorptive qualities of wool under varying atmospheric conditions, as well as making tests in order to establish uniform formulas for scouring wool, so that these factors which enter into the value of the wool may be more uniformly applied.

As previously stated, thus far the Agriculture Department has been able only to work on the establishment of grades on the one factor of diameter of fiber, and therefore only a comparatively small amount of basic research in the marketing of wool has been possible up to the present time. More detailed studies should be made and information disseminated concerning the preparation, packing, shipping, storing, transporting, and utilizing of wool so that the marketing processes could be conducted according to more definite and scientific knowledge than now prevails and which would certainly result in a practical advantage to the producer.

In all of the standardization work the department has had splendid support from the entire industry, from the grower to the manufacturer, and I believe that the bill before us will enable the Agriculture Department to carry on this work and broaden it in a way that would result in the same advantages to wool producers and the wool trade in general that have resulted from the same kind of work done in a larger way on some of the other major agricultural products.

The purposes to be accomplished and the economic benefits to be derived from an educational program proceeding in an orderly manner and carrying directly to the wool producer by actual demonstrations and otherwise the value of standards, the proper methods of their use, and the interpretation of market quotations when the various standard factors which effect prices are known, are as follows:

It is proposed to establish wool standards into which the various kinds of wool produced in the United States can be included. Such standards will be—

First. Place at the command of the growers a knowledge of wool that will make for the greatest possible efficiency in the marketing of the commodity.

Second. Establish a basis for the payment to the producer according to quality, thereby creating an incentive to produce the best.

Third. Establish a basis for intelligible quotations.

Fourth. Make possible the manufacturers' buying direct from the producer.

Fifth. Make possible the employment of uniform methods and practices in the grading and in the preparation of the graded product.

Sixth. Minimize or eliminate the general practice of making a one-half to 1 cent a pound dockage.

Seventh. Place all manufacturers on an equitable basis in the manufacture of their goods.

Eighth. Create uniform understanding as to grade in order that loans on wool many intelligently and equitably be made by banking institutions.

Ninth. Insure definiteness in writing governmental and commercial specifications and contracts.

Tenth. Provide an intelligent basis for legislation.

Eleventh. Make possible the ascertaining of the trend of production.

Twelfth. Reduce transportation.

Thirteenth. Provide agricultural and textile colleges and extension workers with tangible means for giving instructions.

Fourteenth. Increase the returns to the producer through discouraging the production of inferior wools and rejects.

Fifteenth. Place the production and marketing of wool in the United States on a distinctly higher plane than obtains at the present time.

(a) Terminology, present and prospective; and

(b) Methods of representation of standards.

(a) Terminology follows closely the present commercial terms; however, the numerical classification is preferable, and its use is urged in connection with the present classification until such time as the numerical is associated with the present, and then to discontinue the use of the old term.

(b) The standards for grade and length will be represented by physical specimens, spinning property, and shrinkage in part by physical specimens and in part by description.

If the benefits of this bill are received it may be advisable to urge the establishment of conditioning or inspection points throughout the wool-producing areas to determine the average yields of wool from various sections of the United States as an index to producers of actual value. It is conceivable that specific yields of lines or consignments of wool may be determined prior to offering them to the market centers. Also such will serve as a local clearing house for information on the production of more uniform merchantable types of wool. Standardization would simplify the marketing of wool on a definite grade, where all the value-determining factors could be recognized and, made known, would result in benefits to everyone connected with the industry and to the ultimate consumer. The acquisition and dissemination of standard wool factors in the merchandising of wool will aid the wool producer in more intelligently disposing of his product, either through existing agencies or by the formation of new ones.

Advice and assistance could be given in sheep breeding in relation to wool production, correlating such work with that already being undertaken by some State extension departments. Standards will provide uniform educational assistance to all States instead of many States working along dissimilar lines. It is not only advisable but essential that demonstrations in the presence of woolgrowers of wool grading and classing should be carried on in all the leading wool-producing States similar to the work that is done in important foreign wool-producing countries. The classing of wool by definite standards would establish a percentage of offsorts and permit their relative valuation, and also emphasize the profitable advantages to be gained in offering such wools as the manufacturers may desire without forcing them to purchase and handle many offsorts, which in most cases must be resold.

A complete standardization classification by the wool-marketing department, United States Department of Agriculture, should be established and used comparable with that already being used with relation to diameter or fineness. This would provide for the procedure in an orderly manner of additional work in every phase of the industry along uniform lines, since grade remains constant from raw material to finished goods. Wool in this respect is very dissimilar to many other raw products, the identity of which is lost when processing begins.

It is a coincidence that almost at this very instant in Great Britain the attention of official bodies, trade organizations, and technical institutions is drawn to the subject of the standardization of quality in wool.

The question they are considering is the drawing into closer relationship and a better understanding the wool-growers and the worsted and woolen manufacturers in order that the former may have more precise and definite details of the requirements of the manufacturer.

An official of the Empire Marketing Board of England stated recently, as per January 4 issue of the Yorkshire Observer, published in Bradford, England, "that a grant of £9,000, or \$45,000, was being made for the purpose of studying the factors in the standardization of wool qualities." We are informed that most of this grant will be used in the establishment of a suitable wool laboratory where this technical study may be made. It is pointed out that the main object of the grant is to establish a specific standard in the quality of wool based on scientific principles that will be common both to the manufacturers in England and the wool producers in the Dominions.

Suggestions have thus far been made in Great Britain that for research in wool and the costs of such investigations a levy of 1 pence, or 2 cents, per hundred pounds of all greasy wool imported into the country be made, the same to be set aside for this investigational work, the results of which will be highly beneficial to the industry. Before the full benefits of standardization of wool qualities can be fully realized the fixing of standards and specifications for fineness, diameter, staple length, crimp, elasticity, felting property, strength, presence of foreign material, and shrinkage by origin must be established.

For practical purposes standards may be established which may be used in commerce and also specifications may be writ-

ten sufficiently descriptive to serve every purpose from a scientific and mechanical standpoint. It is evident that with standards of wool qualities receiving the serious consideration of so important a group as the wool-textile industry in Great Britain that this country should give more consideration to this important phase of research work in order that wool producers, merchants, and manufacturers may be in possession of such information as will enable them to breed, handle, and merchandise their wool in the most efficient and economical manner. This means that the masses of people throughout the country will reap the benefits of the savings which will accrue and the elimination of unnecessary expenses and costs of handling between the producer and the ultimate consumer. The importance of the wool industry in this country deserves the greatest consideration and attention, and any assistance we can give to the more orderly marketing of a standardized product with the benefits accruing therefrom is deserved in this industry.

As evidence of the value of the standardizing of the grades of wool are the indorsements that have been received from manufacturers and producers. Among others are the following:

Letter I received from the National Association of Worsted and Woolen Spinners:

The fact has been brought to our attention that your committee is to hold hearings on H. R. 15476, "A bill to authorize the appropriation for use by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain funds for wool standards, and for other purposes."

Unfortunately, other engagements prevent us from appearing in person to indicate to your committee the approval and indorsement of this measure by the National Association of Worsted and Woolen Spinners. We venture to hope, however, that you will record this indorsement along with other evidence submitted at the hearing.

Yours truly,

THOS. H. BALL, *President.*

Telegram from the California Wool Growers' Association to the American Farm Bureau Federation:

Authorize you represent California Wool Growers' Association in favor H. R. 15476 by Morgan.

Letter from W. P. Wing, secretary of the California Wool Growers' Association:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., January 3, 1927.

Thank you for your letter of December 24, inclosing copy of the so-called "wool bill," about which you wrote me some weeks ago.

H. R. 15476, introduced by Mr. MORGAN, Congressman from Ohio, is entirely satisfactory to the California Wool Growers' Association. We will be prepared to appear in behalf of this bill whenever you advise us, by wire or otherwise, that hearings are to be held upon it.

Please keep us advised relative to the status of the bill, so that we can telegraph as you direct.

With best wishes for a prosperous and happy New Year.

W. P. WING, *Secretary.*

Telegram to Mr. Gray, Washington representative American Farm Bureau Federation:

Your message 14th relayed to me here account convention. No time prepare statement desired. Suggest you make statement for us.

Statement from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers:

THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
House of Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: The National Association of Wool Manufacturers has willingly aided the United States Department of Agriculture in formulating the terms and definitions for the United States standard wool grades and their correlation with the Bradford count system. It believes the general use of the United States standard wool grades will be of benefit to both manufacturer and woolgrower.

It further believes that the proper use of funds for the purpose of acquiring information and facts and diffusing them among people of the United States relative to standardization, transportation, handling, and distribution of wool will be a public benefit.

It therefore recommends the enactment of the Morgan bill (H. R. 15476) providing ways and means for research and education along these lines.

WALTER HUMPHREYS, *Secretary.*

Letter from the above-named association:

MR. CHESTER H. GRAY,

Washington Representative, American Farm Bureau Federation,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GRAY: It gives me pleasure to hand you herewith a brief outlining the position of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers in regard to the Morgan bill (H. R. 15476) now before the House of Representatives in the second session of the Sixty-ninth Congress.

Very truly yours,

WALTER HUMPHREYS.

Letter from Mr. Thomas H. Ball, president of the National Association of Worsted and Woolen Spinners:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., January 17, 1927.

MR. CHESTER H. GRAY,
American Farm Bureau Federation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: I duly received your letter of the 14th, and it will be impossible for me to be present in Washington on the 21st and find our secretary of the association, Mr. H. J. Nevins, will also be engaged that day, and he will send you a letter of indorsement as per the result of our last board meeting.

Wishing you every success, remain,

Yours very truly,

THOS. H. BALL,

President National Association of Worsted and Woolen Spinners.

L. B. Palmer, president of the Ohio Farm Bureau and Ohio Wool Growers' Association, and also a wool producer, and J. F. Walker, secretary of this association, both indorsed H. R. 15476. Many individual growers have expressed their interest in the passage of this bill.

The funds appropriated in this bill being due the growers, manifestly they should be used for their special benefit and will be so used in case the bill is enacted into law.

If the grades of the domestic wool clip are standardized and the purposes of the bill carried out, the producer can become educated to the true market value of his clip, as he can definitely compare it with the imported product and at the same time have the knowledge of its scoured market value, and, having this knowledge, will naturally be influenced to produce a higher-class product.

PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS OF TOBACCO

MR. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 53.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the bill H. R. 53. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 53) to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department of Agriculture.

THE SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

MR. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to collect and publish statistics of the quantity of leaf tobacco in all forms in the United States in the possession of dealers, manufacturers, growers' cooperative associations, warehousemen, brokers, holders, or owners, other than the original growers of tobacco. The statistics shall show the quantity of tobacco in such detail as to types and groups of grades as the Secretary of Agriculture shall deem to be practical and necessary for the purposes of this act, and said statistics shall show the stocks of tobacco of the last four crop years, including therein the production of the year of the report, which shall be known as new crops, separately from the stocks of previous years, which shall be known as old crops, and shall be summarized as of January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall not be required to collect statistics of leaf tobacco from any manufacturer of tobacco who in the preceding calendar year, according to the returns of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, manufactured less than 50,000 pounds of tobacco, or from any manufacturer of cigars who during the preceding calendar year manufactured less than 250,000 cigars, or from any manufacturer of cigarettes who during the preceding calendar year manufactured less than 1,000,000 cigarettes, or from any dealer in leaf tobacco who, on the average, had less than 50,000 pounds in stock at the ends of the four quarters of the preceding calendar year.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish standards for the classification of tobacco. He shall specify the types and groups of grades which shall be included in the returns required by this act. Such returns shall show the quantity of tobacco by such types and groups of grades for new and old crops separately. The Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare appropriate blanks upon which the returns shall be made, and shall, upon request, furnish copies to persons who are required by this act to make returns.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of every dealer, manufacturer, growers' cooperative association, warehouseman, broker, holder, or owner, other than the original grower, except such persons as are excluded by the proviso to section 1 of this act, to furnish within 10 days after January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year, completely and correctly, to the best of his knowledge, a report of the quantity of leaf

tobacco on hand, segregated in accordance with the blanks furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture. Any person, firm, association, or corporation required by this act to furnish a report, and any officer, agent, or employee thereof who shall refuse or willfully neglect to furnish any of the information required by this act, or shall willfully give answers that are false or misleading, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not less than \$300 or more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 4. The word "person" as used in this act shall be held to embrace also any partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Agriculture shall have access to the tobacco records of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and of the several collectors of internal revenue for the purpose of obtaining lists of the persons subject to this act and for the purpose of aiding the collection of the information herein required, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the several collectors of internal revenue shall cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture in effectuating the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. The returns herein provided for shall be made under oath before a collector or deputy collector of internal revenue, a postmaster, assistant postmaster, or anyone authorized to administer oaths by State or Federal law.

SEC. 7. That the information furnished under the provisions of this act shall be used only for the statistical purposes for which it is supplied. No publication shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture whereby the data furnished by any particular establishment can be identified, nor shall the Secretary of Agriculture permit anyone other than the sworn employees of the Department of Agriculture to examine the individual reports.

SEC. 8. The act approved April 30, 1912, providing for the collection of tobacco statistics by the Bureau of the Census is hereby repealed.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

MR. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield for a question?

MR. HAUGEN. Certainly.

MR. CHINDBLOM. Is there any estimate as to what additional cost this legislation will place upon the Treasury? I observe in the report that it is stated the legislation is not in conflict with the financial program of the President, and I shall not raise an objection; but it will be interesting to know how much additional cost it will be to the country.

MR. KINCHELOE. I will say to the gentleman that I do not think it will cost any more.

MR. CHINDBLOM. I notice that you are repealing the present legislation on the subject and substituting this for it.

MR. KINCHELOE. Yes. Under the present law the dealers had to report only the amount of pounds. This simply transfers this duty from the Census Bureau to the Department of Agriculture, and now it must report not only the number of pounds on hand, but the grade and group it embraces, so that the producers will know how much is on hand before they prepare for another crop.

This bill unanimously passed the House at the last session, and the Secretary of Agriculture has reported favorably upon it, and the Secretary of Commerce has no objection to the change of the activity from the Census Office to the Department of Agriculture.

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

MR. KINCHELOE. Yes.

MR. McLAUGHLIN. I see a provision here to the effect that if one section of the bill is held to be unconstitutional it shall not make the rest of it unconstitutional. Have you put into the bill the usual provision to that effect? As I heard it read, it sounded to me as though it provides that if the court holds one provision in the bill to be unconstitutional, thereby all the other provisions in the bill become constitutional. It often happens that a case goes to the Supreme Court on one particular portion or feature of a law, and the court passes only upon that and does not express its opinion as to the constitutionality of the other provisions. If the other provisions were not at issue before the court it would not be right to say that because they are not attacked they are constitutional.

MR. KINCHELOE. This bill provides:

If any provision of this act is declared unconstitutional or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provisions to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

MR. McLAUGHLIN. I think that is all right.

MR. KINCHELOE. I think it is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Usually we provide that the applicability to other circumstances shall not be affected by the decision of the Supreme Court. Usually the action of the Supreme Court relates to a paragraph or section of the law and holds that to be either constitutional or unconstitutional. Here you presume the constitutionality of the law when the other sections have not been taken before the court.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS OF TOBACCO

Mr. KINCHELOE. This information will be obtained under this bill from the tobacco dealers or purchasers or manufacturers of cigars and cigarettes. If it should become unconstitutional as to one of these agencies, I do not see why that should affect the others.

Mr. GILBERT. This is the usual language that is employed.

The SPEAKER. 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. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress I have endeavored to secure relief for the tobacco growers by the passage of what is known as the Gilbert tobacco bill. At the last session this bill passed the House but did not pass the Senate.

There are hundreds of thousands of people in the United States engaged in raising tobacco and this bill for their relief will be a substantial help to a large class of farmers. The eighth district of Kentucky, which I have the honor to represent, is one of the largest tobacco-growing sections of the world.

The present law, known as the Cantrill law, provides for the collection of certain statistics, but without sufficient detail. For several years it served to help the grower, but now, under changed conditions, it operates to seriously hurt him. Under its provisions the total amount of tobacco on hand is shown. In the past when there were large crops of tobacco of poor quality the buyers purchased it often lower than 1 cent a pound. This tobacco has been stored away, and though it was unsuited for consumption it became valuable for statistical purposes. This vast quantity under the present law is reported with other tobacco in making up the amount on hand and helps to show a large surplus, and thereby unjustly depresses the market price of the tobacco in the hands of the growers to be sold. Under my bill the manufacturers and dealers report not only the amount on hand but also the years in which it was grown.

This bill also requires the grades and groups of grades and families of tobacco on hand to be shown. Types of tobacco for market purposes differ greatly from one another. Corn and wheat compete with each other more than different types of tobacco compete one with another. Corn and wheat are both used for food, while one type of tobacco is used to smoke, another to chew, and another for snuff. Smoking tobacco is divided in its use—a type for cigarettes, a different type for cigars, still a different type for wrappers, and yet another type for fillers, and so forth. The information of the total amount of tobacco on hand, which alone is required under the present law, is of little value to any grower unless he knows the type and grade also. All of these details are required under my bill. If enacted into law, the grower of light burley, which is used mostly for cigarettes, can know just how much tobacco is on hand of that type which comes in competition with him. This bill will also prevent his price from being lowered by the showing of large stocks of tobacco in no wise competing with him and much of which is of no use or value at all.

James N. Kehoe, of the Burley Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association, testified recently before the House Committee on Agriculture that if this bill had become a law before his association had disposed of its tobacco it would have saved its members \$20,000,000.

The manufacturer and dealer know exactly how much tobacco there is on hand, the amount and quality in the hands of the grower, and this bill gives the grower that same information about the buyer's business that the buyer already has about the grower's business.

It should also be remembered that while the courts directed the manufacturers and dealers' monopoly in tobacco be dissolved, yet in practical application there is yet a monopoly, because there are only about five tobacco buyers to sell to. Although the courts have determined that these buyers are to act independently, anyone who observes their bidding on the breaks must agree that while they go through the pretense of bidding against one another, yet they have arranged just how much and what tobacco and what price will control. While this bill alone can not prevent that and the grower must sell

to these buyers, yet by its provisions he will know whether or not he is being paid a price to which he is entitled under the law of supply and demand, and, if courts and grand juries protect him from an unlawful monopoly, this bill will otherwise protect him as to the knowledge of his rights.

Tobacco should be one of the most stable crops in price. Its different types, unlike general farm products, have a limited area of production. Its consumption has maintained a gradual increase. The increase in the consumption of cigarettes, for which light burley tobacco is used, has increased from five billion to sixty billion within the last 12 years.

This increase in consumption has been much greater than the increase in production, and yet prices have fluctuated solely at the will of the buyers under the pretense of enormous stocks on hand. In view of this situation, it is preposterous that the price of burley tobacco should have been twice as much in one year as it was in the succeeding year. When that occurs, the price is fixed wholly unrelated to the laws of supply and demand.

The tobacco grower has received on an average for his labor smaller pay than any other class of industry, while those engaged in its manufacture have enjoyed profits far in excess of other industries. Financial reports show that the great tobacco companies have even in the recent years of agricultural depression not only declared enormous dividends but have been the only industry able to anticipate its outstanding obligations and meet them before maturity.

Comparisons may not be agreeable, but they are peculiarly enlightening. From the press we learn that the great tobacco manufacturer, James B. Duke, after a very generous career, left an estate of \$300,000,000. This princely fortune was wrung from the tobacco grower of mine and neighboring States, who will leave no property, not even for the wife who, with him, labored in the fields under the summer's sun, nor for children whose only portion in life has been poverty and toil.

Agriculture is in the greatest crisis of its history. My district contains land as fertile as the valley of the Nile, and yet it is plastered with mortgages heretofore unknown. In a country blessed as this, there should be prosperity for both the manufacturer and the farmer. Such there was before this and the preceding administration. The farmer can not benefit by a tariff. He would need no legislative help if others were not permitted by legislation to exploit him.

The party in power can not remove the advantages it gives the manufacturer to the prejudice of the farmer without its own destruction. So while the farmer is gradually being drawn into bankruptcy the party in power flounders in its effort to grant agriculture relief. As it can not take the props from under the manufacturer, it attempts by other props to lift up the farmer to the same level. This is the theory of the McNary-Haugen bill. Would it not be easier, simpler, and less expensive to remove the props from under the manufacturer and thus place them on an equality rather than to build other props at great expense and great complication under the farmer in order to arrive at the same purpose? And what assurance have we that after the farmer has been propped up that the same influence that first gave the manufacturer his props will not again assert itself to still maintain the manufacturers' advantage by still higher props, and where is the false foundation to end?

The Members of Congress from agricultural districts whose friends and neighbors and who ourselves are farmers would like to do something for the farmer, but what can we do with a majority against us who will not permit any real, constructive, far-reaching legislation to be enacted? We are presented with the alternative of seeing our neighbors, our friends, and ourselves suffer without an effort to help them or to vote for a type of legislation like the McNary-Haugen bill, which attempts to do the right thing in the wrong way. I shall vote for the McNary-Haugen bill not because it is the kind of relief I would offer, but because, with the party of manufacturers in control, it is this or nothing.

I am at least glad to offer to one class of farmers, the tobacco grower, this legislation, which is at least simple, constructive, just, and beneficial.

NEW USES OF COTTON

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 11579.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11579) relating to investigation of new uses of cotton.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that this bill is not on the calendar.

Mr. JONES. This bill was reported to-day. A unanimous report was made, and I have a favorable report from the de-

partment and from the Bureau of the Budget. I only ask to bring it up to-day, as I am anxious to secure early passage.

The same character of provision was included in a bill that was passed by the House at the last session, but which was caught in the Senate legislative jam. The bill was ordered reported a week ago, but I did not file the final report until I had the approval of the department and the Budget, which latter reached me to-day. The gentleman realizes the value of such approval before calling a measure up.

Mr. TILSON. Unless the bill is actually in the possession of the House, the House can not act on it.

Mr. JONES. The bill has been in the possession of the House for a week.

Mr. TILSON. There is only one bill so far as legislation is concerned, and that is the bill as reported by a committee. If that bill is not in the physical possession of the House, I do not see how the House can proceed.

Mr. JONES. The bill, together with the report, was dropped in the basket to-day—the actual bill. It is the same bill that was ordered reported by the House a week ago. It was simply dropped in the basket again with the report, and I do not see any reason why we can not proceed with the consideration of it unless there is objection.

Mr. TILSON. My only question is whether the bill is in the possession of the House.

Mr. JONES. It is and has been in the possession of the House for a week, but the report was filed only to-day. The bill was ordered reported a week ago; the bill is in the possession of the House and the Clerk has it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I take it we are proceeding under the general rules which apply on Calendar Wednesday. Under those rules this bill could only come up by unanimous consent and not under the order already made.

Mr. JONES. The remainder of to-day has been yielded to the Committee on Agriculture for the consideration of bills unobjected to.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; consent was not granted for the consideration of bills unobjected to. Consent was granted to yield the remainder of this afternoon to the Committee on Agriculture for the consideration of bills under the rules applicable to Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. JONES. I do not think the latter was tied onto the consent.

Mr. TILSON. I think that was the understanding.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. At least that was the effect of it.

Mr. TILSON. It was the understanding that these bills were to be considered under the regular Calendar Wednesday rules.

Mr. JONES. I will state that the only reason I have brought up the bill now is because I am compelled to be away from the city Wednesday week, which, I understand, will be one of the regular days for the Committee on Agriculture. I am anxious to pass it, and I do not think there will be any controversy over the bill. As stated, a bill carrying similar provisions was passed through the House at the last session but failed in another body due to conditions prevailing there. It has the approval of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget. It was reported unanimously by the committee about a week ago, and I delayed filing the report until I had the approval of the Budget, and then reported it immediately.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The bill could be read as well as the letter from the department, and the letter from the Bureau of the Budget, with the understanding that then the bill shall be subject to unanimous-consent consideration. If that is done I shall not object, if the documents referred to bear out the statements made by the gentleman from Texas, which I have no doubt they will.

Mr. JONES. I have a copy of the letter here.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce are hereby authorized to engage in technical and scientific research in American-grown cotton and its by-products and their present and potential uses, including new and additional commercial and scientific uses for cotton and its by-products, and to diffuse such information among the people of the United States; and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce or their duly authorized representatives may cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or any person in carrying out the purposes of this act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been reported. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the letter from the department be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the letter referred to will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read the letter, as follows:

HON. G. N. HAUGEN,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAUGEN: Your letter of March 1, in which you request comment on the bill H. R. 11579, relating to the investigations of new uses for cotton, has been received. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce to engage in technical and scientific research in American-grown cotton and its by-products and their present and potential uses, including new and additional commercial and scientific uses for cotton and its by-products, and to diffuse such information among the people of the United States.

Believing as we do that one of the greatest single opportunities for improving the economic position for our cotton growers is through the increased use of cotton, we are in sympathy with the purpose of this bill. Somewhat similar authority is carried in the current appropriations act for the Department of Agriculture and for the Department of Commerce, but we believe that specific legislation of this kind is desirable.

Sincerely yours,

W. M. JARDINE,

Secretary of Agriculture.

HERBERT HOOVER,

Secretary of Commerce.

(Submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to Circular No. 49 of that bureau, and returned to the Department of Agriculture with the advice that the legislation proposed in H. R. 11579 is not in conflict with the financial program of the President.)

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. As I understand, the purpose of this bill is to somewhat broaden the authority that is now carried in the appropriation bill, which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to make these studies as to the new uses of cotton? If so, it seems to be a good bill and I am for it.

Mr. JONES. It not only provides for broadening the authority, but also provides for continuing the work that was begun last year. Last year the Committee on Agriculture held hearings upon a measure containing substantially the provisions of this bill. It was reported by the committee and while it was pending the Appropriations Committee included an item covering this work and this is to give legislative authority for a continuation of that work.

A measure which I introduced last year containing substantially the provisions of this bill passed the House during the last session, but died on the Senate Calendar. The pending bill has for its purpose the giving of legislative authority for the continuation of practical investigation into new uses for cotton and its by-products. While the measure last year was pending provision was made in the appropriation bill for the beginning of this work.

Under this provision much valuable work has been done. During recent years most of the attention has been paid to the problems of production. Too little attention has been paid to the problems of distribution. Just now the problem of distribution is a far more vital one. Every thinking man must admit this. The work contemplated by this measure applies to this phase of the problem.

My colleague [Mr. FULMER] has rendered valuable assistance in this matter. In fact, while a bill covering this and other matters was pending last session in the committee, he offered an amendment which materially added to the value of the bill.

Already much valuable work has been done. Experiments are being conducted in the making of brattice cloth for use instead of jute, in the use of cotton materials in conduit installation, in the better finishing of fabrics so as to make them more suitable for use, in the use of bagging for cotton, the making of sugar sacks and other wrappings, and the blending of cotton with other materials in the making of many useful

articles. Surely the House does not want this work discontinued.

In other words, it furthers the effort toward stimulating the consumption of cotton and its by-products. Anything that will do this will help to solve its marketing and disposition, and would, of course, be reflected in a better price for producers of the commodity.

I don't think this Congress could do a finer thing for this great industry. The work costs but little and means much to the cotton producers of the South.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHINDELOW). 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. JONES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, at present I do not care to take much time in discussing H. R. 11579, a bill introduced by my good friend and colleague, Mr. JONES of Texas.

As stated by Mr. JONES, I offered last year an amendment to certain legislation before the Agricultural Committee authorizing the Department of Agriculture to do the line of work contemplated under the Jones bill. This amendment carried an authorization of \$50,000. Under this bill Mr. JONES includes the Department of Commerce, which I think proper because they have done and are doing quite a lot of work along this line.

About four years ago I had the matter of trying to bring about uniform tare for cotton, and the use of cotton bagging as a substitute for jute now used in covering cotton up with Mr. Wallace, then Secretary of Agriculture. I want to say that since that time wonderful progress has been made, and I am hoping in the near future to be able to report favorably from the Agricultural Committee, of which I am a member, a bill (H. R. 10303) introduced by me bringing about the selling of cotton on net weight, uniform tare, and the substitution of cotton bagging for jute bagging.

It is my opinion that if our Government would spend considerable more money along the line of research work and less money in trying to bring about overproduction they would be working much more in the interest of the farmers of the country.

It is an easy matter to go to Congress for most any size appropriation to fight crop pests, and for appropriations to make two sprigs grow where one used to grow; but after all is said and done the farmer is left high and dry, without a proper and up-to-date marketing system. Very often he is left with a surplus that he is unable to handle, which fixes the price of the whole crop, usually under the cost of production.

Cotton bagging for cotton bales has been a recurrent subject of controversy for more than a quarter of a century. In the year 1889, I remember as a boy, the fight that my father, along with other farmers, made to substitute cotton bagging for jute. Southern papers carried headlines as, "The cotton-bagging fight," "The new cotton covering," "The cotton-bagging question," "Cotton or jute," "Let cotton cover cotton," and "Cotton bagging wins." We had at that time, as we have to-day, a Jute Trust, that not only put up a fight but put the cotton-bagging interest out of business, and immediately thereafter the price of jute advanced. This same fight has begun in opposition to my bill, which, if passed, will save the cotton farmers millions annually in freights and otherwise, and besides would consume a quarter of a million bales of low-grade cotton annually.

I quote here a part of a letter written by the manager of a jute-bagging company to his Senator asking that the Senator use his influence to prevent the passage of my bill:

We have before us a copy of bill H. R. 10303, introduced into the House of Representatives by Mr. FULMER. This bill provides for the selling of cotton on net-weight basis and also gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to specify the kind of weight of cotton-bale covering to be used. As the Department of Agriculture has already issued a preliminary statement on the use of cotton bagging for covering cotton, it is obvious that they will specify bagging made of cotton if given the authority.

In regard to selling cotton on a net-weight basis, we see no reason for this, as practically all bagging (jute) is now being made on a 2-pound basis and prices are based on this amount of tare.

We do not wish to burden you with this matter, but you can realize how important it is to us. We trust that after you have considered the matter you will use your influence to prevent the proposed legislation, which would be so destructive.

Under the amendment proposed by me last year the Department of Agriculture entered into this work by designing four weights of cotton bagging and one for patches for the purpose of comparing them with jute bagging in shipping and weather tests. Due to the fact that I am so much interested in this subject, I am glad to say that the cotton used in this test was manufactured in the cooperative testing laboratory at Clemson College, South Carolina, my State, and stood the test well.

As a shipping test, 120 bales of cotton were shipped from Henderson, N. C., to Portsmouth, Va., by rail and to Norfolk, Va., by barge. At Norfolk the cotton was weighed, sampled on both sides, compressed to high density, and shipped to Bremen, Germany. Twenty-four bales of this cotton was covered with 2-pound jute bagging and the balance was covered with the various types and weights of cotton bagging. This same cotton later was shipped back to the United States and is now on exhibition at the Department of Agriculture, where Members interested can call and inspect same. I will not take the time to go into details as to the test comparison of the cotton bagging with jute, but will say that in every way the bagging made of cotton won over the jute.

I will insert here a statement that will be very interesting in connection with this test:

TABLE 3.—Condition on arrival of 120 bales of cotton shipped to Bremen, Germany, by kind of bagging used on the bales, and rank of bagging in the test.

Kind of bagging	Condition of bale on arrival ¹			Rank
	Excellent	Good	Fair	
2-pound jute.....	4	16	4	Normal.
No. 1 cotton.....	5	14	5	Do.
No. 2 cotton.....	8	11	5	15 above normal.
No. 3 cotton.....	13	8	3	50 above normal.
No. 4 cotton.....	15	9		75 above normal.

¹ Excellent.—Bale must be neat in appearance with all bands and marks intact. Heads of bales must be completely covered. No large cuts or torn places permitted. Good.—Bales must be free from actual damage and fairly neat. Marks must be legible and bales must be in fair condition. Not more than 1 band may be missing. Reasonable number of small cuts or torn places permitted. Covering may be loose on one end only. Fair.—Covering is ragged or unattractive. Band may be off. Marks damaged. Bagging cut or torn or ends slightly hanging, but no actual damage to bale.

² A type of bagging is given a rank of normal if an equal number of bales are found to be above and below "good" condition upon arrival in Bremen, Germany. In determining the rank of other types of bagging, 5 points are scored above or below normal for each bale the condition of which was found to be above or below "good" upon arrival in Bremen.

If Members will call upon Hon. Lloyd S. Tenny, Chief Bureau of Economics, Department of Agriculture, he will be glad to furnish them with reports in detail in connection with what I am talking about.

I am inserting herewith statement contained in the report referred to showing the probable increase in price if we should consume only 200,000 bales of cotton for cotton bagging:

It is estimated that something like 200,000 bales of low-grade cotton would be required, on the average, to cover the American cotton crop with a light-weight cotton bagging. It is thought that the consumption of 200,000 bales would have approximately the same effect upon the price level as a reduction of that amount in the available supply; that the rise in the price might amount to as much as one-half cent per pound, or \$2.50 per bale.

The statement below will enumerate other savings:

ESTIMATED ADVANTAGES OF A LIGHT-WEIGHT STANDARDIZED BAGGING

Taking as typical the year 1913, when the production was approximately 13,700,000 bales of 500 pounds each, and when 8,800,000 bales were exported, the following is an estimate of the savings which might accrue from the use of a 6-yard pattern of cotton bagging weighing 5 pounds, and a cotton patch 30 inches wide and 36 inches long, weighing 1 pound per yard:

(a) Taring in Europe (say 80 per cent of cotton tared, at 15 cents per bale).....	\$1,056,000
(b) Inland freight (at, say, 85 cents per 100 pounds on difference between 24 pounds and 16 pounds per bale) on 8,800,000 bales.....	598,400
(c) Ocean freight (at, say, 65 cents per 100 pounds on difference between 26.5 pounds and 16 pounds per bale) on 8,800,000 bales, 265 pounds representing 9 pounds for bands and 3% per cent for bagging.....	600,600
(d) Excess tare (i. e., excess over allowance of 16 pounds per bale) was also avoided by standardization saving, say, 1 pound per bale (say, 7 cents per pound on 8,800,000).....	616,000
(e) Inland freight on 1 pound excess tare per bale, on 8,800,000 bales (say, 85 cents on 100 pounds).....	74,800

(f) Ocean freight on 1 pound excess tare per bale, on 8,800,000 bales (say, 65 cents on 100 pounds).....	\$57,200
(g) Insurance commission, discounts, etc. (say, 2 per cent on 1 pound per bale saved on excess tare) on 8,800,000 bales, cotton selling at 20 cents.....	35,200
(h) Insurance commissions, discounts, etc. (say, 2 per cent on difference between 23.5 pounds and 16 pounds per bale), on 8,800,000 bales, cotton selling at 20 cents.....	369,600
(i) Domestic freight on 8 pounds per bale at an average rate of \$1.10 per 100 pounds, on 4,900,000 bales.....	431,200

(j) Insurance, exchange, etc. (say, 1 per cent on 8 pounds per bale, cotton valued at 20 cents), on 4,900,000 bales.....	\$78,400
Total estimated savings.....	3,917,400

Table 6, taken from Mr. Tenny's report estimating consumption of various types of jute bagging 1909-1920, 1919, 1920, and 1926 should be interesting. It is as follows:

Types of bagging	Consumption				Percentage of total			
	1909-1912 ¹	1919 ¹	1920	1926 ¹	1909 to 1912	1919	1920	1926
New bagging.....	Running yards 254,308,354	Running yards 51,427,000	Running yards 46,896,000	Running yards 62,288,000	P. ct. 69	P. ct. 61.07	P. ct. 48.29	P. ct. 58.94
Imported bagging.....	32,906,574	16,599,616	15,446,428	13,239,653	9	7.83	5.61	12.63
Rewoven bagging.....	24,000,000	8,065,000	7,396,000	24,001,430	7	9.37	7.62	22.79
Sugar-bag cloth.....	7,000,000	12,056,000	9,706,000	6,156,896	2	14.31	10	5.83
Secondhand bagging.....	50,000,000	6,053,496	27,625,028		13	7.22	28.48	
Total.....	368,304,928	84,201,112	97,042,456	105,685,969	100	100	100	100

¹Data used are from Tariff Information Surveys, "Jute cloths," 1922, p. 21.

²Data compiled by means of questionnaire sent out in September, 1927.

³Imports for the calendar years 1919 and 1920 amounted to 8,799,488 square yards and 7,261,904 square yards, respectively. These totals have been converted into linear yards of 45 inches in widths, as have all figures in this column.

Based on actual sales and imports amounting in 1919 to 59,079,476 linear yards and in 1920 to 51,903,727 linear yards.

From the study of cotton bagging for covering cotton, Mr. Tenny gathers the following:

1. Cotton bagging may be manufactured from the lowest grades and staple lengths of cottons produced in the United States, and can be manufactured from high-grade waste.

2. Cotton bagging, as manufactured at present, makes a very suitable covering for cotton bales. It is reasonable to suppose that a better method of spinning yards and weaving the cotton-bagging fabric may be developed by experimentation and the cost of production consequently lowered.

3. Decided economies in transportation and insurance costs would result from the use of a lighter-weight bagging.

4. A strong, light-weight cotton bagging of standard construction and weight would tend to obviate the disagreeable and costly practice of challenging and taring American cotton in spinners' markets at home and abroad.

5. Cotton lint does not adhere to cotton bagging so tenaciously as it does to jute bagging.

6. The lightest weight of cotton bagging thus far tested is superior to 2-pound jute bagging and to the burlap covering commonly used on the Egyptian bale, which has the reputation of being the most attractive covering now entering the world's markets.

In connection with this line of work I have taken up with the Post Office Department the substituting of cotton twine for jute twine, and I have taken up with the Agricultural Department and Department of Commerce the use of cotton bags instead of jute bags for fertilizer and other merchandise.

Since this work has begun it is most interesting to note the activity on the part of the manufacturers of cotton bags and twine.

In the new uses for cotton the department of the Cotton Textile Institute (Inc.) of New York is doing great work along this line also.

I want to quote here some statements contained in a speech made by Hon. George A. Sloan, secretary of this institution, who addressed the thirty-fifth annual convention of the American Wholesale Grocers' Association, May 18, 1927:

Cotton is a basic American industry, and as such deserves the hearty support of the American people. We are a Nation of intense and enthusiastic patriots, and when sound economical buying is coupled with an appeal to our patriotism we may all feel sure that cotton shall be king again.

Have you ever stopped to analyze this commodity, cotton, on which a basic industry has been built up during the centuries? If you have not, let me sketch briefly some of its outstanding qualities which make it vital to our civilized comfort to-day.

Cotton is a good retainer of heat. Conversely, by the porous construction of many cotton fabrics it is one of the coolest materials. Hence its enormous use in tropical countries.

It is economical, in that it has a waste value and many uses beyond the initial use.

It is nature's whitest fiber.

It is nature's cleanest fiber.

It is capable of being spun into very soft and downy products and also into products sufficiently tough to wear down metal surfaces.

It possesses an excellent affinity for dyes and remarkable ability to retain them, and I could go on indefinitely.

Your secretary in his kind letter of invitation asked me to report to this meeting on the results of our investigation to date so far as they relate to the uses of cotton bagging. First of all, you may be interested to know that the following associations and industries have urged their members to use cotton containers in the shipment of their products:

National Coffee Roasters' Association.

National Fertilizer Association.

National Wholesale Grocers' Association.

American Wholesale Grocers' Association.

Rice Millers' Association.

The salt manufacturers have sent out letters to the trade expressing a willingness to ship in cotton when so requested.

Most of the starch manufacturers have advised their customers that they will ship in cotton if so asked.

The following is the status of cotton containers in the various industries as indicated by our studies which at best must be accepted as preliminary.

Eighty per cent of the cement is shipped in cotton sacks.

In the coffee industry Meyer Bros. Coffee & Spice Co., of St. Louis, Mo., have adopted cotton for their 25 and 50 pound sizes for roasted coffee beans with satisfactory results.

Cotton until recently has never been considered suitable for the shipment of cottonseed cake and meal. Yet one of the large companies tells us that they began using cotton bags last October with such satisfaction to their customers that their trade has appreciably increased and they now find it advisable to use cotton sacks entirely. They predict that the various other concerns in this business will soon be compelled to ship in cotton.

Flour is one of the great outstanding fields for the use of cotton, it being estimated that 50 per cent of the 700,000,000 cotton bags now used annually in the United States are used for this purpose.

In the shipment of certain vegetables, for example, potatoes, it has been suggested that cotton bags could be used to advantage on the returnable basis.

Grain is largely shipped in bulk, yet one large company uses from 600,000 to 750,000 cotton sacks, and has the empty bags returned. This has proven so satisfactory and economical that it has had no occasion to buy any new bags in 10 years.

One of the bag companies advises that there has been an increase of approximately 3,000,000 yards of cotton bagging cloth over the quantity used in 1925 for the shipment of chick feeds and staple foodstuffs, like bran and alfalfa meal.

With nuts, the practice has been to use burlap or wooden crates and half barrels. One of the largest peanut shippers is now carrying on extensive investigations into the bagging situation.

In the case of salt, it is common practice to use cotton in the packing of evaporated salt; rock salt is largely shipped in bulk.

For seeds, 7,500,000 cotton bags are needed to handle the commercial demand. In this respect, it is interesting to know that 85 per cent of all seed used in this country either remains on the farm where produced or is sold to neighbors.

Soap is a field in which cotton is coming to the front. In the last year and a half one of the largest companies has shipped over one-third of its product in cotton and states that its advantages are: Ease of handling, saving of floor space, convenience in making up the laundry solutions, and the bags can afterwards be used for collecting the soiled laundry or for returning the wet wash. In one city of Canada (Toronto), 90 per cent of the laundry owners prefer cotton bags. Arbuckle Bros. have

advised us that they are now packing all of their 100-pound packages of refined sugar in cotton.

The meat industry uses large quantities of cotton for the protection of its dressed meat.

Several of the large nurseries are now investigating the use of cotton sackings for the packing of their trees and shrubs.

The grocery trade is doing much toward increasing the use of cotton containers in the shipment of coffee, cottonseed meal, flour, grain, nuts, potatoes, rice, salt, seeds, soap, starch, sugar, and various other bulk commodities. If only 10 per cent of these products were carried in cotton, it would mean an increased use amounting to at least 50,000,000 cotton bags a year. But this percentage is not taken advisedly, and you will therefore see that our studies have only begun to indicate the possibilities.

We know and you know that there are instances where cotton goods may be substituted for other materials for the best interest of the ultimate consumer and consequently of the trades concerned. We both know equally well that there are other instances in which such substitution is not compatible with the public good.

My friends, if we could bring about the using of cotton as a substitute for jute along these lines we would consume not less than 1,000,000 bales of cotton. The National Fertilizer Association reports that during 1926, 7,347,700 tons of fertilizer were used. If all this fertilizer had been bagged in new 200-pound cotton bags made of 8-ounce Osnaburg, approximately 170,000 bales of that year's supply of low-grade cotton would have been consumed.

Think what it would mean to cotton farmers of the South, many of them broke to-day because of the present situation. Think what it would mean to American cotton mills and to thousands of their employees. Therefore, with these facts before the Congress, it seems to me that the Members would be willing to help us secure funds for this line of work.

In 1925 we imported nonmanufactured jute to the amount of \$12,840,972 and manufactured jute fabrics to the amount of \$95,196,263. Please think for a moment of this tremendous amount of money going out of the pockets of the Americans into a foreign country, and in the meantime we are stifled with a surplus of cotton that could be substituted for this foreign product. It is very clear to me that one of our greatest troubles is in not being able to compete with cheap labor in foreign countries.

Mr. Leavelle McCampbell, of Harding, Tilton & Co., New York, makes the following statement regarding wages paid at Bengal:

The jute mills in Bengal pay for carder, 89 cents per week; for rover, \$1.75 per week; for the spinner, \$1.40 per week; for the winder, \$1.91 per week; for the beamer, \$2.37 per week; for the weaver, \$2.84 per week.

It is a strange thing to me that our Republican friends have overlooked the placing of a duty on the importation of jute products which would give our American mills protection so as to manufacture cotton to be substituted for jute.

I think the trouble about this is that the mills in foreign countries are largely owned and operated by Americans, and they seem to have more weight in having free shipments of their goods than mills and farmers in America in having a duty placed thereon.

I hope that the Members will give time and serious thought to this line of work and that they will call on the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce for information and reports regarding same.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a letter from Mr. B. F. Yoakum on farm legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

FEBRUARY 29, 1928.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I received, through Secretary Sanders, a copy of Secretary of Agriculture Jardine's letter to you dated February 14.

While the Secretary of Agriculture agrees partly with my views concerning farm marketing, he expresses himself as not favoring certain suggestions contained in my letter of February 8 to you, which objections I desire briefly to explain.

I appreciate his commendation of its purpose and objective, but apparently Mr. Jardine did not give my plan the full consideration to which it is entitled.

Regarding my estimate that \$7,350,000,000, approximately one-half the price spread between the farmers and consumers, represents "unjustifiable and unnecessary commissions, profits, rake-offs, etc.," he says:

"This department is not acquainted with the basis for these figures. He [Yoakum] has no doubt compiled his data with great care, but our research has thus far failed to reveal such unjustifiable profits in distribution."

My data was carefully compiled. For more than 20 years (and intensely so for the past 7 years) I have concentrated my attention on farm marketing, spending time and money unstintingly in investigating the spread between the farmer and consumer. The Government, so far as I have been able to learn, has given but little attention to that phase of the problem. Therefore, I wish to reaffirm that my figures are dependable.

"The cost of processing [Mr. Jardine says] must also be taken into account."

All but two of the 17 standard farm products I cited (sold to consumers for \$22,500,000,000, of which the farmers received only \$7,500,000,000) go direct from the farmer to consumer. Processing, therefore, does not enter into the question.

Senator CAPPER, in his speech a few days ago at a dinner held under the auspices of Columbia University and the American Country Life Association in New York City, President Nicholas Murray Butler presiding, declared that last year from farm products farmers received \$10,000,000,000, while consumers paid \$30,000,000,000, the rest going to middlemen. In this the Senator included all products, while I confine myself to 17 standard food products.

In paragraph 4 Mr. Jardine says:

"More and better statistical information would help to bring about a reduction in the cost of middlemen services, to the benefit of both producer and consumer"; and that he is "strongly of the opinion that provision should be made for an adequate census of distribution, recommended by Secretary Hoover."

Such a census might be of some value. But it would cause long and useless delay. Why complicate the situation and becloud the issues? When the farmers are calling for action, why feed them statistics?

Mr. Jardine believes with me, that "mass marketing by strong business organizations of producers would reduce cost of marketing, give farmers greater bargaining power, and help stabilize farm prices and adjust production to demand," and that "these associations should be organized along commodity lines." He says:

"However, the enabling legislation proposed by Mr. Yoakum would not be necessary, since farmers already have broad authority under the Capper-Volstead Act to form cooperative marketing associations."

This is partly true, but misses the main point. The Capper-Volstead Act does not enable farmers to control and distribute their products and stabilize prices through a "marketing board of control" consisting of farmers. It does not permit them to direct interstate and foreign shipments, or give them the authority to make a uniform nation-wide marketing system effective.

If that act had given authority to stabilize profitable prices the farmers would not now be on the brink of bankruptcy with farm values reduced from \$79,000,000,000 to \$56,000,000,000 in seven years. There isn't a farmer or business man in the land who does not know that further legislation is necessary, and that it must be upon broader and more practical lines.

"Mr. Yoakum's proposal for a Federal loan for organization purposes should receive a great deal of support, especially among professional promoters." (Page 2, paragraph 3, of Mr. Jardine's letter.)

What does Mr. Jardine mean by that? My plan calls for the least expenditure, a very small loan not exceeding \$1,000,000 to any one commodity marketing organization, and that for organization expenses only, to be reimbursed from the first crop. (Fourth paragraph, page 8, my statement before the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, February 15.) Its very basis is to take this matter out of the hands of promoters and politicians and place it under control of the farmers. The farmers are not promoters, professional or otherwise. In honesty and integrity they stand at the head of our citizenship. In business they are as capable as those engaged in any other lines of industry. Can't they be trusted to care for their own interests and fulfill their obligations to the Government? I am sure they can.

The farmers only stand in need of a simple act of Congress that will give them authority to organize under Federal charters, control distribution of interstate and foreign shipments of their commodities, stabilize prices, and establish a practical, effective nation-wide marketing system.

I agree with Mr. Jardine that "successful cooperation can not be built on the extravagant assertions of professional promoters." Neither can it be built on the extravagant claims of politicians or under professional or political control. It must be kept out of the hands of promoters or politicians, must be controlled by the farmers themselves, operated by them in their interest. That is the very heart of my plan.

I entertain the highest opinion of Mr. Jardine. We are both striving to bring about a better system of farm marketing. We may differ as to methods. I understand Mr. Jardine is favorable to Federal control, on which I strongly disagree. Marketing products of any character is a business proposition and should be operated by those who understand the business. Certainly no one understands the farming business and its requirements as well as the farmers. Therefore,

if the marketing of farm products is taken from under the control of the farmers, the marketing of farm products can not be made successful.

Having sincerely the same objects in view, Secretary Jardine and myself should be able to find a common ground upon which we can work in harmony in seeking a solution of this perplexing problem.

Thanking you, Mr. President, for your consideration of this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

B. F. YOAKUM.

Hon. CALVIN COOLIDGE,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on farm-relief legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, believing that the policies during, and the wicked deflation after, the World War have produced a profound depression and created grave inequalities as between agriculture and other industries, I set forth my reasons for opposing the so-called McNary-Haugen bill, as considered by the Agricultural Committee, that contains the dubious "equalization fee" and its false promises, according to its paid propagandists, of producing prosperity in perpetuity for the farmer.

Reason 1. I want farm legislation to assist agriculture now. Reason 2. I promised, when a candidate, to support my President, Calvin Coolidge, and his policies. He vetoed the McNary-Haugen bill, and especially emphasized the equalization fee as one of its objectionable features. I think it naturally follows he will veto it again with the equalization fee in, therefore its passage means no farm legislation. I want farm legislation now.

Reason 3. The present McNary-Haugen bill contains this equalization fee, the Attorney General, as the legal advisor of the President, says that this fee is unconstitutional, therefore the McNary-Haugen bill may pass both the House and the Senate, but it can not pass either or both the House and Senate over the President's veto and that means no legislation.

Reason 4. Not a single paid propagandist, agitator, or lobbyist for the McNary-Haugen bill has presented one argument before the Agricultural Committee justifying the opinion that this equalization fee is constitutional. The following Members of Congress, irrespective of party and recognized as profound students of constitutional law, are of the opinion that the equalization fee is unconstitutional.

Hon. GEORGE GRAHAM, present chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Hon. HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER, a former president of the American Bar Association.

Hon. WALTON MOORE and the Hon. THEODORE BURTON and others; so even if it became a law, legal and constitutional questions would be raised, interminable litigation started, the "fee" would not be in operation for years, and what agriculture needs is an operative, full-functioning law now.

Reason 5. I believe the cooperative movement has done more and promises more than any other movement for agriculture, and supplementing it with the different agencies created by law and already existing in the Department of Agriculture, is having a tremendously beneficial effect upon agriculture.

Upon an emergency being declared under the McNary-Haugen bill on any commodity the producers thereof are all placed under the equalization fee; therefore if you impose another tax upon cooperative producers when no benefits accrue you greatly discourage and ultimately destroy those cooperatives.

Reason 6. The McNary-Haugen bill in its last analysis is fundamentally un-American, in that the producer's liberty is destroyed, his commodity in the emergency is placed under the equalization fee, and he is compelled thereby to have the production of his commodity taxed and the handling and administration thereof taken from his control; such processes reverse the fundamental theory of our Government, in that those who are "least governed are best governed," and goes contrary to the processes governing the evolution of civilization, that are not founded upon compulsion but rather upon love, education, and cooperation.

I have felt the uncompromising attitude of the proponents of the McNary-Haugen bill was absolutely wrong, and it has been utterly repulsive to me to hear threats of political annihilation uttered by some of these proponents against some of the members of the Agricultural Committee who honestly want farm legislation and honestly believe they will never get it if they expect the McNary-Haugen bill to become a law, in view of the strong opinion of the Attorney General against the equalization fee and the stronger language of President

Coolidge's veto, for the President emphasized the fact that the equalization fee was especially obnoxious.

There seems to be prevalent a conception that by legislative enactment we can bring prosperity to the farmers. Hot-air artists, theoretical economists, and ingenuous organizers have led many of our farming people to believe that through legislative fiat miracles can be wrought, that through taxing all the people 30 per cent of the people can be made prosperous. They seem to ignore or forget the wrecks and tragedies that have followed the State ownership experiments in the Northwest; they seem to overlook the cold, hard experience of the States that guaranteed bank deposits and the troublesome times they went through that necessitated the wiping off from the laws of these States of this guaranty. Read and reread the story again of the experiences of some of our joint-stock land banks, where the uneconomic, unscientific, and dishonest practices led to the indictment of the officials of at least three of those banks and threatened to wreck the entire system.

Any law that encourages the growing of surpluses that must be sold in world markets and hopes to get around the law of supply and demand in the long run is predestined to failure, and any surplus of this year stored in any old place will bob up another year to help reduce prices and demonstrate that the laws of supply and demand finally obtain.

England just completed a great experiment in seeking to control the production and price of crude rubber. This has resulted disastrously, doing incalculable injury to the industry, so that the price of rubber has descended from around \$1.20 to about 31 cents per pound. You may seek to "hamstring and halterbreak" the law of supply and demand, but ultimately she rules.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9495) to provide for the further development of agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement. I stated on the floor I would not call up any bill that carried an appropriation or any bill that had not been passed by the House before. I find we have a bill here that I believe has been materially changed from the way in which it passed the House the last time, and I am not sure but what this is in conflict with the agreement. I shall yield to the gentleman from Michigan to make a statement about it.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, in accordance with the suggestion of Chairman HAUGEN I want to state that a bill with this particular object and with the exact title that this bill bears, passed the House last spring by unanimous consent. The changes to which the chairman refers are two in number, first, the \$480,000 item which the bill of last year carried has been changed to an item of \$960,000; that is to say, the \$10,000 provided for each State under the bill of last year has been increased to \$20,000. This is the first difference.

The second difference is that the bill last year carried a two-year appropriation. The bill this year is a continuing appropriation, but continuing at the same total mentioned in the bill.

These are the only two changes in the bill. There are no particular changes in the phraseology.

By reason of the fact the bill passed by unanimous consent last year I do not propose to take the time of the House at any length this afternoon. I think probably of all the bills that have come before our committee, none has exceeded this bill in the number or enthusiasm of its indorsements. Very briefly, the bill does this.

Mr. Speaker, just a few words will serve to indicate the purpose and scope of this bill. It provides for the further development of the cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics with men, women, boys, and girls, inaugu-

rated under the Smith-Lever Act, passed May 8, 1914. The bill is in conformity with the plans of the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges for further expanding the cooperative extension system.

The first question that might naturally arise in the minds of those who have been supporters of the extension work set up under the Smith-Lever bill and successive acts, is whether or not the supplementary funds provided in this bill are necessary. In answer to this question it would be well to state the extension system is less than one-half completed at the present time. In order to complete the system and provide for extension agents in all the countries requiring them, there is a further need of the employment of 700 county agricultural agents; at least 1,500 county home demonstration agents; and approximately 1,650 agents and assistant agents to conduct boys' and girls' 4-H club work.

In the 2,800 agricultural counties of the United States there are at the present time 2,150 agricultural agents; 900 home demonstration agents and 135 boys' and girls' club agents. The additional appropriation provided in this bill will make it possible to add enough agents to take care of the more urgent calls now on file.

Earlier in my remarks I referred to the very wide indorsement given to this bill by organizations as well as individuals. I think perhaps the most direct, positive, and convincing evidence of the value of the work which is to be extended by the funds set up in this bill was offered by three witnesses directly connected with extension work, who appeared before the committee and spoke from their own experience.

I desire to quote very briefly from the testimony offered by each of these witnesses. The first was Mr. John Visny, of Newtown, Conn., a member of a 4-H club in his county. Mr. Visny first came in contact with the county club agent in connection with some experiments he and his brother were making with an improved variety of ensilage. From this he branched out into growing certified potatoes, and finally centered his interest on dairy work. His progress was so rapid that he finally wound up by taking a rather extensive course in dairy-cattle judging, and concluded so well that in the national dairy judging contest of 1923 he won first place. Mr. Visny's testimony as to the value of club work is summarized very nicely in one brief paragraph, which I quote:

Our real interest and belief in farming as an occupation and knowledge of how farming may be made more profitable; a broader knowledge of the things in this world, as well as a wider circle of friends, contact of the people in the community with us; made dreams of a college education a reality; and strengthened our belief that there is a way out if you can only find it, and through club work we are finding ours. The privilege to take part in club work activities and to state what it has meant to me I must confess I appreciate. I am not sorry for the young farm folks with 4-H opportunities, but I do sympathize from the bottom of my heart with the thousands of young farm folks who are going through what was to me the most important part of my life unaided, because there are not enough county workers to carry club work to all farm boys and girls.

A representative of the girls' clubs appeared before the committee in the person of Miss Viola Yoder, of Cumberland, Md. Miss Yoder took up food, sewing, home improvement, and livestock projects. Her testimony was exceedingly interesting, both as to the practical and esthetic value of club work. Her summary of what it has meant to her and her family is very well stated in her own words:

Then club work has been valuable to my folks, as it has brought me closer to my parents and the duties of my home. It has given me a larger circle of friends; it has given me self-confidence, and it has given me a moral responsibility, and I know the club work has been a benefit in my home, because it has brought the children closer to our parents, and it has brought cheer into our home more than it had before.

Mrs. D. B. Phillips, a local leader of girls' clubs of Forestville, Ohio, offered convincing testimony as to the value of home-demonstration and club work. She said:

So the women's work is certainly not being neglected. But from the small amount that we have been able to receive, just as you might say getting a taste of what is in store for us, has created the desire in every county for the work of a home-demonstration agent. We want it, and the sooner we can get home-demonstration work into our county the better we will be pleased. But I am going to be frank to say this, that I would not prefer either an agricultural or home-demonstration agent in preference to the boys' and girls' club work.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs gave very cordial approval to the bill upon the adoption of an amendment pro-

viding for the appointment of men and women agents in just and fair proportions.

I think it would be a matter of interest to the Members of the House, who naturally have a particular interest in this measure in its application to their several States, just to show what the States are doing in raising and expending extension funds already provided. I present herewith a table showing the amount of funds appropriated under the Smith-Lever and supplemental appropriations from the Federal Treasury for extension work, and in a parallel column the amount similarly expended by State, county, and local agencies:

State	Present funds	
	Federal Smith-Lever and supplemental	Total State, county and local
Alabama.....	\$203,201.83	\$256,208.19
Arizona.....	32,761.23	68,591.23
Arkansas.....	163,576.10	268,060.00
California.....	125,061.46	601,186.87
Colorado.....	61,101.07	152,701.07
Connecticut.....	56,680.09	175,950.00
Delaware.....	20,741.56	11,541.56
Florida.....	74,368.33	272,648.33
Georgia.....	237,780.76	316,780.76
Idaho.....	42,867.74	133,469.32
Illinois.....	228,495.98	763,895.98
Indiana.....	162,087.09	361,385.00
Iowa.....	170,596.43	705,297.57
Kansas.....	130,962.06	434,555.17
Kentucky.....	197,342.23	222,342.23
Louisiana.....	132,963.33	229,811.43
Maine.....	36,217.76	81,017.76
Maryland.....	70,963.51	209,097.11
Massachusetts.....	31,234.75	357,728.50
Michigan.....	159,913.95	496,347.00
Minnesota.....	150,319.33	283,624.33
Mississippi.....	172,904.83	311,071.66
Missouri.....	200,921.32	248,671.32
Montana.....	49,597.13	211,217.00
Nebraska.....	103,620.98	187,378.20
Nevada.....	16,530.11	65,630.11
New Hampshire.....	27,159.69	127,820.00
New Jersey.....	80,773.81	253,650.00
New Mexico.....	41,035.33	112,544.01
New York.....	198,634.11	1,015,812.77
North Carolina.....	227,356.06	377,940.00
North Dakota.....	68,694.01	148,505.00
Ohio.....	228,775.06	529,520.00
Oklahoma.....	166,422.88	304,257.36
Oregon.....	51,224.89	235,398.38
Pennsylvania.....	336,987.38	326,987.38
Rhode Island.....	11,898.82	25,808.82
South Carolina.....	156,014.49	242,104.51
South Dakota.....	66,176.30	190,076.30
Tennessee.....	191,413.63	227,540.00
Texas.....	341,015.26	612,875.81
Utah.....	34,565.68	75,082.32
Vermont.....	35,473.53	85,261.68
Virginia.....	181,804.66	317,454.66
Washington.....	73,808.29	159,550.29
West Virginia.....	125,015.45	246,181.00
Wisconsin.....	155,779.27	291,930.00
Wyoming.....	24,399.74	98,812.54
Total.....	5,880,000.00	13,420,960.73

Taking the United States at large, we find that for every dollar that is voted by the Federal Government for the extension service the States and the local communities match that by \$1.94. Several of the States go far beyond this ratio. It will be conceded that the State of Massachusetts is usually very conservative in matters of this sort. The ratio between the amount of extension funds supplied by the Federal Government and the amount voted by the State of Massachusetts and the local units of government in that State is as 1 to 11; that is to say, Massachusetts votes \$11 out of its own State treasury and the treasuries of its local units against every dollar that is applied to that State out of the Federal Treasury. Taking the State of New York, from which my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. CLARKE] comes, a member who has lent very valuable service in the framing of this bill, for every dollar that is appropriated by the Federal Government for extension work the State of New York appropriates \$5. The State of North Dakota, from which my colleague on the committee [Mr. HALL] comes, appropriates \$2.50, and in the State of Connecticut, usually a very conservative State and the State from which our distinguished floor leader comes, the ratio is 3 to 1.

So, in general, we may say that the response on the part of the States of the Union to this very valuable service has been very fine, indeed, indicating that they do appreciate the work and that they are very anxious that it be extended. The dis-

tribution of funds under this bill will be \$20,000 to each State of the Union the first year. Beginning with the second year, the total distribution by States, both cooperative and noncooperative, will be as follows:

State	Amount
Alabama.....	\$37,889.06
Arizona.....	22,107.52
Arkansas.....	34,220.01
California.....	30,653.84
Colorado.....	24,731.58
Connecticut.....	24,322.23
Delaware.....	20,994.69
Florida.....	25,960.03
Georgia.....	41,090.81
Idaho.....	23,043.31
Illinois.....	40,231.11
Indiana.....	34,082.14
Iowa.....	34,870.04
Kansas.....	31,200.19
Kentucky.....	37,346.50
Louisiana.....	31,885.54
Maine.....	24,557.20
Maryland.....	25,644.77
Massachusetts.....	21,966.18
Michigan.....	33,880.92
Minnesota.....	32,992.53
Mississippi.....	35,083.78
Missouri.....	37,677.90
Montana.....	28,668.40
Nebraska.....	20,604.64
Nevada.....	21,588.86
New Hampshire.....	26,553.13
New Jersey.....	22,873.66
New Mexico.....	37,466.12
New York.....	40,125.56
North Carolina.....	25,434.63
North Dakota.....	40,256.95
Ohio.....	34,483.60
Oklahoma.....	23,817.12
Oregon.....	50,276.61
Pennsylvania.....	20,148.04
Rhode Island.....	33,519.86
South Carolina.....	25,201.51
South Dakota.....	36,797.56
Tennessee.....	50,649.56
Texas.....	22,274.60
Utah.....	22,358.66
Vermont.....	35,907.84
Virginia.....	25,913.73
Washington.....	30,649.58
West Virginia.....	33,498.08
Wisconsin.....	21,333.31
Wyoming.....	
Total.....	1,460,000.00

Mr. Speaker, many additional things might be said as to the value of the work which it is proposed to continue and enlarge under the funds provided in this bill. Because of the fact, however, that no objection appeared to the passage of the bill last year and that the situation is practically the same this year, so far as my information goes, I do not want to trespass further upon the time of the House with a discussion of its merits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair desires to say that the gentleman from Michigan has proceeded by unanimous consent.

Mr. TILSON. Leave has been given to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole, but the bill has not been read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa called up the bill and immediately asked unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] make a statement. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to further develop the cooperative extension system as inaugurated under the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," approved May 8, 1914, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying the expenses of the cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, and the necessary printing and distributing of information in connection with the same, the sum of \$960,000 for each year, \$20,000 of which shall be paid annually, in the manner hereinafter provided, to each State which shall by action of its legislature assent to the provisions of this act. The payment of such installments of the appropriations hereinbefore made as shall become due to any State before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this act may, in the absence of prior legislative assent, be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year following that in which the foregoing appropriation

first becomes available, and for each year thereafter, the sum of \$500,000. The additional sums appropriated under the provisions of this act shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under such act of May 8, 1914, except that (1) at least 80 per cent of all appropriations under this act shall be utilized for the payment of salaries of extension agents in counties of the several States to further develop the cooperative extension system in agriculture and home economics with men, women, boys, and girls; (2) funds available to the several States under the terms of this act shall be so expended that the extension agents appointed under its provisions shall be men and women in fair and just proportions; (3) the restriction on the use of these funds for the promotion of agricultural trains shall not apply.

Mr. ASWELL. Now, Mr. Speaker, may I make an inquiry? In view of the fact that this bill passed the House at the last session by unanimous consent, that it has the indorsement of the committee, that it has the approval of everybody else that has been before the committee, including the American Federation of Women, consisting of some 3,000,000 people, I wonder why it is necessary to debate it at all. How much time will be given to it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is now being debated under the five-minute rule. The first section has been read and the gentleman from Michigan recognized.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Lever law—I do not call it the Smith-Lever law because I know how it originated, and Mr. Lever should have the credit of it—when the Lever law was passed it provided for \$10,000 to each State and a proportionate share of a larger sum to be divided among the States in proportion to their population, but it gave the money only to the States. I believe an amendment has been made by which the Territories also get the benefit of it. Now, this bill, as it now reads, the bill now before us, proposes to give money only to the States. Should it not be so amended that the additional money will go to the Territories as well as to the States?

Mr. KETCHAM. Let me say that that point has been strongly urged by the Delegate from Hawaii who is present and able to present his own argument.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Very well. I did not see the Delegate. If I had known he was here, ready as he evidently is to take care of the matter, I would not have spoken.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And before the gentleman proceeds I would like to ask a question for information, because we have not had an opportunity to examine the bill. This does not make any change in the structure of the original act?

Mr. KETCHAM. No.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It merely increases the appropriation?

Mr. KETCHAM. It does not make any change in the structure of the original act, but it provides the way that the funds shall be expended; and the major portion of the money shall go to the men and women agents in a just and fair proportion.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the figures "\$960,000" and insert "\$980,000."

Page 2, line 11, after the word "State," insert the words "and Territory of Hawaii."

On page 2, line 14, after the word "State," insert the words "the Territory."

Page 3, line 5, after the word "State," insert "and Territory of Hawaii."

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker it will be recalled that the other day when the Agricultural Department appropriation bill was under consideration I asked for the inclusion of certain benefits for the Territory of Hawaii. At that time I was told, and it was so held, that such matters should come from the Legislative Committee. I have proposed at this time an amendment which will unequivocally take care of the needs of the Territory of Hawaii in connection with this particular bill.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. And if the gentleman's amendment is adopted I suppose the Legislature of Hawaii will have to make a matching appropriation, just the same as the legislature of a State?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That is correct. They have heretofore taken care of all such benefits that they have been given the privilege of sharing in.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. And they have the power to do that under the organic act?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. They have that power under the organic act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Has not this same privilege been extended to other of our outlying possessions?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. We are not an "outlying possession." We are a Territory, and as such occupy a position quite distinct from Porto Rico, the Philippines, and the Virgin Islands. By the terms of the organic act which was framed by the Congress we were accorded certain privileges which are not being met unless this particular amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I heartily approve the gentleman's amendment; but my impression is that the Lever Act had been extended to other possessions or Territories beside the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. No.

Mr. KETCHAM. Do not the provisions of the Purnell Act apply to Hawaii?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. To the "Territories," in the language of the bill; but by administrative decisions Hawaii does not yet benefit by reason of the Purnell Act.

Mr. KETCHAM. To what extent do any of these bills that have this feature in them apply to Hawaii?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. We feel they all apply, but by administrative decisions we have been denied the benefits.

Mr. KETCHAM. Does the gentleman happen to know whether any of them apply to Alaska?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Only the second Morrell and the Nelson Acts, I believe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 2. The sums appropriated under the provisions of this act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, sums appropriated under such act of May 8, 1914, or sums otherwise annually appropriated for cooperative agricultural extension work.

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF MOUNT WEATHER OBSERVATORY

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 89, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of real property, located in Loudoun and Clarke Counties, Va., known as Mount Weather, no longer required for observatory and laboratory purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa calls up House Joint Resolution 89. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1531, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell the Weather Bureau station known as Mount Weather, in the counties of Loudoun and Clarke, in the State of Virginia, a similar bill, be substituted for the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the Senate bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to advertise for sale and to sell to the highest responsible bidder the premises known as Mount Weather, in the counties of Loudoun and Clarke, in the State of Virginia, and comprising 84.81 acres of land, more or less, together with the buildings and other improvements thereon, including laboratories, cottages, sheds, stables, shops, heating and power plant, kite shelter, and other buildings of whatever nature, together with all rights, easements, and appurtenances thereto belonging, at such time, in such manner, and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States; to convey such property to the purchaser thereof by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt, after deducting the expenses incident to such sale, but the Secretary of Agriculture shall reserve the right to reject any and all bids if in his judgment it is in the public interest to do so; and in the event of a general rejection of bids, to readvertise the property under conditions provided herein as often as may be necessary to accomplish sale.

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

House Joint Resolution 89 was laid on the table.

EXPORT OF HORSES, SHEEP, ETC.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 140, to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 3, 1891, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa calls up House Joint Resolution 140, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. L. 833), be amended by adding, after the word "cattle," as it occurs in lines 4 and 6 of section 1 and in lines 2 and 5 of section 2, a comma followed by the words "horses, sheep, goats, or swine," so that said sections as hereby amended shall read as follows:

"That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to examine all vessels which are to carry export cattle, horses, sheep, goats, or swine from the ports of the United States to foreign countries, and to prescribe by rules and regulations or orders the accommodations which said vessels shall provide for export cattle, horses, sheep, goats, or swine as to space, ventilation, fittings, food and water supply, and such other requirements as he may decide to be necessary for the safe and proper transportation and humane treatment of such animals.

"SEC. 2. That whenever the owner, owners, or master of any vessel carrying export cattle, horses, sheep, goats, or swine shall willfully violate or cause or permit to be violated any rule, regulation, or order made pursuant to the foregoing section the vessel in respect of which such violation shall occur may be prohibited from again carrying cattle, horses, sheep, goats, or swine from any port of the United States for such length of time, not exceeding one year, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, and such vessel shall be refused clearance from any port of the United States accordingly."

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

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

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the House joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

MEDALS GRANTED BY CONGRESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a bill which I introduced some time ago and which passed the House a few days ago, authorizing a medal to be awarded to Colonel Lindbergh, Mr. Harvey Thomas, the efficient clerk to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, has prepared an article, including some statistics, in regard to medals that Congress has given. I think this article by Mr. Thomas would be very interesting to the membership of the House, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incorporating the statement referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statistics prepared by Mr. Harvey Thomas, clerk to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the House of Representatives, in regard to the granting of congressional medals:

THE MEDALS CONGRESS GIVES

By Harvey Thomas

Ninety-three instances, either of individuals or events, have been recognized by Congress through the presentations of gold, silver, or bronze medals since the formation of the United States. This enumeration does not include, of course, the formal congressional medals of honor awarded for exceptional valor. The proposal, however, to give Col. Charles A. Lindbergh another medal at the hands of Congress, as carried by the bill of Representative TILSON, of Connecticut, and already reported out of committee, would list this award in this category and would make the ninety-fourth such recognition since March 25, 1776, when the first medal was struck in honor of Washington before Boston.

Mr. TILSON has personally made a careful study of the records of the Treasury Department regarding these special medals and has reported the result to Chairman RANDOLPH PERKINS, of the House Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, which has had the latest Lindbergh proposal in hand. In addition to the medals referred to above as "specials," Mr. TILSON's report shows that 29 other medals have been struck in bronze in honor of each of the Presidents on the dates of their inauguration. There have also been 11 medals in gold

and silver symbolical of some particular tie-up with George Washington, 10 others emblematical of the Secretaries of the Treasury, and 14 picturing various directors of the mint. None of these, however, was authorized by Congress.

The same report by Mr. TILSON discloses further and somewhat oddly that the rarest of all the medals ever issued by the Government, in so far as present-day value is concerned, was one awarded to Dr. Joseph Pancoast by congressional authorization in 1867. Doctor Pancoast was professor of anatomy at Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia, and was considered one of the greatest of the early day surgeons. A replica of this medal is on exhibition in the National Museum at Washington. The Treasury holds this medal to-day as valued at \$231.50 in gold. The nearest approach to it in value for a gold congressional award is the medal given in 1858 to Louis Agassiz, the naturalist, which has a present-day price of \$105.50. Of those medals not authorized by Congress the one having the highest value was awarded to the third Director of the Mint, J. Ross Snowden. It is worth \$221 in gold, the engraver having been Paquet.

The congressional authorized special medals as reported by Mr. TILSON to Congress have been catalogued as "28 to members of the Army, 32 to members of the Navy, and 33 miscellaneous." The Agassiz and Pancoast medals come under the latter head, of course. Other miscellaneous medal awards by Congress, all in gold, silver, or bronze began with recognition to James A. Garfield during the Civil War. In the order of subsequent cataloguing by the Treasury for Mr. TILSON the awards are mentioned as follows:

Lincoln and Grant, Pennsylvania Bicentennial, Valley Forge Centennial, Lincoln and Garfield, Lincoln (broken column), Japanese Embassy, Frederick Rose, Indian Peace Medal, Hosack, First Steam Coinage, Pacific Railroad, Emancipation Proclamation, Cyrus W. Field, Indian Peace (Grant), Indian Peace (Hayes), Indian Peace (Garfield), Indian Peace (Arthur), Indian Peace (Cleveland), Indian Peace (Harrison), Let Us Have Peace (Grant), Seward-Robinson, United States Diplomatic, Great Seal, Joseph Francis, Lincoln Centennial, Wright Brothers, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge.

The medals authorized by Congress for presentation to Army officials or in commemoration of military events, the first eight of which were executed in France have been enumerated by the Treasury, as follows:

Washington before Boston, Major General Gates for Saratoga, Brigadier General Morgan for Cowpens, Lieutenant Colonel Howard for Cowpens, Lieut. Col. W. A. Washington for Cowpens, Count de Fluery for Stony Point, Maj. Gen. Anthony Wayne for Stony Point, Maj. Henry Lee for Paulus Hook, Maj. Gen. Nathaniel Greene for Eutaw Springs, Major General Scott for Chippewa and Niagara, Major General Gaines for Fort Erie, Major General Porter for Chippewa, Niagara, and Erie; Major General Brown for same, Brigadier General Miller for same, Brigadier General Ripley for same, Major General Macomb, Battle of Plattsburgh; Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson for Battle of New Orleans, Major General Harrison for Thames, Governor Isaac Shelby for Thames, Col. George Croghan for Sandusky, Major General Taylor for Palo Alto, Major General Taylor for Buena Vista, Major General Taylor for Monterey, Major General Scott for battles in Mexico, Major General Grant, Pennsylvania Volunteers, action on Lake Erie, Major General Scott at request of Commonwealth of Virginia, Colonel Armstrong for village of Kittanning.

On the Navy side the special congressional awards other than congressional medals of honor were given to John Paul Jones for *Serapis*, Capt. Thomas Truxtun for action with *La Vengeance*, Capt. Preble before Tripoli, Captain Hull for capture of *Guerriere*, Capt. Jacob Jones for capture of *Frolic*, Captain Decatur for capture of *Macedonian*, Captain Bainbridge for capture of *Java*, Captain Burrows for capture of *Borer*, Lieutenant McCall for same, Captain Perry for Lake Erie, Captain Lawrence for capture of *Peacock*, Captain MacDonough for capture of British fleet on Lake Champlain, Captain Henley for same, Lieutenant Cassin for same, Captain Warrington for capture of *Epervier*, Captain Blakely for capture of *Reindeer*, Captain Biddle for capture of *Penguin*, Captain Stewart for capture of *Cyane* and *Levant*. Rescue of officers and crew of brig *Somers*, Captain Ingraham, Captain Perry at request of State of Pennsylvania, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Captains Creighton, Low, and Stopper for work at wreck of steamer *San Francisco*; Commodore Perry, at request of merchants of Boston, Metis shipwreck medal; John Horn, for life saving, Lieut. Victor Blue, United States Coast Survey, for gallantry and humanity, departure of American Fleet.

The Washington medals are featured around these symbols, "Time increases his fame," "Cabinet medal," "Washington and Jackson," "Commencement of Washington coin cabinet," "Presidency relinquished," "Allegiance," "Washington and Lincoln," "Washington and Grant," "Washington wreath," "Washington before Boston," "Washington, President."

Those Secretaries of the Treasury who have been immortalized on medals, the last four being on bronze only, were William Windom, John G. Carlisle, Daniel Manning, Lyman J. Gage, Leslie M. Shaw, George B. Cortelyou, Franklin MacVeagh, William G. McAdoo, Carter Glass, and A. W. Mellon.

In addition to the medals Congress has also authorized and ordered the special coinage of 17 different pieces of money—gold dollars, silver dollars, and silver half dollars—each commemorative of some historic event in the Nation's progress.

The first of these was the Columbian half dollar coined in 1892, and the Isabella silver quarter struck in 1893 for the World's Fair in Chicago. The next was the Lafayette silver dollar struck in 1899. This was followed by special gold dollars for the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis in 1903, two types being made, one showing the head of Thomas Jefferson and the other that of William McKinley. Then came the Lewis and Clark Exposition gold dollar in 1904, and the Pan Pacific Exposition coins. There were four of these—one 50-dollar gold piece, 2½-dollar gold pieces, 1-dollar gold pieces, and silver half dollars—all stamped in 1915. Also, there were two types of this 50-gold piece, one round and the other octagonal.

In 1916 the McKinley gold dollar was authorized in connection with the erection of a memorial building at Niles, Ohio, and this was followed in 1918 with the Illinois Centennial half dollar commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of Illinois' admission to the Union. The Maine Centennial half dollar appeared in 1920, as did the Alabama Centennial half dollar and the Pilgrim Tercentenary half dollar. In 1921 Missouri celebrated its centennial by getting Congress to approve a special half dollar coin, and the next year the Grant Memorial coins, gold dollars and half dollars, came out in honor of the centenary of the birth of the Civil War general. In 1923 another half dollar was minted, known as the Monroe Doctrine Centennial coin, and a month afterward the Walloon-Huguenot half dollar appeared to commemorate the three hundredth anniversary of the settlement of the Middle States in 1624.

The last three special half dollars minted were known as the Vancouver half dollar, the Sesquicentennial half dollar, and the Oregon Trail half dollar.

None of this coinage has been profitable to the Government, according to a recent letter to Congress by Secretary Mellon. In fact, Mr. Mellon says the special coinages have been dangerously impractical. In this connection Mr. Mellon said:

"The issue of special coins for various commemorations has grown in recent years to the proportions of a distinct abuse of our coinage. As your committee is aware, I feel that the coinage should not be commercialized. The practice introduces confusion into our coinage system, is an unwarranted expense, and, as actual results have shown, special coins are not liked by the public. They are seldom absorbed for circulation, and there are instances of special coins having been refused in trade for the reason that the public is not familiar with them. The issue of special coins opens an easy way for counterfeiting and makes the protection of our coinage difficult. As already stated to your committee in commenting on other bills, aside from the dangerous and objectionable policy of diverting the coinage from its original use in trade, we are imposing upon the mints, and therefore, upon the Government, an unnecessary and wasteful practice. We are required to invest money in the precious metals for coinage not needed, to be sold at a profit for a particular enterprise, and we are entirely defeating the primary purpose of coinage."

FURTHER MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 9293. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Clinch River on the Sneedville-Rogersville road in Hancock County, Tenn.; and

H. R. 9843. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Kanawha River in or near Henderson, W. Va., to a point opposite thereto in or near Point Pleasant, W. Va.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 9198. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Paris-Dover road in Henry and Stewart Counties, Tenn.; and

H. R. 9199. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Dover-Clarksville road in Stewart County, Tenn.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 437. An act authorizing the Maysville Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky.;

H. R. 472. An act authorizing the Dwight P. Robinson & Co. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky.;

H. R. 2809. An act for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Thomas;

H. R. 5476. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. a tract of land situate in the city of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 6491. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, as amended;

H. R. 6579. An act for the relief of James W. Kingon;

H. R. 6684. An act to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, relating to isolated tracts of public land;

H. R. 7008. An act to authorize appropriations for the completion of the transfer of the experimental and testing plant of the Air Corps to a permanent site at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7553. An act for the relief of James Neal;

H. R. 8293. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913;

H. R. 8899. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Epes, Ala.;

H. R. 8900. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Tombigbee River near Gainesville on the Gainesville-Eutaw road between Sumter and Green Counties, Ala.;

H. R. 9019. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Calion, Ark.;

H. R. 9063. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Chattahoochee River at or near Alaga, Ala.;

H. R. 9202. An act to authorize construction at the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.;

H. R. 9204. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Current River at or near Success, Ark.;

H. R. 9339. An act granting the consent of Congress to the board of county commissioners of Trumbull County, Ohio, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mahoning River at or near Warren, Trumbull County, Ohio; and

H. R. 9484. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Aliceville on the Gainesville-Aliceville road in Pickens County, Ala.

The SPEAKER also announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 700. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to execute an agreement with the middle Rio Grande conservancy district providing for conservation, irrigation, drainage, and flood control for the Pueblo Indian lands in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

S. 771. An act providing for the gift of the U. S. S. *Dispatch* to the State of Florida;

S. 1705. An act authorizing the Court of Claims to render judgment in favor of the administrator of or collector for the estate of Peter P. Pitchlynn, deceased, instead of the heirs of Peter P. Pitchlynn, and for other purposes;

S. 2902. An act authorizing the States of Wisconsin and Michigan to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Menominee River at or near Marinette, Wis.; and

S. 2342. An act providing for a per capita payment of \$25 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 176. House joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement or compact entered into between the State of Wisconsin and the State of Michigan for the construc-

tion, maintenance, and operation of a highway bridge across the Menominee River; and

H. R. 11197. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant rights of way to the Vicksburg Bridge & Terminal Co. upon, over, and across the Vicksburg National Military Park at Vicksburg, Warren County, Miss.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 8, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, March 8, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for national representation for the people of the District of Columbia (H. J. Res. 18).

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

Legislative appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To safeguard national defense; to authorize, in the aid of agriculture, research, experiments, and demonstration in methods of manufacture and production of nitrates and ingredients comprising concentrated fertilizer and its use on farms (H. R. 10028).

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10 a. m.)

To further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States (S. 744).

To promote, encourage, and develop an American merchant marine in connection with the agricultural and industrial commerce of the United States, provide for the national defense, the transportation of foreign mails, the establishment of a merchant marine training school, and for other purposes (H. R. 2).

To amend the merchant marine act, 1920, insure a permanent passenger and cargo service in the north Atlantic, and for other purposes (H. R. 8914).

To create, develop, and maintain a privately owned American merchant marine adequate to serve trade routes essential in the movement of the industrial and agricultural products of the United States and to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States; to provide for the transportation of the foreign mails of the United States in vessels of the United States; to provide naval and military auxiliaries; and for other purposes (H. R. 10765).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

A hearing to consider private bills on the committee calendar.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

(10.30 a. m.)

Providing that in all civil-service examinations for appointment to positions under the Federal Government or the District of Columbia honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines shall have five points added, and all such soldiers, sailors, and marines who because of disability are entitled to pension under the pension laws or to compensation under the World War veterans' act, 1924, shall have 10 points added (H. J. Res. 212).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

398. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation under the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, for the fiscal year 1928, in the sum of \$2,500 (H. Doc. No. 194), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 134. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 11526; a bill to

authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 847). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 11579. A bill relating to investigation of new uses of cotton; without amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EVANS of Montana: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 126. A bill to add certain lands to the Missoula National Forest, Mont.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11685. A bill to accept the cession by the State of California of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Lassen Volcanic National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7230. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Dewey; without amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11819) for the relief of Richard L. Meares, administrator of Armand D. Young, deceased, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 11846) authorizing the American Bridge & Ferry Co. (Inc.), its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 11847) to authorize the acquisition of the Queen Emma and Damon Estates, and the Halawa site in the vicinity of Fort Kamehameha, Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 11848) to amend the definition of the words "manufacture of oleomargarine," and to amend the limitation upon oleomargarine taxable at one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, in the act entitled "An act defining butter; also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11849) to amend the World War act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 11850) to authorize the Attorney General to submit a report covering the establishment of an adequate penal system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNS: A bill (H. R. 11851) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 11852) providing for the confirmation of grant of lands formerly the United States Barracks at Baton Rouge, La., to the board of supervisors of the Louisiana State University and Agriculture and Mechanical College; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 11853) creating a commission on the electoral system of the United States and defining its duties; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 228) providing that in all civil-service examinations for appointment to positions under the Federal Government or the District of Columbia honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines shall have five points added, and all such soldiers, sailors, and marines who, because of disability, are entitled to pension under the pension laws or to compensation under the World War veterans' act, 1924, shall have 10 points added, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass all bills authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Ohio River between Maysville, Ky., and Aberdeen, Ohio, now pending before it; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 11854) for the relief of John W. Leich, alias John Leach; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11855) for the relief of James E. Fraser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 11856) granting a pension to Margaret Creamer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11857) to correct the military record of Jacob Shuey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 11858) for the relief of V. P. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11859) for the relief of B. C. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 11860) granting an increase of pension to Joanna Burnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. W. T. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11861) granting a pension to Mary E. Landis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11862) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 11863) granting a pension to Anna Dix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11864) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Jarboe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 11865) for the relief of the Tilghman Canning Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11866) granting a pension to Dwight A. Morford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 11867) for the relief of John E. Davidson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 11868) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 11869) for the relief of William L. Bruhn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 11870) granting a pension to Bertha Becker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11871) to allow the distinguished-service cross for service in the World War to be awarded to First Lieut. Royal R. Baronides; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11872) for the relief of C. N. Knight, administrator of John Ridout MacGregor; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11873) granting an increase of pension to William Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 11874) granting a pension to Charles C. Leiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORMAN: A bill (H. R. 11875) granting a pension to Laura Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 11876) granting a pension to Alice E. Howsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 11877) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hansmeier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 11878) granting a pension to Hannah Poston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 11879) for the relief of Irene Brand; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11880) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 11881) granting a pension to Kerra C. Weesner; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 11882) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Winkler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 11883) granting a pension to Mary F. Leavitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 11884) granting a pension to Charles B. Slanker; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5036. Petition of Benevolent Protective Order of Elks, Atlantic City Lodge, No. 276, urging upon the Members of Congress a full compliance with the recommendations of Secretary of the Navy Curtis D. Wilbur for additions to the naval forces of the Nation; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5037. By Mr. BACON: Petition of sundry citizens of Flushing, Long Island, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5038. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, protesting against the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5039. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of citizens of Burke County, N. C., protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5040. By Mr. BURTNESS: Letter of Gate City Building & Loan Association, Fargo, N. Dak., protesting against passage of the Oddie bill (S. 1752); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5041. Also, petition of Florence Kimball Post, No. 7, American Legion, Lisbon, N. Dak., approving the action of the national convention of the Legion as to a naval program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5042. Also, petitions signed by 85 residents of Cass County, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5043. By Mr. CASEY: Petition of 125 citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Lankford bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5044. Also, resolution of Local Union 1138, United Mine Workers of America, of Edwardsville, Luzerne County, Pa., signed by Adam Mulch, president; Joseph J. Evans, secretary; and C. I. Bennett, Vincent Trettis, Daniel Jones, Max Koslishuis, resolution committee, appealing to Congress to curb the promiscuous and indiscriminate use of the injunction in labor disputes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5045. Also, letter of Louis Frank, vice president of the Pennsylvania Wholesale Drug Co., of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., favoring the passage of the Capper-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5046. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of sundry citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., against the passage of House bill 78, or any other similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5047. Also, petition of Los Angeles Central Labor Council, protesting against House bill 78, or any other similar legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5048. Also, petition of Red Bluff Chamber of Commerce, Red Bluff, Calif., in the matter of House bill 5543, introduced by Congressman HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5049. By Mr. CULLEN: Letter from United Wall Paper Crafts of North America, urging passage of Cooper-Hawes bill, also letter from Fredensborg Lodge No. 258, Danish Brotherhood of America, in re immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5050. By Mr. CURRY: Petition protesting against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5051. Also, petition of citizens of the third California district, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5052. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of William Graham and other citizens of Nevada City, Calif., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5053. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of Harley Messenger, of Tujunga, Calif., and 36 other citizens, for the relief of the permanently disabled emergency officers of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5054. By Mr. ROY G. FITZGERALD: Petition of 92 citizens of Montgomery County, Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, making Sunday observance com-

pulsory in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5055. By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of 43 citizens of Priest River, Idaho, protesting against enactment of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5056. Also, petition of 16 citizens of Latah County, Idaho, protesting against House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5057. By Mr. FULMER: Petition signed by the citizens of Columbia, S. C., against the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5058. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Council of the New England Historic Genealogical Society, Henry Edwards Scott, recording secretary, 9 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass., recommending passage of House bill 5626, providing for the printing of the names of the heads of families as returned by each Federal census from 1800 to 1840, inclusive; to the Committee on the Census.

5059. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of residents of King County, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5060. Also, petition of residents of Marysville, Wash., and vicinity, protesting against the Lankford Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5061. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 76 citizens of Rochester, Portsmouth, Dover, and Farmington, N. H., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or any compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5062. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of residents of Medford, Azales, Glendale, Yoncalla, Portland, Eugene, Tillamook, Salem, Coos County, Yamhill County, Josephine County, Jackson County, Marion County, and the first congressional district, all in the State of Oregon, against the passage of the Lankford Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5063. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petition of Mayor Thomas Dolan and borough council of Sayreville, N. J., requesting proper maintenance for existing project South Channel, Raritan River, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5064. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of citizens of Tacoma, Wash., protesting against the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5065. By Mr. KORELL: Petition of citizens of Portland, Oreg., against the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5066. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of United States Immigration Inspectors' Association, New York, N. Y., urging support of the Reed-Jenkins bill providing an increase in salaries for immigrant inspectors; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5067. Also, petition of National Association of Finance Companies, opposing the Jones bill, or any other bill calculated to put the Government into business for the performance of functions which can be handled better by private interests; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5068. Also, petition of joint legislative committee of the radio industry, making recommendations with respect to the regulatory powers of the Federal Radio Commission, appointment of members of the commission, and with respect to the principle of equitable distribution of radio service; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5069. Also, petition of Knights of Columbus, New York State Council, praying for enactment of legislation providing for full Federal responsibility in respect to future flood protection measures in the lower Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Flood Control.

5070. Also, petition of Masters, Mates, and Pilots Association, Pittsburgh Local No. 25, presenting set of resolutions registering vigorous protest against House bill 11137, entitled "A bill to extend the powers of pilots holding Federal licenses"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5071. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Memorial of Lodge Regina Elena, Order Sons of Italy, approving joint resolution of Senator Copeland requesting President to proclaim October 12 as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5072. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Gibson-Snow Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., in favor of the Capper-Kelly bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5073. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Seattle, Wash., protesting passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5074. By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Petition of I. N. Jones, E. P. Coleman, and other residents of the eighth district of the State of Virginia, protesting against the passage of House bill

78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5075. Also, petition of R. T. Ballard and other residents of the eighth district of the State of Virginia, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5076. Also, petition of M. J. Riley and other residents of the eighth district of the State of Virginia, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5077. Also, petition of K. M. Kendrick and other residents of the eighth district of the State of Virginia, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5078. Also, petition of Mrs. C. E. Gheen, Alma D. Poole, and other residents of the eighth district of the State of Virginia, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5079. Also, petition of I. N. Rich, Mrs. I. N. Rich, Ruth Rich, Mrs. R. R. Rich, R. R. Rich, and M. E. Rich, residents of the eighth district of the State of Virginia, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5080. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Masters, Mates, and Pilots Association of America, Local No. 25, of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing favorable report on House bill 11137, on basis of resolution passed at regular meeting on March 6; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5081. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the International Seamen's Union of America, favoring the Senate amendment to the appropriation for the Shipping Board providing that none of the appropriation shall be used to sustain the sea-service bureau; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5082. Also, petition of the joint legislative committee of the radio industry, Washington, D. C., favoring Federal Radio Commission be extended until March 15, 1929, that the appointment of members of the commission be for terms provided in the radio act of 1927; that the principle of equitable distribution of radio service established in the radio act of 1927 be maintained without adding the arbitrary requirement of a physical equality of distribution which would be without precedent in legislative history; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5083. Also, petition of the New York Photo Engravers' Union, No. 1, New York City, favoring the passage of the Shipstead-LaGuardia bill (S. 1482) and the Cooper-Hawes bill (S. 1940 and H. R. 7729); to the Committee on Labor.

5084. By Mr. OLDFIELD: Petition of Louisa Hickman et al., Denmark, Ark., urging favorable action of proposed increase of pensions of veterans of Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5085. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of E. S. Binger, W. A. Tweed, et al., in behalf of the Liberty Farm Club, of Williamstown, Mo., for a farm relief bill with an equalization fee; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5086. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Joe Rapacz and 19 farmers and residents of Polk County, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6465, the purpose of which is to place Mexico and Canada on a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5087. Also, petition of Joseph A. Roesch and three farmers and residents of Ada, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6465, the purpose of which is to place Mexico and Canada on a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5088. Also, petition of D. B. Smiley and 39 farmers and residents of Polk County, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6465, the purpose of which is to place Mexico and Canada on a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5089. Also, petition of A. A. Dragseth and six farmers and residents of Eldred, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6465, the purpose of which is to place Mexico and Canada on a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5090. Also, petition of Lewis E. Sande and eight farmers and residents of Alvarado, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6465, the purpose of which is to place Mexico and Canada on a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5091. Also, petition of Dick Wibbels and 18 farmers and residents of Mahanomen County, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6465, the purpose of which is to place Mexico and Canada on a quota basis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5092. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of 170 citizens of Pendleton, Oreg., protesting against enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford bill, or similar compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5093. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Hawthorn, Pa., and vicinity, in favor of increasing the rates of pension for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5094. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by John F. Erickson and 122 others of Yakima, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5095. Also, petition signed by Ven Harvey and seven others of Prescott, Wash., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5096. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of San Diego, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5097. Also, petition of citizens of National City, Calif., urging passage of Civil War pension bill providing relief for needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5098. Also, petition of citizens of Orange, Calif., urging passage of Civil War pension bill providing relief for needy and suffering veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5099. Also, petition of residents of San Diego, Calif., urging immediate legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and the widows of such veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5100. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from the women voters of Grand Junction, Colo., urging the passage of the alien deportation bill (H. R. 10078); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5101. By Mr. WASON: Petition of 47 residents of Keene, N. H., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, known as the Sunday closing bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5102. By Mr. WELCH of California: Petition submitted by United States Employees Association, San Francisco, Calif., favoring the passage of the Welch bill (H. R. 6518), to reclassify and increase the salaries of the Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5103. By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Petition of sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., protesting against the enactment of the Lankford Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5104. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Department of Pennsylvania, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, indorsing plan of President Coolidge for an adequate United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5105. Also, petition of 550 members of First Presbyterian Church, Irwin, Pa., favoring passage of Lankford Sunday rest bill for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5106. Also, petition of Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, by George E. Foss, general secretary, protesting against Sirovich bill (H. R. 6511); to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

THURSDAY, March 8, 1928

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 6, 1928,

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. EDGE presented a communication from Mary P. Shelton, president of the Leonia Women's Republican Club, of Leonia, N. J., with accompanying resolutions unanimously adopted by that club, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and, on request of Mr. EDGE, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

127 GLENWOOD AVENUE,
Leonla, N. J., March 3, 1928.

Hon. WALTER E. EDGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR EDGE: I have the honor to present to you a set of resolutions passed by the Leonia Women's Republican Club.

It is a special pleasure to us to stay the hand of those in whom we have such confidence.

Most respectfully,

(Mrs. W. B. S.) MARY P. SHELTON,
President Leonia Women's Republican Club.