By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 2122) authorizing the Utah, Uncompahgre, and the White River Bands of the Ute Indians in Utah and Colorado to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. YON: A bill (H. R. 2123) to amend the tariff act of 1921, as amended, on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 2124) to grant certain lands of the United States of America in the parish of Plaquemines, La., to the Board of Levee Commissioners of the New Orleans Levee District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 2125) to provide for the determination, in不妨当面 time of official tests, to determine protein in wheat for use in merchandising the same to the best advantage, and for acquiring and disseminating information relative to protein in wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 2126) providing a sum of $15,000,000 for World War veterans' hospitalization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 2127) granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Holston River at or near McEeves Ferry, in Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., and Anderson County, Tenn., to construct and maintain and operate a free highway bridge across the Clinch River near Solway, in Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) to improve legislation for the construction of Federal-aid highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution (H. Res. 32) providing for hospitalization for certain World War veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 2129) for the relief of Armbruster; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) for the relief of John B. Brasul; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Matthew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) granting a pension to Oscar Fields; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) granting an increase of pension to Sophia P. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Shields; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) granting an increase of pension for the relief of James R. Allison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 2136) for the relief of James J. Gianaeres; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PINES: A bill (H. R. 2137) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALSEY: A bill (H. R. 2138) granting a pension to Julia H. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2139) granting a pension to Sylvia Holsapple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2140) to authorize the appointment of First Lieut. Claude W. Shepton, retired, to the grade of captain, retired, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 2141) to remove the charge of desertion against Joseph Scharbourough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 2142) granting a pension to William Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) granting a pension to Ephraim Bap­ tiste; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 2144) granting an increase of pension to Rosana Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) granting an increase of pension to Emily A. Northcutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) granting a pension to Kate H. Glavine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 2147) granting a pension to Albert M. Humphreys; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) granting an increase of pension to Jane C. Torney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) granting an increase of pension to Janie L. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) granting an increase of pension to John S. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

245. By Mr. BAIRD: Memorial of North Baltimore Rabbit Association, North Baltimore, Ohio, requesting a duty of 50 per cent. ad valorem on raw rabbit and hare skinned imported from Europe, Asia, and Australia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

246. Also, petition of E. L. Myers, chairman of the Venice-Beed Township, A Farm, Atlantic, Ohio, demanding increased tariff on dairy products, and such other changes as will place the farmer on a parity with industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

247. Also, petition of farmers of Ballrule Township, Fremont, Ohio, demanding revision of the tariff to afford more protection to farm and dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

248. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of a number of residents of Arlington, Wash., protesting against proposed calendar change of weekly cycle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

250. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Foreign Service Camp No. 57, United Spanish War Veterans, petitioning Congress by resolution to speedily pass legislation to increase pensions of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

250. Also, petition of the Debco Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging continuation of present duty on china wood oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

251. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of E. Leits (Inc.), New York City, opposing an increase in tariff on microscopes and scientific equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.


253. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of citizens of Rooks County, Kans., protesting against the calling of an international conference or the acceptance of an invitation by the Government of the United States to participate in a conference for the purpose of revising the present calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

254. By Mr. YON: Petition of Eliza F. Andrews, H. M. Spear, and others, urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote the Civil War pension bill in order that relief may be accorded to needy and suffering veterans and the widows, and thus partly repay the living for the sacrifices they have made for our country; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.
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Rev. Joseph R. Sizoo, D. D., minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who didst lay the foundations of the earth amid the singing of the morning stars and the joyful shouts of the sons of God, give us on this new day a new sense of Thy presence. Be Thou our fortress in temptation, our shield in time of need, our covert in calamity, our star of hope in sorrow. Have in Thy holy keeping our loved ones, from whom we may be separated for a season. Keep them in the hollow of Thy hand, and give us to believe that we never drift beyond Thy hand and give us to believe that we never drift beyond Thy love and care. May the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep our hearts and minds in Thy love. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Oris F. Glenn, a Senator from the State of Illinois, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday last, when, on request of Mr. Jones and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Halti­gan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed
the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the con­
currence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to provide funds for the eradica­tion, control, and prevention of the spread of the Mediterranean fruit fly.


CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen     Blease
Ashurst  Blanding
Barth    Black
Bingham  Bishop
Bland    Blythe
Blunt    Bright
Borah    Brooks
Bowes    Boyd
Broward  Broome
Brooks   Brown
Bray     Brooke
Bryan    Broyhill
Buckalew Brotissard
Buechel  Brooks
Byron    Bunche
Cappel  Capper
Carr    Carver
Cassidy  Caudle
Cayton     Chadbourne
Cement  Cemey
Cope    Caperton
Coss          Capellan
Cox         Copepall
Cushing Cottle
Dale      Daniel
Deese     Deramus
Dewey    Deverell
Dill     Dewey
Dodge    Densmore
Dillinger Dillworth
Dix       Dunn
Ellis     Dobbins
Endicott  Eastman
Eldredge  Egleston
Eldridge  Eldridge
Each and every Senator present.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) to provide funds for the eradication, control, and prevention of the spread of the Mediterranean fruit fly was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 58) to repeal an act approved March 2, 1929, entitled “An act for the relief of C. C. Spiller, deceased,” and to provide for the relief of the estate of C. C. Spiller, deceased, was read twice by its title.

Mr. MCKELD. Mr. President, last session of Congress a claims bill was passed for the relief of the estate of C. C. Spiller, deceased. After the passage of the bill some attorney in New York, whose name I do not now recall, asked that he be given 50 per cent of the amount involved. I have always understood that such a bill could only be given to the claimant and his counsel. If I recall correctly, I think it is possible to say that I have no idea that either House of Congress would ever pass the bill if they had known that any such claim of any attorney being connected with it at all, neither did Mr. Bache.

Mr. Speaker, this body has passed the bill and there is no objection to its passage, and it is necessarily detained in his office.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Objection is made, and the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

LOWDEN APPROVES HOOVER FARM AID—FORMER GOVERNOR SAYS PROGRAM WAS MENTIONED AT POLK CINCINNATI, April 29.—Frank O. Lowden, former Governor of Illinois, who gave a clear field to Herbert Hoover in the Republican convention last June after making a campaign for himself for the nomination, has inscribed the President's farm-relief program.

"Mr. Hoover, in the campaign last fall," he declared in a formal statement, "stated clearly and unequivocally his opposition to the principle of the equalization fee, as well as to the principle of the deputation plan. He was elected by a substantial majority. The country, therefore, authorized him to proceed with his own agriculture program. That program was outlined not only in his speeches but more fully in his recent message to Congress.

"It is to be presumed that upon an issue so clearly decided by the election Congress will support the President. It then becomes the duty of all sincere friends of farm relief to cooperate with the administration in giving effect to its program. If it later should appear that this program was unsound, the President indicated in his message that the way is open for further action."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by Walters' Local Union, No. 30; the Bookbinders and Bindery Women's Union; Musicians' Local Union, No. 6, A. F. of M., and the Journeymen Tailors' Local Union, No. 90, all of San Francisco, Calif., favoring a reduction of 50 per cent in the tax on earned incomes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution by the Senate a petition of citizens of Fort Smith, Ark., praying for the passage of legislation providing for mothers' pensions, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the Junior Order of United American Mechanics at New Bern, N. C., protesting against the repeal of the national-origins clause of the Immigration act, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Immigration Committee.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEREAS the need for a drastic curtailment of Immigration became so apparent in 1924 Congress adopted the Johnson Act, which was intended to limit permanent immigration by excluding all entering the United States who are not of the nationalities usually assimilable.

Resolutions which seeks the further postponement or repeal of the Act of 1924 furnishes a method just and equitable, and not subject to change, to govern the future immigration of those races naturally assimilable: And be it further resolved, that the Senate and Members of Congress be requested to lend their influence in opposition to the passage of any resolution which seeks the further postponement or repeal of the said national-origins clause of the Johnson Act.

The Senate and Representatives from this State be requested to lend their influence in opposition to the passage of any resolution which seeks the further postponement or repeal of the said national-origins clause of the Johnson Act.

A. M. REA, President. J. V. STEPHENS, District Deputy.

Mr. GLENN presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. J. Res. 34.

Whereas the State of Illinois was the first State in the Union to vote for and complete the construction of a state-wide system of durable hard-surfaced highways by means of an issue of State road bonds; and
WHEREAS Hon. William F. Holiday, of Danville, Ill., now Congressman from the eighteenth congressional district of this State, has introduced in Congress a bill which provides for the construction, maintenance, and revenue of a high-speed system of durable hard-surfaced highways; and whereas this bill follows closely the general principles of our national-origins provision of the immigration act of 1924, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BINGHAM presented resolutions adopted by a meeting of the directors of the New England Tobacco Growers Association (Inc.), at Hartford, Conn., favoring a substantial increase in the tariff duty on wrapper-leaf tobacco, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions and papers in the nature of petitions of the Augusta Brotherhood of the Salem Lutheran Church, of Natick; the Swedish Lutheran Church, of South Matapan; members and friends of the Swedish Congregational Church, of Middletown; the Lagen Blenda Lodge, No. 11, Vasa Order of America, of Bridgeport; and Gota Lejon Lodge, No. 19, Vasa Order of America, of Waterbury, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called Congressman Holiday's bill to be original provision of the Immigration act of 1924, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Danielson, Moosup, Windham, Sterling, Central Village, Willimantic, and other towns in Windham County, Conn., praying that the national-origins provision of the Immigration act of 1924 be continued in effect, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

RETIREMENT OF DISABLED EMERGENCY OFFICERS.

Mr. TYSON. Mr. President, I have received a number of letters from various emergency Army officers who have applied for retirement and have been examined and their applications disallowed. There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction about this matter. I have taken it up with the Veterans' Bureau and also with the Association of Emergency Officers of the World War. I know that this matter will be of considerable interest to the various Members of the Senate. I am very glad to be able to report that the secretary of the Disabled Emergency Officers' Association of the World War has made a complete investigation of this matter, and he reports that the operation of this bill as carried out by the Veterans' Bureau is giving very great satisfaction to most of the disabled emergency officers; and I ask unanimous consent to have this inserted in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. It will inform Senators who are interested as to how the bill is operating.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 12, 1929.

Hon. LAWRENCE D. TYSON, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President: Suppleting my letter of April 15, the following is in response to your letter of April 12 inclosing letter from Lieut. Charles A. Loughlin, EORL, U. S. A., commander of our Minnesota chapter, relating to the administration of the emergency officers' retirement act.

Taking a rather broad viewpoint of the whole situation, we feel that the act as it now stands is a great improvement upon anything that has been in effect in the past. The Veterans' Bureau is about as good as can be expected under the circumstances.

You will recall, General, that when this measure was being considered by Congress the Veterans' Bureau submitted a list of disabled emergency officers, or probable beneficiaries, whose cases had been rated 30 per cent or more, which list numbered approximately 1,250, many of whom have since died. Since the passage of the act there have been over 4,000 disabled emergency officers retired with permanent pay, and the number will probably reach 5,000. When the retirement act was passed last May the bureau's figures revealed that there were about 10,000 emergency officers who had suffered disabilities due to their World War service. With the exception of the 3,250 names submitted to the Congress, these emergency officers were all rated either less than 30 per cent permanent partial or were on a temporary rating.

Quite a number of disabled officers who were on a temporary rating at the time the act was passed very properly filed application for retirement, and many have since been adjudged to be more than 30 per cent permanently disabled and placed on the retired list with pay. On the other hand, many disabled officers whose disabilities have been considered to be of a temporary nature have been denied retirement for the reason that the disability is not considered by the Veterans' Bureau to have reached such a stationary level as would warrant the assignment of a permanent rating. It naturally follows that our comrades who are receiving disability compensation for conditions which are rated only temporarily disabled should feel that they, too, are entitled to retirement with pay, and that nothing be left undone in their efforts to secure such benefits. The majority of disabled officers—at least those of our enrolled membership—have a knowledge of the legislative background—who have been denied retirement for the reason that their disability is not considered to be 30 per cent or more permanently disabling, have in most instances, accepted the decision of the Veterans' Bureau as final; however, there are those who feel that their cases have not been justly considered. With the exception of a comparatively few cases, we have had no difficulty whatever in having the Veterans' Bureau reconsider those cases where it is believed that the former decision has not been equitable or approved by a majority of the decision-makers.

In the early days of the administration of the retirement act we felt that the authorities of the Veterans' Bureau, under adverse pressure from various sources, were endeavoring to place as many men as possible on the retired list, and that if there was any practicable way of denying retirement they would do so; however, since the opinions of the Attorney General of January 18, and some of the decisions of the Comptroller General of February 11, the Veterans' Bureau has, in our opinion, been quite liberal in administering the act. Of course, there will be certain disappointed individuals who would likely take issue with us in this statement.

You may be surprised, General, to learn that a few emergency officers have been receiving disability compensation from the Government, when, upon consideration for retirement, the officials cleared to disclose that they were not legally entitled to compensation in the first place. For example, one emergency officer applied for a disability in 1917 and at the time he was examined for commission his hearing was found to be very defective. At the time he was discharged his hearing was practically the same, and still is, according to all examinations of record. The hearing disability was noted and waived when he entered the military service because of the fact that he was a most desirable man and his hearing defect did not prevent his performing duty in the arm of service in which he was commissioned. After being discharged he filed an application for disability compensation for defective hearing, and the Veterans' Bureau has been paying him compensation at the rate of $40 per month for several years. When the retirement rating board reviewed his application for a disability retirement it was decided by a majority that his defective hearing was neither caused nor aggravated by his military service. Whereupon his retirement was not only denied but payment of compensation was subsequently discontinued. We know of other cases similar to the one just cited.

We realize that it is only natural that these officers feel very badly about not being retired; but we spent so many years of hard, honest efforts advocating enactment of legislation providing retirement benefits for these officers who were disabled while in uniform and in line of duty that we believe it would be an unwise policy to insist on retiring former officers who have neither legal nor moral right to expect retirement.

With an applicant for retirement under the emergency officers' retirement act the opportunity of submitting additional evidence to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to show that his disability is due to conditions which meet the requirements of the act as it now exists is a great improvement over any which entitled him to retirement. If when the decision of the Veterans' Bureau is unfavorable the applicant has additional evidence which
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would show that such decision was unjust or illegal, such evidence can be submitted and his application reconsidered. We have had numerous cases of this type reconsidered after the applicants submitted additional evidence.

All the recognized veterans' organizations, including ours, employ experienced service officers to aid in presentation of cases. If an appellant has been denied retirement, representatives of the organizations have the authority to review all of the evidence, including the decision of the retirement rating board, and if in their opinion the decision appears unjust or illegal, it can be taken up on appeal with General Hines, who does not know of any case in which there has been apparent misapplication of law where reconsideration has been denied. Of course, in those cases where the rating schedule provided for under the World War veteran service officers permits of only a temporary rating and the retirement rating board has held that the physical condition is not sufficiently stabilized to warrant a permanent rating, there is always the possibility of reconsideration. If an appraisal of this nature is made, the medical evidence is not sufficient to show that the physical disability is to some degree of a permanent nature, the case, as a rule, will be referred to the director's advisory group on appeals for further consideration. In some cases the advisory group recommends permanent rating notwithstanding the rating schedule provides only temporary rating and in other cases the decision of the retirement rating board is sustained.

I can, of course, fully appreciate that such questions above referred to are purely medical; and a layman is quite often disqualified to successfully dispute the decision of the medical authorities, when it is held that the medical evidence is not sufficient to prove that the physical disability is permanent.

We understand that the awards division of the emergency officers' retirement section of the bureau has, in some cases, refused to entertain the application of the committee of experts, which based the rating on the physical evidence that the medical condition is not sufficiently stabilized to warrant a permanent rating. We have had numerous cases of this type reconsidered after the applicants submitted additional evidence.

The testimony of the committee of experts is conclusive that national origin is fair, practicable, and quotas accurate within terms of the statute. All other systems except total exclusion are un-American, discriminatory, or subject to political abuse. National origin has been the subject of much investigation by 50 organizations including American Legion. Some of these organizations represented in national immigration restriction conference, and by 40 allied patriotic societies. Urge you to speak against suspension or repeal.

JOHN B. TAYLOR,
Chairman National Immigration Restriction Conference.

DEMERLE LLOYD,
Chairman National Immigration Legislative Committee.

F. H. KINNICK,
Acting President Allied Patriotic Societies.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 22, 1929.

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
Chairman Committee on Immigration.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Respectfully urge you to oppose all attempts repeal or postpone national origins provision, immigration act, which apportion immigration fairly on basis our whole population without discrimination to any element, and which is greatly preferable to the foreign-born 1890 census basis, which discriminates heavily against large part of native-born American population.

F. H. KINNICK,
Acting President Allied Patriotic Societies (Inc.)

Par Hills, N. J.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 27, 1929.

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,
Chairman Senate Committee on Immigration.

Mr. President,

I ask may I present a few facts on national-origins clause of the immigration law, as follows:

1. The American Legion from its very beginning has favored restrictive immigration. This question has come before our national conventions every since our first meeting in 1919. While the League was continuing this stand, the Congress passed the act of 1924, which based restrictive quotas upon the national origins, to go into effect in 1927, temporarily basing quotas upon the foreign-born population in this country according to the 1890 census. The American Legion immediately endorsed the act of 1924, and in 1928 specifically indentured the national-origins provision as a basis for selecting our immigration without one dissenting vote from the 1,000 delegates at the San Antonio convention.

2. Any method of selecting immigrants based upon the foreign born—whether upon the census of 1890, 1900, 1910, or 1920, inevitably discriminates against some foreign nations in favor of other foreign nations.

The American Legion contends that this is not a matter for foreign nations—it is an American question which should be settled by Americans on American terms. The question should be settled once and for all, and now is the time to settle it. The question which therefore confronts you is this: Shall the foreign born in this country, contending through blocs of their own, determine our immigration policy, or shall it be decided by the American people in an American way?

On February 13, after full and complete hearings, the Senate Immigration Committee voted against reporting the resolution to postpone further the effective date of the national origins provision of the law. On March 22, the President, in accordance with law, proclaimed the effective date as July 1, 1929.

With the convening of the special session, resolutions have again been introduced to repeal this part of the law. Again the Senate Immigration Committee, after consideration, voted against a favorable report.

I therefore respectfully request your vote against the Senate Resolution 87 that be discharged the Senate Immigration Committee of the legislation, and bring the question of repeal to the floor of the Senate.

The American Legion believes Senate Resolution 87 should be defeated. We therefore respectfully request your vote against this resolution.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Vice Chairman National Legislative Committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, Senators are receiving letters from various people inclosing blanks petitioning Congress to repeal the national-origins clause of the immigration act. They do not realize that this is a propaganda on the part of certain steamship companies who are selfishly interested in attracting money bringing immigrants into our country. I have here an affidavit to show that the steamship companies which want to bring these immigrants into the country are responsible for much of this propaganda. I ask that the clerk read the first affidavit. The affidavits are from reliable people showing the activity of these companies.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

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

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. King) is permitted to make an inquiry.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Georgia has been inciting this propaganda. I can show him 20 letters opposed to the legislation as against 1 upon the other side. I wonder if I should denounce that propaganda?
Mr. HARRIS. The affidavits will show that it is propaganda of the steamship companies, who are selfishly interested in making more immigrants to this country.

Mr. REED. Without objection, the clerk will read the affidavits, as requested.

The Vice President. The remaining affidavits presented by the Senator from Georgia will be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have not the affidavits here, but I want to say that I have in my possession affidavits from Chicago, Ill., similar to the one just read, showing the distribution of national-origins petitions by the North German Lloyd and other foreign steamship companies in Chicago, but that these affidavits into the record at the first opportunity.

Mr. REED subsequently said: Mr. President, when petitions and memorials were in order, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] presented certain affidavits regarding the circulation of anti-national-origins petitions by foreign steamship companies. I then said that I had similar affidavits from Chicago which I would ask to be sent to the desk and have read in the same way. I ask that the affidavits which I now send to the desk may be read, so they may be embodied in the Congressional Record.

The Vice President. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask, for information, though not objecting to the reading of the affidavits, if it is to be the purpose to proceed to the Senate, when a controversial question like it, the pros and cons? I suppose I have received a hundred letters and a great many statements in regard to the national-origins clause. If I were to ask to have all of them read, most of them coming from reputable men and women, I think I would be doing myself, and certainly the country, a disservice. I do not think that we should cumber the Record with all of these protests for or against measures which are going on in the Senate.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator, but I am not asking that petitions be read. I am asking only that two brief affidavits showing the circulation of petition forms by foreign steamship companies may be read. I think the Senator will be interested to know the source of the petitions which are coming in such numbers.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I have not any objection to the reading of any such affidavits, but may I ask the Senator whether he is insisting upon the affidavits being submitted them as yet to the President of the United States, who is asking this body and the Congress to repeal the national-origins provision?

Mr. REED. No. I am submitting them to him by this method.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I am wondering whether the Senate will have the country and the Senate think that the demand for the repeal of the national-origins clause is the result of the activities of the steamship companies.

Mr. REED. A very large proportion of the petitions that have come to me have been on the printed forms or following the language of the printed forms circulated by the steamship companies.

Mr. DILL. Petitions coming from my State in large numbers are not coming from any foreign steamship company. They are coming from American citizens, large numbers of them being American born.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I would like to add to what the Senator from Washington just said that the letters which I have been receiving in very great number and petitions which have come in a great many different forms from my State, urging the repeal of the national-origins clause in accordance with the recommendation of the President, show no evidence of having been inspired by steamship companies or any other central organization. They express the earnest desire of the large number of people who feel very deeply in the matter, particularly those who feel that their countries and their relatives are being discriminated against in a way which is not justifiable. In short, they come largely from those of Scandinavian origin who feel that the results of Immigration from those countries to the United States are of such a nature as to deserve better treatment than they expect to receive if this national-origins provision goes into effect.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is impossible for us ever to pass an immigration law that will entirely please all of our nationals. These petitions which are coming here to the national-origins clause required are being inspired by national interests, and I shall submit a few remarks in a day or two that will tell the truth about who it is that wants it repealed.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I do not want to be understood as objecting in the slightest degree to the reading of any affidavit or petition relating to this matter. I recognize that it is done as a matter of propaganda upon this particular subject. I have not been deeply interested in it, but I have believed that the President is correct in the attitude he has taken respecting it. The singular situation is presented, therefore, of those who care little for parsimony standing by the President on this matter while Republicans, who pride of their regularity, upon this side, are opposing him in a matter that he has presented.

But may I say, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] has said, that the petitions which have come to me in regard to this particular matter are petitions which have come from those for whom I have the very highest respect. I never heard until it was stated recently in one of our committee meetings that steamship companies had been interested in the slightest degree in the national-origins propositions. I am unable to understand, even though they are interested, what possible difference it can make as to whether the national-origins proposition shall be in effect or whether it shall not be in effect. Practically the same number of people will be brought across the ocean in the one instance as in the other. But to my brethren upon this side of the Chamber who are holding the palladium of the American people in the United States—day by day and make the grand old Republican Party may I say that the head of the Republican Party, the President of the United States, is the one whom they assail when they are assenting to a repeal of the national-origins provision.

The Vice President. Without objection, the clerk will read the affidavit, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS
County of Cook, ss:

Herbert Treble, of the city of Chicago, county of Cook, and State of Illinois, being duly sworn, doth depose and say that, learning of the fact that anti-national-origins petitions were being circulated by steamship lines, I, Herbert Treble, visited the office of the Swedish-American Steamship Lines, located at 181 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., on Monday afternoon, the 22d day of April, 1929, at approxi-
Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, just a moment. Is it proposed to print all the hearings of the Senate committee?

Mr. MOSES. The resolution was drawn by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Agricultural and Forestry Legislation. It is as follows: Is it proposed to print all the hearings of the Senate committee?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does it include the hearings that were taken but not printed in the former volume issued by the committee?

Mr. MCNARY. Yes; it includes all the hearings.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Very well.

Mr. MOSES. I will now direct the Senator from Arkansas that the reason that this has to be done by resolution rather than by an order of the Joint Committee on Printing is because it will require such a large volume that it can not be printed within the money limit at which it was printed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I was interested in knowing whether the volume will contain the complete hearings.

Mr. MOSES. The understanding of the committee is that it will.

Mr. MCNARY. It includes the hearings held openly by the committee. It does not, however, include the testimony given by the two experts in executive session.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why was their testimony taken in executive session?

Mr. MCNARY. It was suggested that they be called in, but the committee did not want to start the hearings anew, so they amended the resolution for the purpose of determining whether they desire those hearings printed. Personally, I have no objection at all to their being printed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I wish to ask the Senator a more general question. Were matters discussed which were essentially secret?

Mr. MCNARY. I think not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is the very point at which I am directing my questions. I should like to have the complete hearings unless there be a valid reason for suppressing a portion of them or for failing to print them.

Mr. MOSES. The joint committee asked the chairman to take the matter up with Mr. Olson, Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I did so on Saturday, and I wish to explain that I have called a session of the committee to-morrow morning, when the committee will probably take action and have the hearings printed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to take the floor, if the Senator from Oregon has concluded.

Mr. MCNARY. I yield the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought not to have these hearings printed until we decide the questions which have been raised.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think the Senator is right about that.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to state briefly to the Senate what happened. I think the committee was unanimous, so far as I know, in the disposition which was had in the committee, that the testimony of the two experts, taken in executive session, ought to be printed; that there was nothing in their testimony, unless it be an exception which I will mention, that would in any way even indirectly be a reason for not printing it.

The two experts were called before the committee by the chairman, knowing that the meeting was executive; that the regular hearings had closed. They were brought there at the suggestion of the President, and I think within a very short time, as soon as the chairman of the committee could get word to them after he had talked with the President, these men were on their way and the committee heard them. I think their testimony made a very great impression upon the committee, as I believe everyone will admit who heard their testimony. This was of course known to me, and I did not object to their being printed. The question was whether they were to be printed or not. Their testimony was in my view not part of the executive session, but determined after the two witnesses had gone, the question was raised that the members of the committee or its action, and when later in the committee, the members of the committee were in favor of printing it, but we thought in justice to these men it ought not to be done without their consent. The suggestion was made that they were sent for; they were not attempting to control legislation or to give the committee or the Senate any advice, but in the examination of the two experts in executive session, they were asked by members of the committee to express their views, which under the circumstances they ought not to have been called upon to do, but they did express their views very courteously and in a modified way, perhaps, rather reluctantly.

I presume their opinions had nothing to do with the feeling of the committee or its action, and when later in the committee, after the two witnesses had gone, the question was raised that their testimony ought to be printed and that the Senate ought to have the benefit of the same testimony that the members of the committee had in acting, and in acting, the so-called secret of the members of the committee in favor of printing it, but we thought in justice to these men it ought not to be done without their consent. The suggestion was made that they were sent for; they were not attempting to control legislation or to give the committee or the Senate any advice, but in the examination of the two experts in executive session, they were asked by members of the committee to express their views, which under the circumstances they ought not to have been called upon to do, but they did express their views very courteously and in a modified way, perhaps, rather reluctantly.

I presume their opinions had nothing to do with the feeling of the committee or its action, and when later in the committee, after the two witnesses had gone, the question was raised that their testimony ought to be printed and that the Senate ought to have the benefit of the same testimony that the members of the committee had in acting, and in acting, the so-called secret of the members of the committee in favor of printing it, but we thought in justice to these men it ought not to be done without their consent. The suggestion was made that they were sent for; they were not attempting to control legislation or to give the committee or the Senate any advice, but in the examination of the two experts in executive session, they were asked by members of the committee to express their views, which under the circumstances they ought not to have been called upon to do, but they did express their views very courteously and in a modified way, perhaps, rather reluctantly.
directed to see these witnesses, and if they desired to strike out from their testimony the opinions which they had given in answer to qualified questions asked by members of the committee that such portions of their testimony should be stricken out. No possible objection on their part or on the part of any one else could be made to the remainder of their testimony, and even that portion in reference to their opinions is perfectly harmless.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President--

Mr. NORTIS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NORTIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why was it improper to ask for that purpose a minute of legislation if the members of the committee thought that an expression of opinion by the witnesses would be helpful in framing legislation?

Mr. NORTIS. I think most of the members of the committee felt—I know I did—at the time when the questions were asked and insisted upon by one or two members of the committee that they should not be asked because the witnesses were "hired men," as they expressly stated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Can not a "hired man" have an opinion?

Mr. NORTIS. Yes; they may have opinions; but these witnesses were called there to give the committee the benefit of the investigation which they had made on the subject, and they distinctly said they did not want to offer anything as to what Congress ought to do under the circumstances. They wanted to give their study and let the committee decide. I think it is perfectly apparent that a department expert who is called upon to give an opinion which, perhaps, he is justified in believing may later on be found to be in conflict with his recommendations in the department or elsewhere in the Government service is just a little bit embarrassed in trying to tell the Congress what Congress should do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NORTIS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. My point is that Congress might prefer the opinion of an expert who had experience and who had reached investigation and conclusions after seeing the department, whose opportunity for inquiry and investigation had been very limited, as is the case here. The new Secretary of Agriculture, an automobile dealer, knows, presumably, very little about agriculture. The point I am making is whether the Senate proposes to establish the precedent that if it wants the opinion of an inferior or a subordinate in one of the departments it shall deny itself the opportunity of having that opinion if anyone in the department does not want the Senate to have it.

Mr. NORTIS. Mr. President, the experts were called to tell the story of what they had done about the debenture plan and particularly with reference to any attempt by other governments to put the debenture plan into operation. They told us frankly and quite clearly just what they had found from their study and study. They were asked to express an opinion as to what they thought the plan would do. Of course it was not wrong to ask such a question; I realize the Senate or a committee of the Senate can insist on an answer to such a question and secure an opinion if they want to do so; but I feel—and I believe members of the committee felt—that it was hardly fair to those men to ask them to express an opinion as to what we ought to do or if we did certain things what they thought the effect would be. They gave what their study had disclosed, and it was up to us to decide what we ought to do.

While the general belief, whether right or wrong, that those superintendents in the field service, with whom they had talked, might not desire them to express an opinion, regardless of their right to do so, was unimportant so far as our action was concerned, yet, having given us the facts, leaving the committee to judge, it seemed to me that we ought not to embarrass them particularly when they were summoned before the committee knowing that the meeting was executive and not public.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President--

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NORTIS. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, just came into the Senate Chamber a few moments ago, but if the Senator will pardon me, I desire to say that the witnesses went further than telling us what the effect of the plan would be in foreign countries. They also estimated its cost and covered the question very fully. I merely wish to call attention to that fact.

Mr. NORTIS. That was not an opinion of theirs, and it would be perfectly proper to print that portion of their testimony which would be perfectly proper to print that portion of their testimony which was unimportant.

Mr. CARAWAY. The reason I call that to the Senator's attention is that some people might get the impression that the only thing they discussed in their testimony was the question of the effect of the proposed legislation.

Mr. NORTIS. The Senator is right, and I am thankful to him for his interruption.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. NORTIS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the fact, as I have stated, that the chairman of the committee has called a meeting of the committee to-morrow morning to consider this matter, the testimony having been taken in executive session, I suggest that the resolution go over for the present.

Mr. NORTIS. That is what I was going to suggest.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him if the two experts to whom he has referred were the ones who were called at the suggestion of President Hoover?

Mr. NORTIS. President Hoover did not name anybody, as I understand, but when the subcommittee went to the White House, under the direction of the full committee, to find out what the President thought about the debenture plan, inasmuch as he had not studied it and could not give them any information about it at that time, he suggested to them that they call experts from the department. I do not think he named anybody; but the chairman of the committee took it up with the department immediately, and we had the two experts there, I think, within an hour.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if his purpose is to postpone this matter until the Agriculture Committee may meet and discuss it before he asks for action?

Mr. McNARY. I stated that I should ask that the matter be deferred until the committee could consider it to-morrow in executive session.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WHEELER:
A bill (S. 670) for the relief of Charles E. Anderson; and
A bill (S. 671) for the relief of E. M. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 672) granting a pension to David P. Smith; and
A bill (S. 673) granting a pension to Duncan McOwain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOFF:
A bill (S. 674) to declare inauguration day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GYORGY:
A bill (S. 675) granting a pension to Birt H. Hickman; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 676) for the relief of James Evans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 677) relating to examination of applicants for positions in the apportioned service of the Government at Washington; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. COPELAND:
A bill (S. 678) to place Dr. Charles H. DeLancey on the retired list of the Navy as a lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TWYSON:
A bill (S. 679) granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., and Anderson County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Clinch River at or near Maryville, in Knox County, Tenn.; and
A bill (S. 680) granting the consent of Congress to Knox County, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Holston River at or near McRees Ferry, in Anderson County, Tenn.; and
A bill (S. 681) relating to the establishment of the University of Tennessee; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it is the bill that I desire to have considered by the committee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I introduce a bill which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] to the bill. The same bill passed the Senate with amendments at a previous session. A similar bill is now pending before the committee; but the bill I now introduce embraces the amendments adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it is the bill that I desire to have considered by the committee.
By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:
A bill (S. 681) to establish game sanctuaries in the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HOWELL:
A bill (S. 682) for the relief of Charles Walker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES:
A bill (S. 683) to authorize the appointment of James H. Lanarcy a warrant officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIECK:
A bill (S. 684) to amend section 9 of the Federal reserve act, as amended, to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to waive notice to State banks and trust companies of intention to withdraw from membership in a Federal reserve bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPPERS:
A bill (S. 685) to provide for the regulation of the use of certain sugars; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.
A bill (S. 686) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALE:
A bill (S. 687) granting an increase of pension to Lillian D. Field (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:
A bill (S. 688) granting a pension to John L. Tenney; and
A bill (S. 689) granting a pension to James V. Latham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:
A bill (S. 690) for the relief of Ida C. Buxton, executrix of R. C. Buxton, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.
A bill (S. 691) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Cahall (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GLENN:
A bill (S. 692) granting a pension to Jerry I. Knaidl; and
A bill (S. 693) granting a pension to Gustava Deamund (with accompanying papers); and
A bill (S. 694) granting a pension to Sarah Berkenbusch (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:
A bill (S. 695) to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the owners of the British steamer Kyloen for damages sustained as a result of a collision between that vessel and the U.S. S. William O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:
A bill (S. 696) to aid in the maintenance of engineering experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplemental thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SCULLY:
A bill (S. 697) providing for payment of $100 to each enrolled member of the Chipewa Tribe of Minnesota from the funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCOLLUM:
A bill (S. 698) granting an increase of pension to Tilde Owens; and
A bill (S. 699) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Fain; and
A bill (S. 700) granting a pension to Mattie Wood; and
A bill (S. 701) granting a pension to Abe Erlich; and
A bill (S. 702) granting a pension to Mattie Johnson; and
A bill (S. 703) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. C. Blevins;

A bill (S. 704) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Blevins; and
A bill (S. 705) granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Spencer; and
A bill (S. 706) granting an increase of pension to Annie N. Sullivan; and
A bill (S. 707) granting an increase of pension to John L. Dick; and
A bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to Anita Stephens; and
A bill (S. 709) granting an increase of pension to Percy H. Allen; and
A bill (S. 710) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Howell Butler; and
A bill (S. 711) granting a pension to George A. Hufnar; and
A bill (S. 712) granting a pension to Florence Storr; and
A bill (S. 713) granting a pension to Patrick S. Horton; and
A bill (S. 714) granting an increase of pension to Murray Pierce; and
A bill (S. 715) granting a pension to Mary A. Huckaba; and
A bill (S. 716) granting a pension to James Besheers; and
A bill (S. 717) granting a pension to George W. Hacker; and
A bill (S. 718) granting a pension to Albert M. Griffith; and
A bill (S. 719) granting a pension to Lissie Young; and
A bill (S. 720) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Taber; and
A bill (S. 721) granting an increase of pension to George McGinn; and
A bill (S. 722) granting a pension to Robert C. Kistler; and
A bill (S. 723) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hart; and
A bill (S. 724) granting a pension to Roger James Richmond; and
A bill (S. 725) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Simpkins; and
A bill (S. 726) granting an increase of pension to Bessie L. Chrystal; and
A bill (S. 727) granting a pension to Laura Barker; and
A bill (S. 728) granting a pension to William Estes; and
A bill (S. 729) granting a pension to Oscar M. Simpkins; and
A bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Benton; and
A bill (S. 731) granting an increase of pension to Israel W. Bennett; and
A bill (S. 732) granting a pension to F. W. Gerdling; and
A bill (S. 733) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Wells; and
A bill (S. 734) granting a pension to William M. Robinson; and
A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pinion; and
A bill (S. 736) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Brown; and
A bill (S. 737) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Driggs; and
A bill (S. 738) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hawkins; and
A bill (S. 739) granting a pension to John P. Gray; and
A bill (S. 740) granting a pension to Essie Horton; and
A bill (S. 741) granting a pension to Minnie Davis; and
A bill (S. 742) granting an increase of pension to Mattie E. Russell; and
A bill (S. 743) granting a pension to Elna Z. Sweany; and
A bill (S. 744) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa E. McCormick; and
A bill (S. 745) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Williams; and
A bill (S. 746) granting an increase of pension to William Estes; and
A bill (S. 747) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Johnson; and
A bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Queen; and
A bill (S. 749) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Holt; and
A bill (S. 750) granting an increase of pension to Carlton Wright; and
A bill (S. 751) granting a pension to Mary F. Gross; and
A bill (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to Polle Hamby; and
A bill (S. 753) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Kuykendall; and
A bill (S. 754) granting a pension to Jasper O. Craig; and
A bill (S. 755) granting a pension to Van Leitsinger; and
A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Pitts; and
A bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Bateman Hahn; and
A bill (S. 758) granting a pension to Ethel Hay Norton; and
A bill (S. 759) granting an increase of pension to Capt. C. M. Park; and
A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Callie Manley; and
A bill (S. 761) granting a pension to Clarence Queen; to the Committee on Pensions; and
A bill (S. 762) relative to the acquisition of oil lands by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and
A bill (S. 763) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Civil Service; and
A bill (S. 764) for the relief of Jacob D. Nelson; and
A bill (S. 765) for the relief of the Shelby Medical College, of Nashvillle, Tenn.; and
A bill (S. 766) for the relief of Eureka Cotton Mills; and
A bill (S. 767) for the relief of Cabell River Berry; and
A bill (S. 768) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in matter of the claim of the Overton Hotel Co.;
A bill (S. 760) for the relief of the heirs of Robert E. L. Rogers;  
A bill (S. 770) for the relief of the Crystal Steam Laundry;  
A bill (S. 771) for the relief of Emma Grooms;  
A bill (S. 772) for the relief of Mary Whittaker Moffett;  
A bill (S. 773) for the relief of the legal representatives of Enoch Ensmley, deceased;  
A bill (S. 774) for the relief of Daniel M. Whittaker;  
A bill (S. 775) for the relief of the estate of Matthew C. Butler, Jr., deceased;  
A bill (S. 776) for the relief of Mrs. O. K. Joplin;  
A bill (S. 777) for the relief of the heirs of Haym Salomon;  
A bill (S. 778) for the relief of Thomas J. Hunt, surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt;  
A bill (S. 779) for the relief of the city of Bristol, Tenn.;  
A bill (S. 780) for the relief of Margaret A. Campbell.  
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A bill (S. 781) for the relief of the Library.  

A bill (S. 782) to authorize the creation of organized rural communities to demonstrate methods of reclamation and benefits of planned rural development; and  

A bill (S. 783) to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, and for other purposes;  

A bill (S. 784) to authorize the creation of organized rural communities to demonstrate methods of reclamation and benefits of planned rural development; and  

A bill (S. 785) for the relief of E. B. McHenry, receiver of the Bank of West Tennessee;  

A bill (S. 786) for the relief of the legal representative of Samuel Mosby, surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt;  

A bill (S. 787) for the relief of E. B. McHenry, receiver of the Bank of West Tennessee;  

A bill (S. 788) for the relief of Barney Thompson;  

A bill (S. 789) for the relief of H. C. Jaques;  

A bill (S. 790) for the relief of Mary Frances M'Connell;  

A bill (S. 791) for the relief of Horatio S. Hubbell;  

A bill (S. 792) to authorized certain officers of the United States Army to erect certain decorations conferred upon them by the Government of Greece;  

A bill (S. 793) for the relief of Robert K. Christenberry;  

A bill (S. 794) to authorize the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia, approved January 15, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;  

A bill (S. 795) to authorize the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia, approved January 15, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;  

A bill (S. 796) for the relief of Thomas H. C. York as a captain in the United States Army;  

A bill (S. 797) for the relief of Thomas H. C. York as a captain in the United States Army;  

A bill (S. 798) for the relief of Barney Thompson;  

A bill (S. 799) for the relief of H. C. Jaques;  

A bill (S. 800) for the relief of Mary Frances M'Connell;  

A bill (S. 801) for the relief of Horatio S. Hubbell;  

A bill (S. 802) to authorize the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia, approved January 15, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;  

A bill (S. 803) for the relief of the Library.  

A bill (S. 804) for the relief of Edgar C. Campbell;  

A bill (S. 805) for the relief of Kennedy F. Foster;  

A bill (S. 806) for the relief of William Mullins;  

A bill (S. 807) to correct the military record of Thomas H. Nolley;  

A bill (S. 808) authorizing the President to appoint J. H. S. Morton to the position and rank of major, Medical Corps, in the United States Army;  

A bill (S. 809) for the relief of Martin A. Hayes;  

A bill (S. 810) for the relief of Robert C. Wilcox;  

A bill (S. 811) prohibiting the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia from fixing rates of fare for the street railway companies in the District of Columbia at rates in excess of those stipulated in their charters; and  

A bill (S. 812) to amend section 11 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;  

A bill (S. 813) to create a commission for Muscle Shoals, and for other purposes;  

A bill (S. 814) to authorize the creation of organized rural communities to demonstrate methods of reclamation and benefits of planned rural development; and  

A bill (S. 815) authorizing the Secretary of War to build transmission lines and dispose of power generated at Muscle Shoals, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;  

A bill (S. 816) for the erection of tablets or markers at Camp Blount, Lincoln County, Tenn.; and  

A bill (S. 817) to erect a monument to the memory of Gen. William S. Campbell in Smythe County, Va.; to the Committee on the Library;  

A bill (S. 818) to incorporate the International Association of Rotary Clubs, and for other purposes;  

A bill (S. 819) to amend section 729 of the Revised Statutes to provide a jury trial in cases of contempt committed outside the presence of the court;  

A bill (S. 820) to amend section 648 of the Revised Statutes regulating the procedure in civil and criminal cases triable by jury;  

A bill (S. 821) to amend the corrupt practices act by extending the same to candidates for nomination and election to the congressional and representative offices in the Congress of the United States, and for other purposes;  

A bill (S. 822) to amend subsection 3 of section 3220 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to claims for refunds of federal taxes;  

A bill (S. 823) to amend section 250 of the Code of the United States (Judicial Code, sec. 145) by adding a new section (sec. 4); and  

A bill (S. 824) to amend section 239 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary;  

A bill (S. 825) declaring the Obey River, in the State of Tennessee, a navigable stream; and  

A bill (S. 826) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Federal Power Commission; to provide for the improvement of navigation, the development of water power, the use of the public lands in relation thereto, and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act, approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes," which act was approved June 16, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce;  

A bill (S. 827) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Dickson, Tenn.;  

A bill (S. 828) for the purchase of a post-office site at Dickson, Tenn.;  

A bill (S. 829) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ripley, Tenn.;  

A bill (S. 830) for the purchase of a post-office site and the erection thereon of a suitable public building at Dickson, Tenn.;  

A bill (S. 831) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ripley, Tenn.;  

A bill (S. 832) for the purchase of a post-office site and the erection thereon of a suitable public building at Manchester, Tenn.;  

A bill (S. 833) for the purchase of a post-office site and the erection thereon of a suitable public building at Brownsville, Tenn.; and  

A bill (S. 834) authorizing the construction of a recreation hall at Hospital No. 88, Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds;  

A bill (S. 835) granting compensation to Jeremiah D. Bailey; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads;  

A bill (S. 836) for the relief of Erite Jones and Melissa Williams; to the Committee on Finance;  

A bill (S. 837) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the correction of the records of the post-office employees for rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes;  

A bill (S. 838) providing additional compensation to certain employees of the Post Office Department for overtime service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads;  

By Mr. BROOKHART:  

A bill (S. 841) to provide that four hours shall constitute a day's work in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Civil Service.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I will state to the Senator that this measure may properly be regarded as an emergency measure and follows not the usual course of Senate procedure. This very destructive storm occurred quite recently. We have frequently authorized appropriations of this sort without reference to committees.

Mr. JONES. I think the Senator is mistaken in that. We have had prompt action upon such matters, but I think it has been the general rule of the Senate that joint resolutions—which are the same as bills—should go to committees, and I think that is a wise rule.

I do not want to delay this matter unduly, and I cannot see any reason why it should be delayed possibly more than a day. We ought to have a recommendation from the committee, and, if conditions are as the Senator from Georgia understands, I have no doubt that the committee will act promptly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina have stated all the pertinent facts. The matter is one that will require investigation. There will not be the slightest thing accomplished by the delay except the delay. Nothing else will result from it. The same report will come back. It is a matter of complicated character that calls for an investigation. If it were, I should concur in the request for reference, in order that there might be an investigation.

Mr. JONES. The same considerations probably will be urged with reference to joint resolutions that may be introduced. I think it is wise to send this one to the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, a delay of even a day will be a serious matter to the distressed people of the storm area. This joint resolution does not appropriate any more money than was originally appropriated, and, as my colleague says, the money is there, ready to be used. It is for the same purpose as provided in the original resolution, and the object of introducing this joint resolution is simply to include the sufferers from the recent storm. I hope the Senator from Washington will withdraw his request. I conferred with the officials of the Department of Agriculture on this fund. They are quite willing for the balance to be used for the storm sufferers, and there is something over two million left of the six million appropriated to help the flood sufferers that could be used to relieve the storm sufferers.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the objection may be a technical one, but if the committee should report this afternoon—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. JONES. I beg the Senator’s pardon; I thought I was sitting in my own right.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I merely want to say that the Senator's suggestion that only a day's delay will result implies that a favorable report will undoubtedly be made, and that the Senate will lay aside the business and give consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution when a report is made. There is nothing to give assurance that the Senate will take that course if consent for the consideration of the measure is denied now, with every fact before the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia has stated every pertinent fact. The committee will make no investigation. What will happen will be that the committee will promptly report the joint resolution after taking it up for consideration, and then the Senator from Georgia will be compelled to submit another request for unanimous consent for its consideration, and some Senator may wish to withdraw the amendment and prevent that consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I remember many times when the Senate and I have summoned to the Senate, and where the matter has gone to the committee. The committee probably will report back in two or three hours. I think that is the wise course to take, so I object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JONES. I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. TYSON submitted an amendment, Mr. HARRIS submitted two amendments, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by them severally to
Senate bill 1, the farm relief bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO THE CENSUS BILL

Mr. TYSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the Resolution (S. Res. 129), that the report of the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF "POINTS OF HISTORICAL INTEREST IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL"

Mr. MOSES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 5,000 copies of Senate Document No. 228, Seventieth Congress, second session, entitled "Facts of Historical Interest in the National Capital," be printed for the use of the Senate Document Room.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures or any subcommittee thereof be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-first Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ clerical, stenographic, or other assistance as may be necessary, to require the attendance of any witnesses and the production of their books, papers, and documents, and to administer such oaths, to take testimony of witnesses, and to make its report to the Senate; and that the committee shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

RESTATEMENT OF COMPLAINT AGAINST CONTINENTAL BAKING CORPORATION

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 47), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas the Federal Trade Commission on December 19, 1925, following strong public protest against the formation of an alleged bread trust, filed a complaint (DoCKET No. 1558) against the Continental Baking Corporation, in which it was charged, after investigation by its chief examiner and full consideration by the commission, that the said Continental Baking Corporation had acquired the capital stock of a large number of baking companies in violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act; and

Whereas the Department of Justice of the United States on February 8, 1926, also following strong public protest against the formation of an alleged bread trust, filed a petition in the United States District Court of Baltimore, Md., against the Ward Food Products Co., the Continental Baking Corporation, and others, in which it was charged that the defendants were engaged in a combination and conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act, and also that said defendants had violated section 7 of the Clayton Act; and

Whereas on April 2, 1926, the Federal Trade Commission, without the sanction of its majority, suddenly and without notice dismissed its complaint against the Continental Baking Corporation, under strange circumstances that raised a grave question as to whether the majority members who voted for the dismissal acted in the public interest or with a view to cover the grounds of the Continental Baking Corporation and called forth a strong public protest from the minority members of the commission; and

Whereas on April 3, 1926, the Department of Justice suddenly terminated its suit against the Ward Food Products Co., the Continental Baking Corporation, et al., by a "consent decree" agreed upon and entered under strange circumstances that raised a grave question as to whether the Department of Justice acted in the interest of the public or with a view of serving the ends of the defendants, particularly the Continental Baking Corporation, and also as to whether or not the Department of Justice had perpetrated a fraud upon the court in which the "consent decree" was entered; and

Whereas this "consent decree," which is publicly branded as a "smoke screen" behind which the defendants, particularly the Continental Baking Corporation, will be able to continue their monopolistic operations with all the safety from scrutiny that was enjoyed by the commission and the Department of Justice to the effect that the Continental Baking Corporation was guilty of violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act; and notwithstanding the further fact that the said "consent decree" was an entirely new and entirely fictitious monopolistic course which called forth the public protest above referred to, and of which the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice were aware and

Whereas in view of the strange circumstances surrounding the dismissal by the Federal Trade Commission of its complaint against the Continental Baking Corporation, and the termination by the Department of Justice of its suit against the Continental Baking Corporation by the said "consent decree," the United States Senate, by Resolution No. 270, Sixty-ninth Congress, second session, instructed the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and report upon the matter; and

Whereas the report of the subcommittee appointed by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to make the investigation justifies the suspicion that the majority members of the Federal Trade Commission did not act in the public interest, but rather are working for the Continental Baking Corporation, when they hastily voted to dismiss the complaint against the said corporation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Trade Commission should restate, or, if it desires, should set forth in its annual report the Continental Baking Corporation which the said commission, by majority vote, dismissed on April 2, 1926, and prosecute the same with the vigor demanded by the public interest.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF TAX REFUNDS

Mr. MCKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 49), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That a select committee of five Senators be appointed by the Vice President to investigate the subject of tax refunds involving claims for taxes of $50,000 or over. For the purpose of this resolution the committee is authorized to sit during the recess of the Congress to employ such clerical, stenographic, or other assistance as may be necessary, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents as it deems fit, to administer oaths, to take testimony of witnesses, and to make its report to the Senate. In addition, the committee shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

WORKING CONDITIONS IN SOUTHERN TEXTILE MILLS

Mr. WHEELER, I submit a resolution to investigate the working conditions in various southern mills and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was referred to the Committee on Manufactures, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate immediately the working conditions of employees in the textile industry of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee, with a view to determining (1) whether the employees in the textile industry have been and are working for starvation wages, despite the fact that the textile industry is the beneficiary of the highest tariff protection granted any industry in the United States and is still appealing for more tariff protection; (2) whether men, women, and children are compelled to work as many as 60 hours a week for wages insufficient to permit a human being to live in decency; (3) whether such employees have been and are the victims of oppression such as is prevalent in countries where poignancy is the rule; (4) whether enormous profits are being made by the textile corporation engaged in this industry; (5) whether the appeal of the textile interests of the South for higher protection is justified; (6) whether United States Senators in the textile districts to aid these underpaid and oppressed workers in their misfortune have been kidnapped and deported into other States and threatened with death if they returned; and (7) whether union relief headquarters have been demolished by masked men and acts of violence committed against the workers that are making life unsafe.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate until the final report is submitted, to subpoena such clerical and stenographic assistants, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony and make such expenditures as may be necessary.

Any person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation herein authorized, shall be liable to the penalties prescribed by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] whether the operation of the resolution which he has just introduced is confined to strikes in the cotton mills of the South or whether it provides for the investigation of strikes in the textile industry in any part of the United States?
Mr. WHEELER. The resolution applies only to the cotton mills in certain Southern States where there are labor troubles pending and where the wages that are being paid, from the information I have gathered, have been reduced to such a state that it is impossible to expect the wages these employees are getting.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that; but what I desired to know was whether the Senator has limited the scope of his resolution to strikes occurring in the South?

Mr. WHEELER. It does not strike me occurring in South Carolina, and whether or not they should have an increase of wages.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then it proposes an investigation of labor conditions in the mills.

Mr. WHEELER. Of labor conditions, and particularly with reference to the tariff, to ascertain whether or not the workers in these textile industries are getting the benefit of the tariff, and whether or not they should have an increase of wages that they are asking for before the House committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator think that if that is the purpose of his resolution, it would be advisable to have an investigation not only as to the rates of wages obtaining in the South, but the rates of wages obtaining in New England and in other sections where manufacture is being carried on?

Mr. WHEELER. I am perfectly willing that that should be done. The only complaint that has been particularly made to me was with reference to this; but I have asked that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Manufactures, and I assume it will broaden it in such a way as far as I am concerned, to accept the Senator's offer to amend it so as to take in all of the country.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, if there is to be an investigation of the wage scale in the cotton factories of the South for the purpose of obtaining information to enlighten the committee and the Senate upon the question of tariff rates, then I think it is quite manifest that that investigation ought to extend to the cotton factories in other sections of the country as well. Otherwise I do not see how the principle which the Senator says he is seeking to invoke will apply.

Mr. OVERMAN. May I ask my colleague a question?

Mr. WHEELER. The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to his colleague?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. Can not the Committee on Finance or the Ways and Means Committee get all the testimony in regard to the wage scales through the Tariff Commission? Is there any use of such an investigation when we have a Tariff Commission, and have the Ways and Means Committee of the Finance Committee to investigate all questions relating to the tariff? Is not that true? Does not the Tariff Commission furnish information such as is covered in this resolution?

Mr. SIMMONS. If it think my colleague intended to say that I did not see the necessity at this time for the appointment of a special committee to make an investigation either of the wage scale in the factories in the South or in the woolen and cotton industries in New England, because we have now a Tariff Commission which duty it is, and whose chief function it is, to ascertain the difference in the costs of production in this country and abroad, and that necessarily involves that difference in the wage scales obtaining in different sections of this country.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SIMMONS. In just a moment. Not only that, but it is one of the functions of the Finance Committee, in the application of the doctrine of the difference between the production here and abroad, in reaching a just protective rate, to investigate that sort of investigation; and it is their custom ordinarily to call upon the Tariff Commission for the evidence with which they proceed through their investigations, and not only to call upon the Tariff Commission for such aid but to call upon any individual citizen, manufacturer or otherwise, in this country.

The Congress has provided no instrumentality for ascertaining information necessary for legislation in respect of any question that equals that we have set up for the purpose of getting information to enable us to frame a just tariff measure. The only question that is competent to make the investigation on which they are authorized by law to make, whether they will make the investigations which they are provided with a power to make, whether the Finance Committee itself will institute a thoroughgoing and comprehensive investigation to this end.

With all of these sources of information available to us, actually provided by law, it does not seem to me that a special investigation is justified. But if it is justified, if for any reason whatever, the Finance Committee is not able to provide that information which the facts and the situation seem to demand, then I insist that the investigation shall not be a sectional one, shall not be confined to the one section in which we propose these particular mills referred, shall not be limited to the mills in all sections of the country.

This is not only a strike investigation, but the author of the resolution admits that its main purpose is to get information concerning the cost of production and the difference between the cost of production here and abroad, and I say any investigation of a part of the mills of this country would be unfair if it does not extend equally to every other part of the country in which these manufacturing industries are located.

I yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I simply want to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I am in full accord with his suggestion as to the scope of the proposed inquiry. If an inquiry is to be made with the idea of determining what share in a tariff rate the employees in the cotton mills receive, I concur in the opinion that it should cover all the commerce in the country.

Mr. MCMASTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. MCMASTER. It has been suggested that the Tariff Commission is a great source of information, and I can carry it far enough in existence some 16 years, and the members of the commission have been charged with the duty of ascertaining the difference in the levels of wages in Europe compared with those in America. Two years ago I directed an inquiry to the Tariff Commission asking that the daily wages of the various types of labor in the woolen and cotton industries in America be converted into pound loaves of bread, and a similar inquiry was directed to them for the purpose of getting the wages in the Southern States.

They have been investigating that matter for 16 years, and all the information along that line that I could obtain from them was a comparison of the wages obtainable in the cotton and woolen industries in England and continental Europe. They have been investigating that matter for 16 years, and all the information along that line that I could obtain from them was a comparison of the wages obtainable in the cotton and woolen industries in England and continental Europe.

Nevertheless, we have that instrumentality.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have not undertaken to justify the Tariff Commission in its acts of omission or in its failure to discharge fully the functions with which they are invested by Congress. I think myself it has been very negligent, but I would not like to say that it has not heretofore furnished very valuable information. When we were considering the last tariff act it furnished a book giving the results of its investigations, and in this country which was of very great value to us, although I thought in many respects it was incomplete, and sometimes very misleading.

Nevertheless, we have that instrumentality. It is not a function of the Tariff Commission. I have heard that it is the business of the Chamber of Commerce to ascertain the difference in the costs of production wherever they please in this country upon any question that affects the matters of legislation pending before that committee.

The point I make is that we have thoseInstrumentality, and if they fail us, then the Finance Committee has a duty to perform. The Finance Committee may, if it sees fit, appoint a subcommittee to make investigations wherever they please in this country upon any question that affects the matters of legislation pending before that committee.

The proposal to come from the State of Massachusetts.

The southern people have not today, so far as I have heard, presented or have any purpose of presenting any resolution with respect to this matter. Their attitude is largely that the committee is competent to make the investigation on which they are authorized by law to make, whether they will make the investigations which they are provided with a power to make, whether the Finance Committee itself will institute a thoroughgoing and comprehensive investigation to this end.
Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I think he does condemn some of the things that have gone on in North Carolina, but he does indorse this resolution, and he does, if I mistake him, come down here, just at this time to present such a resolution as this. Let us take this matter up at another time, and not encourage the agitators who went down there from New York and other places. I do not feel that his Federation of Labor do not encourage it. He does not ask that this strike be continued. He wants it stopped. Mr. Wood, of the Department of Labor, has been there and condemns it.

I am simply saying now—and this is all I mean about this resolution if it shall subsequently come before the Senate for consideration. I will show the purpose for which it has been introduced, and remind the Senators how much money has been spent in regard to the communists, and Industrial Workers of the World, and the circulars they are printing reading, "Down with property! Down with the flag! It is your property."

If the Senator was to ask the committee, before they report back this resolution, to consult with Mr. Green, the head of the American Federation of Labor, and with Mr. Wood, of the Department of Labor, who have had much to do with the investigations which have been conducted by committees investigations which have had no object in view except to provide trips over the country. They have done nothing except a little ferreting and then reporting to the Senate, with never a bill or resolution introduced to remedy any evil complained of. That has been the history of many of these investigations, and this resolution is the same. I ask the Senators if it shall be reported back favorably, that at this time members of the I. W. W., communists, and adherents of the soviet system, led by penitentiary "birds," including a woman now under indictment by the Federal Government for swearing to a lie in regard to her naturalization, are fomenting strikes in North Carolina and elsewhere in the South, discouraging the people, and bringing about the present trouble.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I think he has had considerable experience in dealing with labor troubles, and I have never seen the sort of people that have been mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina ever get any foothold in any community unless there are conditions of life so bad as to become intolerable. The thing I want to do, and I am sure the thing the American Federation of Labor is trying to do, is to see that we have living conditions for the workers, so that we will not be bothered by the kind of men the Senator from North Carolina thinks are infesting his State at the present time.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know they are doing it. I do not think it; I know it.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not familiar with it. I am taking the words that represent the resolutions of the American Federation of Labor as to what is going on and as to the conditions that exist there.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the resolution, but when the resolution comes back to the floor I shall attempt, from the standpoint of the boys and girls who work in the cotton mills of North Carolina and South Carolina who are not getting enough to live upon or enough to keep their bodies and souls together, I want the Senate of the United States to investigate it. If the people whom he says are trying to overthrow the Government are down there, then the committee of the Senate will find it out and properly brand them, I presume.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes, Mr. President; but—

Mr. WHEELER. I do not yield for a moment. I am not going to stoop and I am not going to be frig the Senators not asking to show. If this resolution shall be reported back favorably, that at this time members of the I. W. W., communists, and adherents of the soviet system, led by penitentiary "birds," including a woman now under indictment by the Federal Government for swearing to a lie in regard to her naturalization, are fomenting strikes in North Carolina and elsewhere in the South, discouraging the people, and bringing about the present trouble.

Mr. OVERMAN. That question will come up hereafter; but, in view of what is going on in the Senate, I propose to show the Senators how much money has been expended for investigations that have not amounted to the snap of the finger. I propose to show the Senate how much money has been spent in regard to the communists, and the American Federation of Labor, and to show how much money has been spent in regard to the communists, and the American Federation of Labor, and with Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor and at the request of Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. OVERMAN. I introduced the resolution at the request of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor and at the request of Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor. Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that I introduced the resolution at the request of representatives of the American Federation of Labor and at the request of Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor. Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that I introduced the resolution at the request of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor and at the request of Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor. Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that I introduced the resolution at the request of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor and at the request of Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor. Let me say to the Senator from North Carolina that I introduced the resolution at the request of the representatives of the American Federation of Labor and at the request of Mr. Green, the president of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know they are doing it. I do not think it; I know it.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not familiar with it. I am taking the words that represent the resolutions of the American Federation of Labor as to what is going on and as to the conditions that exist there.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss the resolution, but when the resolution comes back to the floor I shall attempt, from the standpoint of the boys and girls who work in the cotton mills of North Carolina and South Carolina, and whom I particularly represent upon the floor of the Senate, because without their votes I fear I may not be a member of this body, to demonstrate and show to the Senate what they think about conditions there. Conditions are not such in my State as mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. OVERMAN). I regret that the people he speaks of have gone down there, but he should have expected it when his people supported Herbert Hoover for President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Occupants of the galleries must not exhibit signs of approval or disapproval, but must be in order.

ERADICATION OF THE MEDITERRANEAN FRUIT FLY

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a matter of great emergency, but one which I think will not consume more than two minutes of time.

If I may have permission, I report favorably without amendment from the Committee on Appropriations the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 56) to provide funds for the eradication, control, and prevention of the spread of the Mediterranean fruit fly. The joint resolution provides for the transfer of $4,250,000 of an appropriation heretofore made, but not expended, and the time to be broadened in its scope, and ought to apply to every section of the country where cotton and tomatoes are manufactured. It was voted down by the Senate, because without their votes I feared I might not be a member of this body, to demonstrate and show to the Senate what they think about conditions there. Conditions are not such in my State as mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. OVERMAN). I regret that the people he speaks of have gone down there, but he should have expected it when his people supported Herbert Hoover for President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Occupants of the galleries must not exhibit signs of approval or disapproval, but must be in order.
The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. Res. 35) as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the presence of the Mediterranean fruit fly, the sum of $4,250,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $5,000,000 for establishing and enforcing noncotton zones carried in the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1929, be transferred, without the necessity of new legislation, for the eradication, control, and prevention of the spread of this pest, the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and for other expenses, including objects specified in the agricultural appropriation acts for the years 1929 and 1930, the heading "Salaries and general expenses, plant quarantine and control administration," and for necessary investigations, for printing, and for the purchase, maintenance, rental, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles outside of the District of Columbia: Provided, That in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture no expenditure shall be made hereunder until a sum or sums adequate to State cooperation shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, county, or local authorities, or any combination thereof.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF ART—RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. HAWES, Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the Record the following radio address delivered by the senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] over broadcasting station WRC, Washington, D. C., on March 8, 1929, on the subject of painting and art in America.

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

The Government of the United States, in all its various ramifications, costs in round numbers $5,500,000,000 annually. This money is expended to accomplish thousands of purposes. Among them are: Support of the Army and the Navy; Federal courts; law enforcement; forestry; development of the arts; maintenance of the Constitutional Library, and assistance in one form or another to railroads, industries, shipping, aviation, commerce, and most any other phase of our national life.

It is surprising that, in all its annual endeavors, there is little or no contribution to the furtherance of art. Undoubtedly this is partly due to the newness of the United States of America. We have been busy developing and settling our country. In England, Germany, France, Italy, and many other nations of the world art plays a considerable part in the national life, and the governments have not been unmindful that, aside from creating something of beauty and delight, there is a business side to this subject as well. Hence they have encouraged and fostered the development of the artistic. Their national gallery is open to the world and they would show, perhaps, more national pride of the works of art born in their own citizen. Annual exhibitions of paintings, sculpture, architecture, and allied arts are held under governmental auspices in many lands. These exhibitions attract thousands, and many Americans annually visit these countries to feast their eyes upon the beautiful objects which have been created and preserved in foreign lands. Recently many citizens of this country have purchased some of the most desirable of these treasures. They have been brought to the United States. Here they reside a while in private galleries and frequently are donated to large cities where municipal museums become their permanent abode, to the great delight of thousands of people who have, to some degree, an appreciation of these exquisite creations of the art world.

The United States Government has given no encouragement whatsoever to the furtherance of the cause of art except upon those occasions when it has purchased a marble statue of some person noted in American life. It has fostered no national contests or national exhibitions. The thousands of Americans engaged in the business of art constitute a group of citizens, and about the only group, of which the Government seems not to think at all, or, if it does, it keeps its thoughts to itself.

Now, art is an important thing in any nation's life. We may measure our power in our population, exports, natural resources, and in the development of our industries. We may count our prosperity in bank deposits and from the hum of machinery in thousands of mills and by the belching clouds of black smoke from scores of factories and forges. We may measure our civilization to our national wealth and the size of our armies. Our schools, free public schools dotted all over our land; but, to a large extent, we must measure our civilization by the soul of the people, by an appreciation of things that are treasured because they are distinctly beautiful and true. In no manner is the soul of a nation so well developed and express itself as in, first, the creation of the beautiful, and, second, by the cultivation of an appreciation of the beautiful.

In this respect the United States is not in the vanguard. We have neglected this side of our national life. The decay is there but it is latent. A few public-spirited men have greatly stimulated it with private endowments. We are rich and have but we have not too much of the harshness of any new civilization—those qualities which always come from rapid progress. The refining gentleness of a well-ordered society is greatly advanced by creating in the minds and the hearts of the people who comprise it a love and desire for beautiful things. From such a vision comes a sense of proportion, and the psychology of tolerance and understanding.

Recently, in order to stimulate the development of art in our own country, to offer encouragement for those engaged in this profession, to provide for our Government the means whereby American art may be encouraged, I prepared and introduced a bill into the Congress to bring about in a measure this desirable result.

That bill creates a national board of painting and sculpture, to be composed of not less than three nor more than five persons who are trained and skilled in adjudging painting and sculpture. If the measure is adopted, there would be held annually in the city of Washington a national exhibition open to all American painters and sculptors. The five hundred and fifty thousand dollars appropriated for this subject as well. Hence they have encouraged and fostered the development of the artistic. Their national gallery is open to the world and they would show, perhaps, more national pride of the works of art born in their own citize

The total cost, including the case awards, of this annual contest and exhibition for American sculptors and painters would be but $50,000 a year. This sum can not be termed extravagant. It would be many times more than the amount of money expended to conduct the exhibition. The winner of the first award in each case would go that distinguished prestige of being the first American painter or sculptor for, say, the year 1929. We would in this way assist many men and women who are struggling to reach some pinnacle of recognition and acclaim. We would be able to offer encouragement for those engaged in this profession, to provide for our Government the means whereby American art may be encouraged, I prepared and introduced a bill into the Congress to bring about in a measure this desirable result.

There is no reason to think other than if this project were carried out that over a period of several years these exhibitions in Washington, the National's Capital, would bring to this city thousands of people from all over the United States and, indeed, many foreign countries.

In my judgment, every painter and sculptor in the United States of any promise would contest for the first award of the Government of the United States. Paintings of the various phases of American life would result. There would be paintings of the West, of the mountains, the lakes, our rivers, our cities, our towns, the plantations, the forests of Maine and Florida, Texas and Montana. Our industries, too, perhaps would furnish the inspiration for many works. Over a period of time these paintings and bits of sculpture would be living pages of American life. They would show and tell so much better than can the printed page the ever-changing story of a nation's life. Already much that we know of the old West has disappeared. Thanks to Frederick Reming­ton, many scenes truly depicting western life as it was are preserved to us. A collection of paintings and objects of sculpture year by year over a period of a century will show more vividly and graphically and accurately the transition of a nation than can any other single thing.

In the retounds of the National Capital there are some priceless paint­ings. There are about 10 of them, showing vivid spots in the early history of our land. There are the Pilgrims on their ship coming to this then uncharted stretch of wilderness. There is Corwin's sur­render of Bull Run, Washington and Yorktown; here is Washington in the conclusion of the Revolutionary War resigning his commission as Command in Chief of the American Army to Congress, which was sitting in the Delaware Senate Chamber. These paintings show the faces and the costumes of the men who made history, and, as the years roll by, the American people will treasure their possession more and more.

The new Pullman company, a large railroad company, the oldest railroad in the United States, held an exhibition to which came hundreds of thousands of people. It was called the Fair of the Iron Horse. All the different types of locomotives, freight and passenger vehicles that had been built, together with their trains, were displayed. It was held to attract attention to the early beginning of modern transportation and its development to the present giant engines and palace Pullman cars. To visit the exhibition was a period of time to forget the cares of everyday life. It was distinctly worth while and portrayed so vividly the evolution of this Nation from its small beginnings to its present position. While this exhibition was confined only to transportation, the field of painting and sculpture would enhance the whole gamut of American life.
life. If it is possible to conceive that the policy which I have outlined had been in existence for the last century, we would have now 500 paintings by American artists in the year 1929, during which time there was the gold rush; the long covered-wagon trains across the Nation; the war with Mexico; the War of the Rebellion; slave life in the South; the old Robert E. Lee plying up the Mississippi; the great round-ups in the West; life on the American frontier; the building up of American industry; the launching of gigantic ships; the development of the cities; horse racing; dueling; stirring moments in the World War.

All objects of sculpture had been from 1929, during which time, the Rush to Alaska; life on the frontier; nation; the war with Mexico; the War of the Rebellion; slave life of Time a noble destiny.

We can begin it now, and at very little cost.

No nation is perfect. Many of the transitory ills from which we suffer are products of the city. It is a force of great value and worthy of the American people who wish to carry out of the Rock of Time a noble destiny.

**JUDGES OF THE WORLD COURT**

**Mr. BLEASDE.** I ask to have printed in the Record an article from the Washington Herald of this morning giving the names of the judges of the World Court.

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

[From the Washington Herald, April 29, 1929]

Q. Who are the judges on this World Court that they want us to join?—A. There are 10 foreigners and 1 American, Charles Evans Hughes.

Q. Then, they could outvote us 10 to 1 in settling any controversy where Europe's interests conflicted with ours?—A. Yes; and pretty soon they could do better than that; soon they will be able to outvote us 14 to 1.

Q. What do you mean?—A. The constitution of the World Court will be amended at the League of Nations meeting in September so as to increase the number of judges from 11 to 15.

Q. The League of Nations; what has it got to do with the World Court?—A. It is the League of Nations; the World Court was established by the league. Its constitution and powers are periodically amended by the league. Its judges are hired and paid by the league.

Q. Why, it sounds like a department of the League of Nations. I thought the Republican Party had promised to keep us out of the league.—A. They did.

Q. And now it is proposed to submit our international controversies to the league's court?—A. Yes; and it will pass on a lot of questions that have not been submitted to it. The Senate was not consulted about the nomination of judges.

Q. What do you mean?—A. A peculiarity of this court is that the judges are not appointed by the Senate, and their appointment is made by the Senate of the United States. The Senate has not agreed to the nominations of judges.

Q. But the League of Nations can submit to it any conceivable question for an "advisory opinion."—A. Yes; and this is one of the powers of the League of Nations.

Q. The League of Nations could ask its court to decide whether we have any right to the Monroe doctrine or our Japanese exclusion act?—A. Certainly; any question at all. Moreover, it is expected that every nation will do as the World Court decides, or face the consequence.

Q. Then, 14 foreigners and 1 American would vote the court's decisions and opinions?—A. Yes.

Q. Who are the World Court judges now, anyway?—A. They are Rafael Altamira y Crevea, of Spain; Diodoro Anzoleite, of Italy; Antonio Sanche de Bustamente y Sirven, of Cuba; Robert Bannay, Viscount Finlay, of Great Britain; and Bernard C. J. Loder, of the Netherlands.

Q. What about,—well, who else?—A. Yoshua Oda, of Japan; Charles Andre Weiss, of France; Dietrich Galuppi Gjedde Nyholm, of Denmark; Max Huber, of Switzerland; and Eptudico de Silva Pessoa, of Brazil.

Q. Then who?—A. Dumitruc Neguescu, of Romania; Wang Chung Hui, of China; Mikhalo Ivanovich, of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State; and Frederick Valdemar Nikolai Reichmann, of Norway.

Q. Great heavens! And there's to be just one little American voice in that mob, deciding any controversy they want to trump up with us?—A. Yes.

Q. You don't mean to say the Senate will vote our necks into that big noose?—A. Maybe.

**NATIONAL-ORIGINS CLAUSE OF IMMIGRATION ACT**

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 37), submitted by Mr. Nye on the 230 Instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 151) to repeal the national-origin provisions of the immigration act of 1924.

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry at this time of the Senator from Alabama. I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama if Senate Resolution 37 should be raised and discussed at this time; who could help him in his devotion to devote the hour before 2 o'clock to a consideration of the resolution itself?

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to speak on my resolution, and I expect to do so at the first opportunity. I do not know whether or not I shall conclude when the morning hour has ended at 2 o'clock. I hope I may be permitted to go on. I have a good deal to say, and I wish the Senator from North Dakota would permit me to have my remarks considered.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I shall insist upon the consideration of Senate Resolution 37 at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I should like to say, in connection with this resolution, that I have no desire to supplant the measure which is now before the Senate in order to consider the Immigration Act. It is my belief that a rational espousal by the league's court?-A. Yes; and the committee could ask the court to decide whether we have any right to the Monroe doctrine or our Japanese exclusion act?

Q. Then, would we not have any chance of getting the matter here on the floor of the Senate, where Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to express themselves upon the subject of postponement or upon the subject of repeal?

Mr. President, there are one or two impressions that are being conveyed broadcast over the land that are altogether false. One is that the program looking to the repeal or postponement of the national-origins clause is a movement against immigration, and, in consequence, a movement in favor of the national-origins clause. Immigration laws. I deny and resent that charge, Mr. President. No one is a firmer believer in restricted immigration than I.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. NYE. I wish that the Senator from Georgia would permit me to finish my statement. I am not going to speak long. When I shall have concluded, then the Senator from Georgia, in his own time, may make answer and speak for himself.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well.

Mr. NYE. I resent very much the charge that those who are insisting upon a postponement or repeal of the national-origins clause are enemies of restricted immigration. Such is not the case at all. The national-origins clause of the immigration act would restrict immigration beyond the restrictions now called for in so limited a degree that it would not have any severe consequence at all. At the present time, under our immigration law, approximately 164,000 immigrants from foreign lands are being admitted each year; under the national-origins clause 152,000 would be admitted; so that the proposed reduction would be a mere 12,000.

The national-origins proposal is not in principle a further restriction measure in any sense of the term at all. I have a great deal of sympathy for those who are endeavoring to base Western civilization upon the culture of the West, and, in other words, to fix immigration quotas upon the basis of our nation as constituted at this time, an altogether desirable purpose, but there are those of us who have not been sufficiently well informed to believe that it is the wisest course to follow with any degree of accuracy, with any degree of fairness. Instead, and quite to contrary, it would be quite inaccurate; it would be quite unfair; and would, as the President has declared, work a very severe hardship upon people, many of whom constitute the very finest class of immigration which has come to this land.
There has been a further misrepresentation made which has had a very telling effect upon a great many people whose sympathies and purposes and prejudices sometimes come into play in considerations of this kind.

There is at least the impression has been conveyed—that under the national-origins clause, if immigration from any part of Europe would be restricted, it would be that coming from southeastern Europe. Mr. President, that is not false as false can be. Under the basis of immigration, according to the national-origins plan, immigration from southeastern Europe would not be restricted further than it is restricted at present. Instead, the countries of southeastern Europe could send to this country every year from two to three times as many as they are permitted to send into this country under the prevailing immigration law. Those who would suffer by virtue of the national origins clause because of its restrictive character would be the people of northern Europe, the people of Ireland, of Norway and Sweden and Germany; those countries which in times past have contributed the finest element of our immigration, I dare say.

It is not my purpose, and it is not my desire, to indicate a wish with relation to immigration quotas to build them upon any national prejudice whatsoever. That is not my purpose, and I shall try to refrain from it, but the false impression to which I have referred has been given out so freely over this land as to what the national-origins plan would do that I felt quite necessary that I make that much of a statement at this time.

I do not think the dedication of the Senator from Alabama if he will not permit a vote upon the resolution this morning?

Mr. HEFLIN. If a vote can be had now, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection to it. I think the Senate will decide on Senator Reed’s resolution, as I hope it will.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—the PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hearst in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. Nye. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to make some observations this morning before the resolution comes to a vote.

Mr. Nye. May I ask the Senator before I leave the floor if he expects to permit the Senate to vote on the resolution this morning?

Mr. REED. I do not think it is possible to vote on the resolution this morning. I see no reason why it should not go to the calendar, however, and be taken up in the usual way. There is no question in the United States so important as is the question of immigration, and the idea that we should dispose of it in the morning hour, with 30 minutes of discussion, seems to me to be shocking.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that the resolution ought to go to the calendar.

Mr. Nye. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from North Dakota has the floor, I will wait until he concludes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am going to yield the floor immediately. I have no desire to delay the floor indefinitely. I have no desire to call for a test at this time as to the strength of the two sides in the Senate in this controversy and I am not trying to obtain a vote for or against the repeal or postponement of the national-origins provision. I am seeking only to secure consideration from the Senate this morning of a resolution discharging the committee in order that we may get the question before the Senate in proper form, and I wish that we might be permitted to adopt the resolution without debate.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether or not his suggestion that this resolution go to the calendar and be taken care of in the regular order of business would not make it perfectly possible for any individual Senator by objecting to prevent its being considered when reached on the calendar?

Mr. REED. Of course, Mr. President, that would be true if we were considering the calendar by unanimous consent; but a bill on the calendar, as the Senator knows, can always be taken up on motion.

Mr. REED. Would the Senator be willing to have the resolution made a special order for any definite time?

Mr. REED. Not at present, Mr. President; I would not.

Mr. BINGHAM. Even though the time fixed were some distance in the future?

Mr. REED. No; not at the present time.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that at some distant day in the future we shall have the matters before us for which the Congress was assembled, when his time and that of others who are deeply interested will be taken up with the consideration of changes in the tariff. Would it not be better to try to settle this question before we have to become involved in the consideration of the tariff bill, which will come before the House of Representatives, I assume, within the course of two or three weeks?

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President. The tariff bill which will be passed this year will be forgotten in another 15 or 20 years; the farm bill which may be accorded this year under legislation passed by Congress will be forgotten in that space of time; but what is done on the question of immigration will affect the United States for centuries to come, and we are not going to let the Senate consider it even if it is posthumously put on it under any guise whatever. I am quite sure that I have been on other things have at least learned what it is all about. I can not agree now that any time be set for a vote on the resolution, if a special order. It is going to be debated fully. I have no disposition to filibuster the resolution, but I am not going to let it come to a vote until I am convinced in my heart that the Senators who are about to vote on it realize its importance and realize the nature of the question.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall yield the floor in just a moment, Mr. President.

The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that as soon as the House is the tariff bill is going to come up entirely in connection with the committee hearings on that bill and the very long debate in connection with it. On previous occasions we were called in extra session to consider a bill of that sort, and the debate went on for months and sometimes until the next session of Congress. Would not the Senator be willing to have this matter come up and be disposed of, if possible—at any rate, be fully debated—as soon as the House passes the tariff bill out of this country? If we can not debate it fully before it becomes necessary to treat the tariff bill it might then go over?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there are many Senators here who know just as much about immigration as I do. My engagements in the Finance Committee will make no real difference in the debate on this resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have reason to believe that there were quite a number of Senators who were willing to debate it all summer, but that will not get us any nearer to a solution of the problem; and if the Senator from Pennsylvania would only help us in fixing a time for a discussion of this matter, so that it might be fully discussed and so that there might be an opportunity for a vote on it, or at least a test vote on it, before we get into the mazes of tariff discussions, it seems to me that to do so would only be to grant a reasonable request.

Mr. REED. I have no right to consent for anyone except myself. I could not in any way commit the Senators who feel as I do. But, Mr. President, there is something shocking about the statement of the Senator from Nebraska in one line in a President’s message and in discussion such as has been given to this matter on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. REED. On March 4, Senator Reed—on a day that is a dozen of my associates congratulated me on my "filibuster!" Twenty minutes on the most important question that the American Congress has had to pass upon in the lifetime of many of us! That is not my estimate of its importance. I remember the day the bill passed, in 1924, the late Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, then finishing his thirtieth year of service in the Senate, rose from his seat in the front row and came back to mine and asked me what was the most important act taken by the American Senate in my lifetime, with the exception of the declaration of war against Germany; and that is to be disposed of. If you please, in one line in the concluding paragraph of the President’s message that brought us here! That is to be disposed of as cavalierly as that! But you can not dispose of it, Mr. President, in future years. If you have not acted on this bill that has just passed this body, that is the most important act taken by the American Senate in my lifetime, with the exception of the declaration of war against Germany; and that is to be disposed of. If you please, in one line in the concluding paragraph of the President’s message that brought us here! That is to be disposed of as cavalierly as that! But you can not dispose of it, Mr. President, in future years.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there are such places in the United States to-day; if you have gone on building foreign blocs where to speak the English language in their community makes you an outcast; there are such places in the United States to-day; if you have gone on filling your julls and your asylums and your hospitals with the diseased and the feeble-minded paurers of countries of a blood alien to ours.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator proceed in his own time?

Mr. REED. I have been trying to proceed in my own time, and I shall when the Senator has finished.
Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, have I the floor? The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for a moment? Can the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry give us any idea when we may expect a vote on the farm bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my opinion probably would be no better than that of any other Member of the Senate. It is my decided hope that we will vote on the bill by Friday of this week.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania, although he took some time to answer my question, gave us only one reason as to why we should not proceed with this matter after theFarm Bill is considered, and that was not to be disposed of in a single line in the President’s message. I understood that the tariff bill is likely to be reported to the House within a day or two, and that the House probably will debate it for two or three weeks. It is the hope of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that we may dispose of the farm bill this week. That would give us at least two weeks before the tariff bill comes over to the Senate. I will ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye], the father of the resolution, whether or not he plans to ask or to give notice that on the passage of the farm bill he intends to move to have this matter disposed of in a single day of the legislative calendar.

Mr. Nye. No, Mr. President; I do not, for I understand, and feel that those who have that understanding are entitled to that consideration, that the census bill and the reapportionment bill have been referred already. I for one would prefer that that agreement be gone through with, and that the immigration question be permitted to have a place immediately following the disposition of that matter.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the steering committee of the majority party passed upon this resolution?

Mr. Nye. This resolution? No. It has passed on the matter of reapportionment and the census. Mr. JONES. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. Reed. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JONES. I wish to say that I do not know that the steering committee has passed formally on the matter; but the general understanding, I think, is that after the agricultural bill is disposed of, the census and apportionment bill—the subjects of which are combined in one bill—is to be taken up.

Mr. BINGHAM. Can the Senator give us any idea as to how long that is to be debated?

Mr. Reed. I am not. It ought not to be very long, and it will not be very long on my part, I know. I have no idea how long the debate will take. I do not anticipate that it will take very long, although I will say frankly to the Senator that I have heard some argument that possibly will be considerable opposition to the apportionment provisions.

Mr. BINGHAM. Can the Senator, as assistant leader of the majority party, tell us whether he has been made aware as to what is being made in the Senate in recess while the Finance Committee is holding hearings on the tariff bill?

Mr. JONES. The only suggestion I have seen with reference to that is in the newspapers. I do not anticipate that we will be in recess until the measures that the Senate desires to consider are considered and disposed of.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, from all that I have been able to learn, it looks as though the chance of getting a test vote on the majority mentioned in the President’s message, albeit in one line, is rather doubtful. I hope very much that I may be mistaken in this supposition, and that the Senator from Pennsylvania, to whom these papers are opposed to the measure, as well as the friends of it, will give us an opportunity to get a vote on the measure, in order that we may not be placed before the country in the position of declining to vote on a matter to which the President has called our attention in the message calling together this extra session.

Mr. Nye. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether he foresees any chance for the Senate to be in recess until the measures that the Senate desires to consider are considered and disposed of.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was asking the Senator from North Dakota if he wants to force his resolution to a vote here in the Senate on a motion to discharge the committee. Whoever does that proceeds with a heavy burden.

Mr. Nye. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. Yes; gladly.

Mr. Nye. Does the Senator resent attempting to discharge the committee in this matter?

Mr. REED. Not in the least, Mr. President. It is well within the Senator’s rights, and it is his duty if he believes it to be the proper thing to do; but I say—and I shall try to be brief—that the Senator who moves to discharge a committee that has taken action by a majority in two successive Congresses carries a heavy burden when he comes before his busy colleagues and tells them that for two Congresses that committee has been all wrong, and that we should summarily discharge them and disregard their recommendation, and bring a bill out here by force on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. Nye. Mr. President, that burden, if burden it is, is shared, I am confident, by a majority of the Members of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, will he tell us who has the floor?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. HEFLIN. Are we proceeding under the 5-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5-minute rule does not apply in this case. It applies to bills taken up under Rule VIII.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I am a little bit astonished that the Senator from Alabama should be interested in the 5-minute rule. [Laughter.] I never knew him to be interested in it before.

Mr. HEFLIN. I made the inquiry because the Senate was told, a little while ago, that we were under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BINGHAM. I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota about this very decisive vote to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has referred. The vote apparently was 4 to 2. I should like to inquire what constitutes a quorum of the Committee on Immigration, and how it happens that 4 to 2 becomes a decisive vote. I appreciate the fact that it is a 2 to 1 vote; but a quorum of 6 in a committee of 15 seems to me a very extraordinary matter.

Mr. Nye. To whom is the Senator directing his question?

Mr. BINGHAM. I was asking the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. Nye. For the information of the Senator, I will state that I understand that a quorum of the Committee on Immigration consists of seven members. Is that correct?

Mr. BINGHAM. If the Senator is addressed to me, the committee does not consist of 15, but of 13; and 7 is a quorum, and 7 were present. The vote was 4 opposed to the Senator’s resolution, 2 in favor of it, and 1 not voting.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, it seems to me hardly fair for my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, to refer to a vote of 4 as being so important that the Senator from North Dakota is doing a very serious thing in endeavoring to bring before the Senate something which four Senators voting on a committee decided that the Senate had better not have the opportunity of passing upon.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am sure the Senator does not know the fact, or, with his customary fairness, he would have mentioned it, that the vote in the last Congress was 7 to 4, which was quite decisive, in our judgment, and seemed to be accepted as decisive by the majority of the committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; but that was before the President of the United States, in a special message, called our attention to the necessity for doing a certain thing. Evidently his message had some effect.

Mr. GEORGE, Mr. COPELAND, and Mr. BLACK addressed the PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. BINGHAM. I was addressing to the Senator from Pennsylvania the necessity for doing a certain thing. Evidently his message had some effect.

Mr. GEORGE, Mr. COPELAND, and Mr. BLACK addressed the PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?
far members of the committee who are opposed to the President's measure, and all the Senator from North Dakota is endeavoring to do is to give the Senate a chance to say whether the four members of the committee whose position were justified in their attitude that the Senate should not be allowed a vote on this.

Mr. REED. The Senate will have many chances, Mr. President, to express its opinion without some discussion and explanation of what the question is.

Mr. President, may I have the floor in my own right? The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

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

Mr. REED. I yield for a question.

Mr. COPELAND. I wanted to ask the Senator from North Dakota if he said that this is not a measure that will restrict immigration. He made a statement which I think is so interesting that I believe it should be repeated. What will be the effect of the national origins law in relation to restriction of immigration as compared with the prevailing law?

Mr. NYE. I made the statement, Mr. President, that under the prevailing law we are admitting immigration quotas from the various countries, whereas under the national origins clause there would be 133,000 admitted annually. I did not say that the national-origins clause would not restrict immigration. I said it was never intended to be a piece of legislation for the further restriction than that already had; that that was not its principal purpose.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator will permit me just one further comment, in my judgment the country believes that the national origins law is essentially a measure to restrict immigration.

Mr. NYE. That is true.

Mr. COPELAND. And, therefore, I think the statement made by the Senator from North Dakota is very significant, and the country should know that, so far as restriction is concerned, there would be no practical difference between the prevailing law and the national origins law. The only difference is that the numbers coming in from certain countries which now have very considerable quotas would be reduced materially while England would have a very much larger proportion of immigration.

Mr. GLOBE. Mr. President, I want to make very plain where he stands when he will be shaking his gory locks at me, and I want to make very plain where he stands to-day in his regularity and in his following of the President of the United States.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I have given testimony as to why the Senator from California was making a plea for Japanese immigration to this country?

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; he only follows the President sometimes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; quite so, when the President agrees with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it is worth while remembering in this connection that this policy of the Congress was determined upon by a vote of about 65 to 8 in the Senate back in 1924. Both parties rose above politics. It was determined as a patriotic American doctrine. I do not remember the exact vote, but it was approximately 65 to 8, and that was many years before Mr. Hoover had expressed himself upon the subject.

If anybody has departed from party policy, it is not the Senators who to-day maintain the same position they maintained in 1924. If there is any irregularity—and irregularity means departure from the straight line—we are not departing; we are merely remaining consistent.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator mean to say that the President of the United States?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If a Senator desires to interrupt, he will please address the Chair.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator mean to imply that the President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, has departed from the principles of the Republican Party when he advocates this measure?

Mr. REED. I do not mean to criticize Mr. Hoover—we know his no profit in that—but I disagree with him very ardently and I disagree with him with respect to him; but we have studied this question far more than Mr. Hoover ever has had an opportunity to study it. He was on the quota board, it is said, and he then, in one of the three drafts of the letter of transmittal but not in the other two, expressed dissatisfaction with this method. He had no chance to study it then. The evidence before our committees shows that the quota board could give it no study but a glance at the typewritten report of the experts, and the experts who did the studying are convinced of the soundness and the accuracy and the absence of discrimination in this measure.

Mr. REED. I do not remember that the Senator has ever had a chance to hear my opinion on the farm bill or on following the President, but I will answer him directly. If Mr. Hoover were so great a student of population problems and economic problems as he is himself to be of economic problems such as the farm problem, I am convinced that he would agree with us in this immigration matter, just as I believe I agree with him in the farm relief matter.

Mr. HARRIS and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to ask another question. Some of us on the Committee on Agriculture feel that we have studied the agricultural problem much more than the President of the United States has, but I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania wants us to follow blindly the President of the United States with reference to agriculture but does not want us to follow him with reference to immigration.

Mr. REED. I do not remember that the Senator has ever had a chance to hear my opinion on the farm bill or on following the President, but I will answer him directly. If Mr. Hoover were so great a student of population problems and economic problems as he is himself to be of economic problems such as the farm problem, I am convinced that he would agree with us in this immigration matter, just as I believe I agree with him in the farm relief matter.
Senators discuss this proposition as if there were involved in it some idea of prejudice against the Germans or against the Scandinavian. I think that the fiction is the fact from the face of it in us in the Immigration Committee who have taken a stand against postponement of the national-origins clause have been ready to acknowledge that in all the strains of immigration there is no more desirable strain than that of Scandinavian peoples or of the German peoples. They have made excellent immigrants. The effort to arouse among those people the idea that in some way we are unfair to them, that we are attacking them as compared with other groups is unfair to them and unfair to us. They are a magnificient strain and they are entitled to their full proportionate share of the immigration into this country. They should not be discriminated against.

We talk English to-day in the American Senate because the ancestors of the predominant number of Americans talked English, because they came from Great Britain. Is it not then rather disgraceful to take an immigration basis such as the 1890 foreign-born basis, which gives the Germans almost twice as much out of every million persons in Ireland 9,806 of that million can have been born in the country as shown in the census of 1890 foreign-born basis, which gives the Germans almost twice as much out of every million persons in Ireland 9,806 of that million can come to the United States every year, while if you cross the channel to England, Wales, or Scotland only 752 persons out of a million can come to the United States every year? The Irishman in Ireland to-day under the immigration basis has a much better claim to America that is possessed by his brother across the channel in England, Wales, or Scotland. Why should that be? I do not know, nor has anyone yet suggested an explanation. The President does not. The antagonists of the national-origins plan suggest no explanation for these disparities. One wonders why Congress ever adopted such a basis in the beginning.

The answer to that is, that when immigration restriction was first determined upon, some rule of thumb had to be adopted to apportion these quotas among the different countries. It had to be done quickly. The first act was passed in May, 1921, and it was determined then, with very short debate, that quotas should be fixed at 3 per cent of the number of foreign born in the country as shown in the census of 1910. That is to say, if the 1910 census showed a million people residents of the United States as having been born in Italy, then the annual migration from Italy should be 30,000.

When we came to enact a permanent law in 1924 the design was primarily to reduce the aggregate of immigration. It was not primarily to get a better balance between the northern and southern Europe, we would base it on the 1890 census, which was taken before the sudden outflow of immigrants from southeastern Europe. It seemed to be more in accordance with the composition of the American population to take 1890 than to take 1910. But it was an artificial thing to go away back to a census then 34 years old, and it was taken only for want of something better. It was frankly adopted only as a temporary expedient.

In that original act of 1924 for a permanent policy of the United States for all of the years to come it was provided that after three or four years to be spent on a study of those quotas under the national-origins plan, the national origins should be the permanent basis of apportioning immigration for all the years indefinitely into the future. Why was that fair? If we base immigration on the 1890 census, the foreign born only, observe and ignore the movement of the grandchildren of those born in the United States, from South Dakota, Pennsylvania or Montana who might now be represented in their homelands as the foreign born, half of whom were not even naturalized, half of those people at the time that census was taken were not even Americans, and many lodgers who have never crossed those borders. That method ignored all of the present-day descend- ants of the men who settled this country, all of the descendants of the British who fought the Revolutionary War, who could, if the Government in the system that it now has, all of the men who fought so bravely on both sides of the Civil War—all of them and their descendants were ignored.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. NORBECK. Is it not a fact that the question of the adhesion of Pennsylvania to the cause of the Revolution was developed in a political contest, in which the Germans outvoted the English-speaking Quakers and turned Pennsylvania to the Revolutionary cause?

Mr. REED. I frankly confess that I do not know. It may be so, but I can not see that it has anything to do with this present question.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator was speaking about the English having done it all, giving the others very little credit.

Mr. REED. If the Senator would confide to listen to me for a moment.

Mr. NORBECK. I have been listening to the Senator for about a year on this question.

Mr. REED. He would have understood that my protest is based just as much on the disregard of those Germans of Pennsylvania as the British of Pennsylvania.

Mr. NORBECK. But the Senator is trying to keep the—

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). Occupants desiring to interrupt must first address the Chair.

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. NORBECK. I think the effect of the Senator’s attitude is to keep other Germans from coming to Pennsylvania, because Congressmen who are not supposed to have that attitude or did something more than somebody else for the cause of the Revolution.

Mr. REED. Now I am perfectly certain the Senator has never listened to me. I have listened to the galleries.

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). Occupants of the galleries must be in order.

Mr. REED. In all the discussion that has taken place on this question I have expressly disavowed and those who agree with me on this question have disavowed any effort to compare races, to pretend that one stock is any better than another. All I do say is that the people of our time who are descended from the British and the Germans that lived in America back in colonial days are as much entitled to recognition as the most recently arrived unnaturalized Greek, and that is what the Senator would not give us.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President.

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

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GLENN. A few moments ago, as I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania, in emphasizing the importance of this problem, he said that he did not propose to allow a matter of this supreme importance to be decided without full discussion, and to which I understood him to say would fill our jails, our insane asylums, and our poorhouses, or words to that effect. Now, he has paid a tribute to the Scandinavian people and the German people, and now says that he does not desire to compromise between any of the racial groups.

Mr. REED. That is right.

Mr. GLENN. May I inquire to what groups he referred as being those which would fill our jails with criminals, our poorhouses with paupers, and our insane asylums with the mentally deficient?

Mr. REED. I am very glad to answer that directly. I spoke of conditions obtaining in Southern California where it is an acknowledged fact that the proportion of Mexicans diseased, insane, and paupers is far beyond their proportion in the population of that community.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Then the Senator did not have any reference to any people who will be affected by the national-origins clause?

Mr. REED. Yes; I did. I am coming to that in a moment. I see what the Senator is trying to get at and I am going to make it quite halfway.

For a long time before the war broke out in Europe this country was the trash basket of Europe. We were sent thousands of immigrants who were expelled from peninsular Spain on condition that they would emigrate to America. We got the trash of the Mediterranean, all that Levantine stock that churns around through there and does not know what its ancestry is got the trash of the Mediterranean, all that Levantine stock that churns around through there and does not know what its ancestry is, all the trash of Italy, all the trash of the Balkan peninsula and from all that part of southeastern Europe. If that process had kept on, Americans would not...
much longer have been speaking English, would not much longer have continued with a democratic government.

The fact is that it has taken our ancestors and us centuries to learn how to govern ourselves even as badly as we do some of our big cities to see how that population tends to govern itself.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania yields to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Speaking about the Levantine Provinces, and taking Syria for instance, what would be the national origin of those people?

Mr. FREED, Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. The present discussion of the Senator relates entirely to the period which precedes 1921, does it not?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. EDGE. Since the restrictive act of 1921 was passed has the Senator observed any such condition as he is now describing as having existed before the war?

Mr. REED. I have not observed immigration coming in such numbers.

Mr. EDGE. Or that type of immigration which was generally unresponsive to our institutions?

Mr. REED. Yes; I have noticed lots of it.

Mr. EDGE. Is not that entirely a matter then, or to a great extent at least, in the hands of the United States consuls abroad who first must be satisfied before any immigrant can come even under the 5 per cent or 2 per cent quota?

Mr. REED. I think the quality of immigration since 1921 is vastly better than it was before that time. I think it is very much better than it was before that time. But what I say is that it was perfectly obvious that the flow of immigration had to be restricted. Suppose we agree on that point. The next question was, How are we going to apportion these quotas? The limited number that was to be admitted was to be apportioned fairly, so much more likely was our restrictive policy to continue. Equally obviously if we divided it unfairly in the aggregate, then so much greater was the danger that our restrictive policy could not last. There had to be an absence of discrimination in order to insure that the immigration law would last. We sought then to find some method by which discrimination could be avoided. We took the foreign born of 1890 as a temporary expedient only, but after lengthy debate we decided that we would base the quota ultimately on the national origins of the entire population of the United States in the very latest census, which was 1920. If that can be done, I understand the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. NYE) to admit that that is highly fair, that it is not open to criticism if it can be done. His objections seem to go solely to the practicability of it.

Mr. NYE.

Mr. REED. And he admits, as I understand him, that it is not fair to disregard us if it is possible to include us, that it is not fair to base our quotas on recent unnaturalized arrivals.

Mr. NYE. I have no desire to carry on beyond the morning hour in this matter, but I wish the Senator would make it more explicit just how national origins is going to give us a cleaner population, an immigration which is devoid of the degree of disease and degeneracy that now exists. He told me some time ago he was going to do that. I wish he would do it at this time.

Mr. REED. I have done it. In so far as we shut off the admission of paupers, the pauper labor of Europe, just so far will it be done. And when we get to that we shall find there is no question as to the admission of immediate and succeeding generations, and national origins, which admits fewer than the 1980 basis, closes the throttle just that much further.

Mr. NYE. The Senator feels that is an answer to my question.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I did not mean to speak as long as I have, but perhaps the questions are partly responsible for it. I shall conclude as quickly as I can.

Back in 1910 our Census Bureau made a very careful analysis of the colonial stock of the United States and their descendants. That study was made long before immigration restrictions became an acute question. When the national origins plan was adopted it was immediately realized that part of the calculation could be absolutely exact and part of it involved a research. There were four groups into which all our citizens fell, as follows:

First, the foreign born reported in the 1920 census; that was reported in terms of postwar geography and was absolutely accurate, as far as a census could be.

Then came the next group, the children of foreign-born, or persons having one or more parents born abroad. That group necessarily was reported in terms of pre-war geography and involved some calculation to apportion it between the postwar countries.

Then came the third group, the descendants of immigrants since the colonial period, descendants in the third degree—grandchildren or later. That had to be treated in the same way, because the immigration statistics were, of course, in the terms of postwar geography, that is, post-1914, became of colonial stock; and there the same kind of study that had been made as of 1910 had to be applied in order to ascertain the national origins.

It is claimed by some of the critics that the national-origins plan is inaccurate. I think if the Senators have followed me, they will see that as to the first three of those classes it is at least as accurate as the 1890 census basis. The 1920 basis is wholly inaccurate because it is naturally in terms of pre-war geography. We can not resort to the 1890 census to find out the quota of Yugoslavia. There was not then any Yugoslavia, nor was there any Czechoslovakia, nor Estonia, nor Finland. Those who insist on a plan whose whole basis rests on a pre-war census which has to be guessed at in order to apply it to postwar countries talk of inaccurancy.

That is true also of two of the groups under the national-origins plan, affecting the children of foreign born, the descendants of those who arrived since colonial days; it is no more accurate than is the 1890 basis as to those two groups; it is no more accurate than is the 1890 basis. To a great extent at least, the questions are partly responsible for this.

I desire to say that my first consideration has been the principle that the immigration law should be treated in the same degree of accuracy. I think it is highly fair, that it is not open to criticism if it can be done. And when we get to that we shall find there is no question as to the admission of immediate and succeeding generations, and national origins, which admits fewer than the 1980 basis, closes the throttle just that much further.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator has said on at least three occasions in discussing the resolution he is now talking about that all he wanted was a vote. If the Senator will now give me an opportunity, I will ask whether or not the company of business may be laid aside in order that the Senate may take a vote immediately on his resolution. Will the Senator agree to do that?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am going to do that in a few moments.

Mr. WATSON. Would not the Senator be willing to do it now?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, this is such a grave question and one of such far-reaching importance that I feel that certain other things should be said, since things have taken the turn they have here, before a vote is taken. The Roman plan and purpose to prevent free speech and peaceful assembly in the United States goes to the very vitals of this Government. It has been rumored around, and the rumor has been conveyed to me, that the Senate is going to vote down this resolution; that that is the present intention; that on the other side there will probably be a rather large vote against it, and I learn that there will be some over here who are going to vote with you who oppose this resolution. So in order that the people back home to every State may know just what is going there and just what influence it is that is prompting and pressing opposition to my resolution, I feel that I should say a few things that the people who love this Government need to know.

The people are entitled to know, and I am going to ask for a roll call on the resolution, and whether the Senate gives me a roll call or not, I am going to print in the Record the number of those who vote for or against it. It will be a memorable roll call, Senators! I have here a list of Senators by States. The American people are entitled to know and they are going to know about this matter, Senators. I am not appealing to you to give it to me; I am giving this to you as the American citizens-men and women-in Massachusetts who want to do it. I am going to pass the resolution that I introduced. That is not my object at all. I have presented this matter to the Senate from a sense of patriotic duty and I never dreamed that anybody would be afraid it could be passed. I said that those who interfered with free speech and peaceful assembly and sought to assassinate a Senator were Roman Catholics. I am seeking to make it so unpopular and despicable for anybody to attack the American citizen's right of free speech and peaceful assembly that nobody will dare to do it hereafter. It is best for the Catholics, it is best for the Protestants, and for the Jews, and everybody else, that my resolution should be adopted, because it announces an American doctrine fair and just to all real Americans.

If the Roman Catholics in America, those who are fighting my resolution in this body, who are opposed to it, if they want to defeat it, if they continue in the course they are now following-of interfering with the American right of free speech and peaceful assembly-mark my words-the day is not far distant when the spirit of retaliation, the Roman Catholic spirit of retaliation, will be committed to speak in many Protestant communities in America. I do not want to see such a day come. I would regret very much to see it; but Protestants and Jews are not going to permit the Roman Catholics in the United States to destroy free speech and peaceful assembly. They would be patriots and cowards if they did.

Suppose the Senate shall not adopt my resolution, that is not going to just do to me; I am going to continue to speak. I believe is right and necessary to warn people of the dangers that threaten this Government, as I warned them at Brockton, Mass.

What may I do and what are the self-respecting and courageous American citizens to do when they want to invite a Protestant speaker to come and address them? Roman Catholics invite Roman Catholic speakers and nobody interferes with them. Would the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Oregon want me to go to the States to provide an armed guard for protection against those Roman Catholics who might disturb free speech and peaceful assembly and make an assault upon me? Is that the course of conduct these Senators and those Senators who would have had me punished?

Mr. President, I assert that the American citizen in his own right has a right to protect his rights. He has a right to have his opinions moved to his constituents-no such refusal can be made; he is not to be inconvenienced or disturbed in any way; he demanded senatorial action immediately upon the matter. Again I say I am in agreement with the Senator that this is an important attitude in asking the Senate of the United States then to inquire into the treatment of an American citizen in a foreign land when he has no protection from his own Government: for molesting, exciting, frightening, and terrorizing American citizens-men and women-in Massachusetts where a United States Senator was delivering a public address.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?
are being employed here. Mussolini's Roman Catholic Fascist organization is taking hold and growing throughout the country. Mussolini has followers who have sworn allegiance to him above everything else. The brutal and murderous tactics that destroyed liberty in Italy are now being employed in the United States. I especially invite the attention of the Senator from Idaho to this.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble.

Mr. President, I have brought to the attention of the Senate a concrete example of an instance heralded all over the land by the press in which a Member of this body was delivering a speech. The Senator from Idaho said in substance the other day, "Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States-and I especially invite the attention of the Senator from Idaho to this-provides:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble."
of the things I said about dangerous Roman activities here were true; and when I rise up to call attention to these things the only leg the Senator from Idaho has left to stand on is that which rests on the shifting sands of the old threadbare cry of Catholic leaders of 'intolerance,' and he seeks his hide behind a plea for religious liberty. That subject I will talk to you about later.

Religious liberty! It was because they hounded various religious groups here and overseas that the worst excesses in Virginia of the old days that went to the rescue. People could not meet in their churches and have a discussion about their plan of salvation and their hope of eternal rest. They were molested by people who gathered around them and who demanded in and out of public places just like they did up here when they interfered with free speech and peaceful assembly where a United States Senator was speaking in behalf of religious liberty. It is a parallel case. There is a group of Roman Catholic priests now, I suppose, just as there was a group of men called by Alfred De Soto, who was a politician and a presidential candidate, who was murder, who are afraid to speak their minds, who are afraid to make, and I presume that some of you now vividly recall that.

Yet a Roman Catholic group, a mob, is permitted to disturb and intimidate you. A friend of mine, I believe, was driving along a stretch of road where a Roman Catholic priest had recently been murdered. You have not begun to act if our places were reversed; and I will stand your attitude. I will talk to you about later.

I am going to show you the reason why I am not and why the intelligent Protestant American is not for a Roman Catholic for President of the United States.

It is not simply because he has a religion different from ours, not at all, because I do not care what a man's religion is. That is one of the reasons. It is because the Roman Catholic does not believe in the American Constitution, strictly construed, as we understand it. Why do I say that? Roman Catholics are not permitted to interfere with these rights to free speech and peaceful assembly. What are some of the other reasons?

If a Protestant man marries a Catholic woman, unless a priest performs the ceremony, and they agree to rear their children in the Catholic faith, the priests hold the marriage illegal and that they are living together in adultery. Is that true or not? I have a case right here, tried in Virginia a few months ago, where that very question was tried and settled as I am telling it to you now. Judge Blechman of the supreme court rendered the decision down there.

An instance has been given me by a distinguished citizen of this city about a former ambassador and his wife and daughter. A Roman Catholic ambassador, the Russian count married the daughter. They got a special dispensation from the Roman Catholic bishop, and the Episcopal father and mother of the daughter and the Episcopal daughter wanted the ceremony performed in the Episcopal Church. The bishop announced that he would annul the dispensation and that there would be no marriage if that were done. The father and mother permitted it to go on; they were married in the Catholic Church, and agreed to rear the children in the Catholic Church, children yet unborn.

Talk about freedom of religion! There is no freedom of religion in that! They bind the offspring before they see the light of day. They bring them into bondage under one faith, without ever having the right to exercise what the Constitution gives, the right of religious freedom to join any church they choose to join.

The American Protestant ambassador and his wife declined to attend the marriage ceremony, and that is what happened with an American representative in France.

This same distinguished gentleman—he gave me this information yesterday—said that when Rear Admiral Sigsbee died the Roman Catholic chaplain on the ship with him years before was in New York when they brought the admiral's body back there and held ceremonies over him in the Episcopal Church and a newspaper reported among those present at the ceremonies this particular Catholic priest, then a Roman bishop, I believe. He wrote a story and had it printed in the papers the next day denying that he went into the church, but did not go into the church, but said he was in New York when they brought the admiral's body there to the admiral's funeral in Arlington, out in the open, but did not go into the Episcopal Church at New York, the admiral's church. Senators, this situation ought to give you a little light. The Roman Catholic bishop, whose name I have had been chaplain with this dead naval officer of America, and when they took the body of this deceased American admiral to his own church, to conduct religious ceremonies over him, this chaplain did not go in there. The papers said he was there, and he issued a statement denying it so that other Catholics might see that he was not there. That is in America, this glorious God-given land of liberty.

What else? A Catholic soldier fights beside a Protestant soldier, the Protestant soldier is killed, and that Catholic boy is not permitted to go to the Protestant church where ceremonies are held for that boy, and participate in any of the religious ceremonies over his dead body before he is buried. Is it wrong, somebody correct me. He can not even join in singing a song. He can not even pray in another church in the presence of the lifeless form of his dead Protestant comrade. Then we have a great deal about religious freedom in the United States.

That is not all. They interfere with free press everywhere. Senators know it. I have heard them talk privately in the cloakroom. They talk about how hostile and intolerant and how that church is with Protestantism in it. I was talking to a newspaper boy not long ago—I do not want his name to get to them, because if it did, they would make him lose his job in 30 days if they had the power. He said—

Senator, there is all the difference in the world in writing a story about a Protestant or a Jew; there is no proportion in the slightest range if it is about a Protestant or a Jew, but if it is about a Catholic, they tell you to be very careful what you say. You know how that crowd is.
Let me tell you a thing one of them told me. He said he got a story on a priest, but he did not tell his boss he was a priest when he first asked him about the story. About 12 o'clock the man came to me and said, "Have you got anything?" He said, "Yes; I have a dandy story on a preacher who is guilty of a very heinous crime with a girl in this community." He said, "Good! Go to it." He said, "The priest and deacon and the minister and the choir and the organist and the vestrymen and the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church and the lawyer and the doctor and the judge and the 40 other fellow." He told him a little more about it. He said, "Who is this bird, anyhow?" He said, "He is Father O' Sullivan." He said, "Go to him. Kill it! Kill it!" He said, "We never published a line of that story." But when they thought it was a Protestant preacher, they said, "Go to it, and put in the headline 'Another Parson Caught."'

That is not all, Senators. Free speech? I went to Ridgeway, Pa., to deliver an address on the Mexican situation when I was fighting in the Senate to prevent the passage of a resolution that was being forced on this body from the House to sever diplomatic relations with Mexico, a resolution introduced by a Roman Catholic Congressman from Tammany, a Mr. Boylan. I was invited up there to speak. Some patriotic citizen put up the money for the theater; $150; he showed me the receipt. They got the theater where I was to speak Friday night. The theater people put the notice among their advertisements:

"Show Monday night, Tuesday night, Wednesday night, Thursday night, but they can't keep you. I'm going to tell you that is plain and simple and it is the Mexican situation."

When those signs went around the town in the street cars, in the newspapers, and in circulation, a priest, with a certain Knight of Columbus, went down, and they called on the manager of the theater. He told them he was renting that theater to anybody who would make it a meeting place. He offered to rent it to them as a meeting place. He offered to rent it to them if they would rent it to you or to anybody else. They said, "If you permit him to use it to deliver his speech on Mexico, we will boycott you." He said he did not think that was right and fair. He refused to yield. They telephoned down to Pittsburgh, and the general manager told him to cut it out. He replied, "I have this man's money. The meeting has been advertised and we have advertised it. The people have the tickets. They are coming in here. They have advertised it, and they have been sold, and we have a seating capacity of this place." The general manager said, "You cut it out." "Lock them doors and do not turn the lights on that night." I went up there the day he got that order in the morning, and the man who had rented the theater came down to the train and met me and said, "This is the worst thing I have ever witnessed. Our people are up in arms. I have never seen them so belligerent. Priest and deacon and all the streets with a few of the Knights of Columbus and they are lording it over everything." "What are you doing about it?" He said, "We are trying to reach our circuit judge to order to open the theater, but we have sent for him." This judge, propped up on that night.

"Another Parson Caught." We have advertised it. We have advertised it the newspapers, and they are lording it over and they are putting in the headline 'Another Parson Caught.'

It is not religious prejudice, but it is, and it may be dangerous talk, but it is my conviction, and I feel it my duty to talk thus plainly when there are so many around here afraid to open the theater and to speak on the subject. I know the subject that relates to a good many of you regarding your connections, and if my resolution is not agreed to I am going to give you an opportunity to examine yourselves in connection with the situation.

Now what else? The reason I will not vote for a Roman Catholic for President! They have in their textbooks now the doctrine of the union of church and state. They teach it throughout the land. Democrats and Republicans alike will assault my resolution ever protest against it? I had a bill up in this body for free textbooks for the District of Columbia and I wanted to amend it so that the Congress would furnish no textbooks that had in them that had in them that would interfere with church and state, and you never let it pass just because I had that provision attached to it. It went over. Is that not true? I am going to use it to make a public address. He said, "This is a matter of religious prejudice. I am giving you my reasons, Senators, and I am going to assert myself and help my people. We are so ashamed that this thing occurred here. Here in Pennsylvania where the Government was born, this outrageous thing has occurred here. I wanted to bring that incident to your attention. I spoke in Bethlehem in a magnificent school auditorium. They had advertised the meeting. I went into this magnificent hall. I said, "This is the most magnificent school auditorium I have ever seen." I said, "Yes; we built it as a memorial to the boys who were killed in France." I said, "It is a magnificent memorial," and I went on to say, "But it is not going to be opened." Did you understand the difficulty we had in getting it for to-night? We already had permission from the chairman of the committee, but when the Catholics found you were going to speak on the Mexican situation, they threatened to cancel the permit, and the chairman refused to do it. Then they asked that he call a meeting of the board, and they had it, nine members, and they voted for you to have the hall. I said, "I can tell you the complexities of the complications of the Catholic Church and the other three Catholics." "No; you have it nearly right. Two of them are Roman Catholics and one of them must be a Protestant." I said, "I know they had him somehow." [Laughter.]

So there you have a bold, malicious, and deliberate attempt by representatives of that group to deny a Senator the right to use their own school auditorium. Then say that those who vote against a Catholic for President are prejudiced; that they are intolerant? No. Let the Catholics quit all these ridiculous and un-American things and there would be a different story to tell. But who wants to vote to put a group in power that wants to kill American institutions and set up Roman institutions in their stead?

I say, and I believe it may be dangerous talk, but it is my conviction, and I feel it my duty to talk thus plainly when there are so many around here afraid to open the theater and to speak on the subject. I know the subject that relates to a good many of you regarding your connections, and if my resolution is not agreed to I am going to give you an opportunity to examine yourselves in connection with the situation.

Now what else? The reason I will not vote for a Roman Catholic for President! They have in their textbooks now the doctrine of the union of church and state. They teach it throughout the land. Democrats and Republicans alike will assault my resolution ever protest against it? I had a bill up in this body for free textbooks for the District of Columbia and I wanted to amend it so that the Congress would furnish no textbooks that had in them that would interfere with church and state, and you never let it pass just because I had that provision attached to it. It went over. Is that not true? I am going to say about Governor Smith and his clans. Doctor Ryan was asked, "Do the Roman Catholics in America accept the doctrine of the union of church and state?" He said, "Yes," and then, "But if I were in office I will not do it. Why, it is the priceless of the Republic for religious freedom."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. Borah] insinuates that this is a matter of religious prejudice. It is not religious prejudice; it is an attack by me and by millions of Americans for whom I speak against the political activities of the Roman Catholic group—activities that mean destruction of free institutions in America unless they are checked. That is what it is. I want the Senator from Idaho, when he comes to speak on this subject again, to differentiate and distinguish between my attack on Roman political activities and their dangerous assaults upon the American Government and religious freedom. You say I am talking about the political use of the Catholic Church and the Government; and this is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not religious prejudice; it is an attack by me and by millions of Americans for whom I speak against the political activities of the Catholic Church and the Government; and this is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not religious prejudice; it is an attack by me and by millions of Americans for whom I speak against the political activities of the Catholic Church and the Government; and this is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church.
here in the United States by assaulting a Senator, when the press of the country says if the deadly missile had hit him it would have killed him; and some of you back off from this question like frightened children in the dark? Where, I repeat, are the spirits of the hero* men who answered to their names in this body in the glorious days that are gone?

I would not do an injustice to an honest Roman Catholic. I do not believe there was any doubt about his guilt, I would give him the benefit of the doubt. I would give him absolute justice. At the same time, I am demanding justice for the Protestant; I am demanding justice for Jew; I am demanding justice for all in my country. When I refer to this as a Protestant country I do not do it merely because those who profess the religion in which I believe are in the majority, but I refer to it as a Protestant country because, thank God, we have religious freedom and the right of free speech, peaceful assembly, and press. That is why I refer to it in that light.

Mr. President, the fine city policeman of Brockton did his duty. He stood between me and my assailant. He caught the blow in his temple that was intended to strike me down. No man denies what I am telling you. No man denies that this meeting was disturbed. No man denies that I was assaulted and it behooved, an American officer trying to stand for law and order in this land, was struck down by one of them, and they thought for a time he was dead.

Yet when we come in here the learned Senator from Idaho—oh, how he has wiggled in and out and evaded issues and trod on egg shells and got away with it; but he and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], mark my words, will never get away from this. It is the first time of its kind that has been presented. He invited this comparison. He said if you voted for my resolution you took sides with me, and I answered back that if you do even whisper against it you take sides with those who sought to murder me. Which side does a self-respecting Senator in America want to take in a situation like that? But I have even put a provocation in the resolution eliminating that question. Here is where you are going to catch it in the campaign next year:

Be it further resolved, that the Senate in taking this action is in no way expressing its approval or disapproval of the subject matter of Senator Harlan's address on the occasion above referred to.

Then, stripped of all that, what is the question? It is whether you are for the protection of free speech and peaceful assembly: whether you do condemn an attempt to murder a Senator for exercising his constitutional right. How are you going to get around that?

He is a very young man and hard pressed financially, wanted to be a lawyer. Somebody suggested he could be appointed to the office of assistant county surveyor of his county. Lincoln asked, "Will it in any way deprive me of my political freedom or of my liberty in any way?" Here is what he said:

If I am perfectly free in my political action I will accept the appointment, but if my sentiments—Listen—
or the expression of them, are to be abridged in any way I would not have it or any other place.

Do Senators want to abridge my rights? Do they want to prevent me and prescribe what I should say, or permit that group to do it? I should not think that Senators would want to do that. However, here is another thing Lincoln said about his country and the law:

I know the American people are much attached to their Government, I know they would suffer much for its sake. I know they would endure evils long and patiently before they would think of exchanging it for another. Yet notwithstanding all this, if the laws be contumaciously evaded and disregarded.

Free speech and peaceful assembly—

if their rights to be secure in their persons—

if they are disregarded—

That is the peril that my life was in at the hands of that bunch—

the alienation of the affection from the Government is a natural consequence, and if I had saved a life or two—

There Mr. Lincoln is talking to you and stating that if you do not express your regret to the rescue of the citizen when his rights are trespassed upon, when his liberties are taken from him—if the Government permits it, if it smiles at it, if it condones it and sanctions it, then the citizen will turn against the Government in times of trial.

Mr. President, I have here another remarkable resolution of the Senator from Idaho. He wanted to inquire into—

the causes of industrial unrest • • • in the various clothing centers in the United States.

He wanted to find out about—

the cost of clothing to the public, and, as bearing upon such cost, the wages and costs of manufacturing clothing in the various clothing centers of the United States; the cost and selling price of cloth and other materials—

Now listen to this—

used in the manufacturing of clothing, and the methods of sale and distribution of such woolen cloth and other materials, and also the cost of selling price of retailers.

What do you think of that, you who do not believe in inquiring into a man's private business?

Here is a resolution of the Senator from Idaho which he called on the Senate to pass, to give authority to call in the people who sell to the retailer and ask them what their selling price was. I do not imagine that any manufacturer in the country would want another manufacturer to know how cheaply he could produce an article and the methods employed to produce it, and just what was selling prices as though it is a part of their private business; but the Senator from Idaho was willing for the Senate to go out on an expedition of that sort to find out the various kinds of material used in manufacturing a certain kind of cloth and what it cost, paid, and then to find out finally what the retailer paid for his goods that he was going to sell to the consumers over the country.

That is far afield from ordinary legislative activities; but the Senator throws a fit when he is called on to proclaim his indignation at an assault upon the great bulwark of free speech, and an attempt to destroy the right of peaceful assembly, and an attempt to assassinate a Senator.

The Senator said the Senate ought not to bother with this occurrence; that I was not at Brockton on a mission for the Senate. These manufacturers were not on a mission for the Senate, either. When they were getting ready the material they were going to make into cloth, they were not representing the Senate; but the Senator from Idaho wanted to bring them in here and make them tell their trade secrets, their processes of manufacture. The Senator would have the Senate do that; but he is not willing for the Senate to adopt a simple resolution declaring that free speech and peaceful assembly must be preserved, and that the Senate has heard with regret of an attack upon a Senator of this body, he has called upon the display of approval and condemnation of the conduct of those who may be guilty of the same.

Senators, what do you think of that? What will the country think of that? Is it as far as we have gone? Is it as much resolutions presented by the Senator from Idaho; I have not had a chance to pursue the others, but I will do so, and I am going to look up the resolutions presented by other Senators as well, because I do not want to misrepresent any of them; I want to be perfectly fair with all, and I want the Senate to know in advance that it will not chill my ardor one particle if they shall defeat my resolution. I am fighting for a principle that is as eternal as this Government, and if the Senate is afraid or for any reason refuses to declare its support of free speech and peaceful assembly the people ought to know it, and when I vote on my resolution is taken I want a roll call.

Mr. President, before I take my seat I wish to close my speech with some remarks which I prepared last night. I want every citizen of the country who reads them to know exactly what the situation here is, there are two cases which I wish to bring to your attention, but I will not do that now, and I am going to close with this statement:

Senator Bonar says if you voted for the resolution you take sides with me. No. You uphold the constitutional right of free speech and peaceful assembly and condemn an attempt to kill a Senator.

Well, if you vote against it what side do you take? Why you refuse to express your regret at an attack and interference with the American citizen's right of free speech and peaceful assembly, and you decline by your vote to express your regret at an attempt to assassinate a United States Senator, and by your voice you dignify the attempt to assassinate a Member of this body. It has long been a fine and beautiful custom here, when a Member of this body is assaulted or threatened with a resolution saying that it has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Senator in question, but here we have a queer, a
very strange and ugly situation where some Senators are oppos-
ing agricultural stabilization, which in my opinion is the most
important question of the American right under the
Constitution that every Senator here has taken an oath to sup-
port and defend. Nobody deniers that on that occasion an assault
with a deadly weapon was made upon a United States Senator
for the purpose of perishing him at an attempt to
assassinate a Senator, an attempt, which, if it had not been
interrupted, may have resulted in the death of that Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I assume that the Senator is aware that the attempts
made on the lives of Senators are no more common than other
acts of law-abiding citizens everywhere to express their views.
What will they think if you say by your votes that you have not heard with regret of an
assault on a United States Senator for the purpose of assassinating him? What
considerations would determine the Senator for speaking about the
thing he considers are "the dangers that threaten the American Gov-
ernment"? What strange influence will they think is at work here if you decline to express your disapproval and condemnation
of such threats by those who, in their desire to prevent the discussion in free America of a question they did not want dis-
cussed, sought to assassinate a Senator?

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator ask with reference to the
section 9, page 17, with reference to the clearing-house associa-
tions but also "other organizations controlled by pro-
ducer of any perishable agricultural commodity."

Mr. McNARY. I do not recall the circumstance. It was the purpose of the committee to follow, as far as it could, the
proposal in the House bill. Indeed, the drafting bureau pre-
pared both these bills, and it was thought that probably it would
be in the interest of simplification; but what we are discussing
now is the bill before the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That provision regarding clearing houses is optional, of course, in case the board desires to exercise it, upon
the petition of various cooperative associations. I can state to the
Senator that there has been some opposition to it. I think those interests opposed clearing houses believe that only the producers of some perishes. I am not sure whether it will be
successful or not. The Department of Agriculture thought great
good probable would come from these clearing houses assisting
producers in presenting their produce to the consumer and the producer in closer contact. How it will work
I do not know, if it shall work.

It is very difficult, of course, to frame a provision that is an
innovation upon present-day systems of marketing without arousing suspicion or opposition from various groups raising
agricultural commodities. I do not think it would interfere with the operation of the bill or in any way diminish its bene-
teffects that whole provision were stricken out; but so long as it is there, and in the judgment of the board, upon the petition of
coopertives, that instrumentality can be used for the benefit of
those producers who desire its employment, I see no harm in
permitting it to remain.

Mr. McNARY. Page 17, line 19. May I ask the Senator why the committee cut out of the original bill the reference to
these other organizations which are controlled by producers of any perishable agricultural commodity.

Mr. McNARY. I do not recall the circumstance. It was the purpose of the committee to follow, as far as it could, the
proposal in the House bill. Indeed, the drafting bureau pre-
pared both these bills, and it was thought that probably it would
be in the interest of simplification; but what we are discussing
now is the bill before the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. That provision regarding clearing houses is optional, of course, in case the board desires to exercise it, upon
the petition of various cooperative associations. I can state to the
Senator that there has been some opposition to it. I think those interests opposed clearing houses believe that only the producers of some perishes. I am not sure whether it will be
successful or not. The Department of Agriculture thought great
good probable would come from these clearing houses assisting
producers in presenting their produce to the consumer and the producer in closer contact. How it will work
I do not know, if it shall work.

It is very difficult, of course, to frame a provision that is an
innovation upon present-day systems of marketing without arousing suspicion or opposition from various groups raising
agricultural commodities. I do not think it would interfere with the operation of the bill or in any way diminish its bene-
teffects that whole provision were stricken out; but so long as it is there, and in the judgment of the board, upon the petition of
coopertives, that instrumentality can be used for the benefit of
those producers who desire its employment, I see no harm in
permitting it to remain.

That is my answer to that inquiry.

Mr. McNARY. Would the Senator seriously protest against inserting the operating clubs and families, and omitting from it the reference to the clearing-house associa-
tions?

Mr. McNARY. Certainly. The committee has reported this
bill in its present form. As far as I can, personally, as chair-
man, I want to keep the bill in its present form. I do not
think a substantial number of producers of perishes want
their commodities removed from the operation of the provisions
of this bill. There may be some in the business, in New York
and the like, but, taking the producers of the country generally, in
my opinion they believe that many advantages and much assis-
tance may be derived from being included within the opera-
tion of the bill.
Mr. COPELAND. One purpose of the questions I have asked of the Senator and the measures to which the attention of the country generally as regards that matter? I have no doubt that this brief debate will call attention to the fact that the matter is under consideration. So far as the producers of perishables in particular are concerned, I want to say that they not wish to be included in the bill now any more than they did last year.

Mr. McNARY. May I ask an inquiry of the Senator? I had a very substantial reason last year for taking out of the provisions of the bill the producers of perishable products because of this physical fact to start with, namely, that it is difficult, indeed, to carry over seasonal surpluses in these commodities that are perishable. Consequently, they did not want to have the board given power to levy a realization fee upon a product which would receive no benefit therefrom. That is perfectly obvious; but I should like to have the able Senator from New York point out to me what disadvantage would be to the producers of perishable products if they are included within the operation of the bill.

Mr. COPELAND. As I read the bill, Mr. President, it is very clear to me that it contemplates the possibility of storing these products. Supposing the board in its operation chooses to buy a lot of agricultural products. That, of course, is contemplated by the bill. I can not for the life of me see how a perishable product could be given the same treatment in the way of storage and preservation that would be given to wheat or corn or cotton, some lastling article which does not deteriorate, while, on the other hand, when we consider apples or peaches or citrus fruits or other products of the orchard and garden we are dealing with products which could not be stored, which could not be handled. I am not quite clear how an organization could be built up to deal with these perishables; yes, after all, Mr. President, I am satisfied that the matter left here because, as I said, my purpose was that the matter might be made a matter of record, and I know how carefully these records are read by those who are interested in them, and I am anxious to know what the reaction is. I say, however, that so far as I have heard from the people of my State who are interested in perishables they are not willing to be included in the operation of the bill.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I shall propose to the McNary farm relief bill. If I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill as it passed the House, and that all after the enacting clause in the bill as it passed the House be stricken out and that the Senate bill be substituted. That is the normal action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays the House bill before the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas and Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON. The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator's proposition it is to proceed to the consideration of the bill as it passed the House, and to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the Senate bill.

Mr. McNARY. That is done.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. So that the Senate will proceed with the theoretical consideration of the bill as it passed the House, but actually with the consideration of the Senate bill, which will still be open to amendment just as it was in the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Yes, Mr. President; that is the uniform practice.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is only one difficulty that occurs to me as a parliamentary proposition. If the Senator secures the action he has suggested, the Senate bill will, of course, be pending as a substitute for everything after the enacting clause in the bill as it passed the House. If that were done, then no amendment could be offered to an amendment to the text of the Senate bill, which would be pending as a substitute, unless by unanimous consent. For instance, there is pending now an amendment to the so-called deuterent plan. If the entire bill were pending as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House bill as it passed the House, this amendment which I mentioned would not itself be subject to amendment except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. I submit that to the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question has been decided, and Rule XVIII provides:
Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; but, Mr. President, the Senator asks unanimous consent to strike out all after the enacting clause in the bill as it passed the House, and to insert the provisions of the Senate bill. That is a part of his request for unanimous consent. I think he should add to that a provision which would safeguard the matter which the Senator from Nebraska has raised, so that amendments to amendments would be in order.

Mr. MCNAHY. Probably I could bring that about by a motion.

Mr. SIMMONS. My impression is that the Senate has not established a uniform precedent. I think the course indicated by the Senator from Nebraska has sometimes been pursued, but I think in a majority of cases we have not moved to substitute the Senate for the House. After the Senate bill has been completed by the consideration and action of the Senate upon the various amendments that have been offered. That method presents no opportunity for complications or parliametary twists which the course pursued by the Senator from Oregon, I think, would lead to a good deal of parliamentary confusion.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very. In view of the statement of the Senator from North Carolina, I withdraw the request for the substitution at this time. After the Senate bill shall have been perfected I shall renew the request, and probably there will be no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think that is the best course to pursue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that a thousand copies of the bill as it passed the House be printed? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MCNAHY. Mr. President, when the Senate concluded its session on Friday last it was considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska with respect to some modification of the debenture plan. It was my hope that we might take that up at this time and finish work on it this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr.どのように] and Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I desire merely to say that I do not believe it is fair that we shall write into a law that if the farmer expects any benefit from the legislation he must agree that he will make the poorest possible use of his faculties and his possessions. It seems to me to be an economic crime to try to prevent the wise and intelligent use of the agricultural resources of the country. If that is to be the policy of the Government, why do we not abandon any activities of the Department of Agriculture which in themselves are calculated to stimulate production? Why do we send out bulletins and supply information, improved seeds, improved processes of cultivation and harvesting, if we think that production is a crime, that it is a mistake, that it is wrong?

There will be a tariff bill here following the pending measure, and there is not a Senator who is going to propose that the schedule rates shall be decreased if additional factories are constructed. If there are more shoes manufactured or more yards of cloth woven or more harvesting machines manufactured than the average of the last five years, no one is going to ask that the tariff schedule be decreased in order to discourage industry. We certainly ought to be willing that the farmer shall have as much as anybody else. I say there is not another industry in America that any Senator would propose we should put a penalty to discourage it. If it invents a new machine, if it makes a new application for means of production, if it can find methods by which it can increase its production, then we are going to penalize it for doing. That is all this amendment means. It simply says to the farmer, "We are going to give you some kind of farm relief, but if you use your faculties, if you are intelligent, if you produce more this year than you did last, and if you do so a second year than you did this year, we are going to penalize you and take away from you the benefits of the legislation."

Why do we make an annual appropriation for universities that have experimental-extension departments? Why do we maintain the instrumentalities that are calculated to give increased production by reason of improved methods or wider information if we are going to turn around and penalize the people for exercising their genius for a wider and more production in America? It seems to me to be indefensible.

I am not unmindful of the fact that if the bill shall contain a provision of this kind, the producers of cotton particularly will be the first victims of the provision, because now they produce more for exportation than they do for home consumption, and it is going to be at once said: "You are overproducing, because you are exporting more than you are consuming in the domestic market. Therefore we will strike off the provisions of the bill that would aid you, because you are overproducing."

Did we appropriate the other day $4,000,000 to check the fly that is destroying citrus fruit in Florida? If it is wise to have a restricted production, why not let the fly alone? It
is restricting production. It is making less and less of the supply of that particular fruit available in the American market; therefore let us encourage the fly. Why did we spend millions of dollars trying to exterminate the boll worm, when the collapse of the industry was complete, as it now seems to be? Did the invasion of foreign goods exist when the textile industry was reasonably prosperous? When the collapse was complete, as it now seems to be, did the invasion of foreign goods exist when the conditions made it curtail production? If we are going to turn around and say to the farmer, after we have eliminated this pest, "If you use your intelligence and bravely and make the best of your facilities and produce more cotton, we will keep the wages and the law intact for your industry." It seems to me this is indefensible.

I would like to say that half the value of our foreign commerce consists of agricultural products. More than one-eighth of all the tonnage of the railroads is agricultural products. The farmers of America, even in their depressed financial condition, are furnishing a market for more than $10,000,000,000 to the agricultural sections of the country. Now, are we going to say, "If you are a little more intelligent or a little more energetic, if you conserve your resources and produce more, we are going to let you take advantage of the law and penalize you for that?"

There was a commission appointed the other day to study erosion of soils in order to keep the fertility of the soil from being wasted away. What do we do? We are treating as an enemy a class that threatens to produce more than it did last year? It seems to me to be indefensible.

I am going to support the plan whether it contains the amendment or not, but it seems to me to be indefensible. It is so unfair to a class of people, to say, "In order that we may keep you from becoming prosperous, we are going to penalize you and control your production; we are going to tell you what you may grow and what you may not grow." There is not another class in America as to which we would write on the statute books a prohibition against the full use of its resources to the very best advantage. I repeat, there is not a Member of the Senate—and I am not impugning their desire to be helpful—who would write into the forthcoming tariff bill a provision that if the textile mills shall multiply or if the number of yards produced shall be increased, we are going to lower correspondingly the tariff on that textile industry until the invasion of foreign goods will drive it out of business and make it curtail production.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Under the plan as it is written in the bill the debenture would not apply at all the time, would it?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. DILL. What I would like to get the Senator's view about is whether we would be better to take off the entire debenture when it is taken off, rather than a part of it?

Mr. CARAWAY. The debenture was to be an extra stimulus when the collapse of the industry was complete, as it now is, when the crop is such that, is bringing a fair price, then we do not propose to go into the Public Treasury and hand to somebody whose industry is reasonably prosperous a bonus. But if the conditions are such that the price is unreasonably low, then we have a provision in the bill, if it shall be retained, which will enable the administration to take care of that particular product for that season. It does not go into effect from the time of the passage of the bill. It does not go into effect until the conditions make it necessary. The board must then call it into effect, and then it is in effect only for that one season. If the product shall bring a fair price the next season, the issue of that debenture.

It is only to meet the condition that everybody confesses exists of the collapse of a great industry, a condition which is largely brought about by legislation that helps the industrial sections of the country. They have a tariff. It protects them against foreign goods. It gives to them 110,000,000 of American people to exploit behind a tariff wall that is effective. Everybody knows that the tariff is not effective against agriculture. When we have an expirable surplus, and the surplus fixes the price of the domestic market. Therefore we have devised this scheme in order to give the farmer 50 per cent as much protection as industries get, or less than that, 40 per cent, or one-fourth as much as industries get. Having asked for that, believing that they can recover with that stimulus, we do not want to say, "But if you do it, if you do grow prosperous and do grow more, we are going to take any benefit of the law from you whatever."

That is the thing I am hopeful does not happen. Some way or other I feel there is no justification for it. It seems to me this is not the day and this is not the time to write into law that we are going to penalize people if they are more intelligent, if they try to help themselves along. If they take care of their resources, if they use their abilities and take advantage of modern learning and how to avoid pests, and therefore produce more. We ought not to write into law that we are going to penalize them if they do.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not had an opportunity to examine the bill and study it as the Senator from Arkansas has, who is very familiar with it. Am I to understand the Senator to say that the debenture plan, if put in operation against the crop of a particular product, would be operative under that decree for one year?

Mr. CARAWAY. That is true.

Mr. SIMMONS. And when the next year is opened, the board can apply it again or not as they see fit?

Mr. CARAWAY. Absolutely. It must call it into operation whenever the situation demands it, and if it does not apply it, of course, there is no legal provision that automatically puts it into operation.

Mr. SIMMONS. There is nothing that does automatically provide a remedy by which the overproduction, if it is prospective or in anticipation, can be prevented?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will my colleagues yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to his colleague?

Mr. CARAWAY. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is not, then, the effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to give the board discretion to authorize debentures in a less amount than that provided for in the bill?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; but it is mandatory that they shall have discovered that the production has increased to a certain percentage. They must do it then. They must deny its benefits then.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska provides that whenever it appears that "the probable production of any debenturable agricultural commodity during such crop year will exceed the average annual production of such debenturable agricultural commodity for the preceding five years, it shall," and so forth. So it is mandatory.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; it is mandatory.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But at the same time the board will consider the situation in which that production will exceed the average for the five years is final. There is no review for that.

Mr. CARAWAY. There is no appeal from it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. So the practical effect of the amendment is to give the board jurisdiction to issue debentures in a less amount or percentage than that carried by the bill now. In other words, instead of issuing 21 cents per bushel on wheat, they may, if they find the prospective production justifies it, issue 11 1/2 cents, or a correspondingly less amount if the estimated production sustains it?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; they must reduce it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I would like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if the effect of it would not be to deny the farmer any benefit of the debenture plan or at least to diminish its benefit in the very year when he would need it and under the very circumstances in which he needs it most, namely, when the market is low?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, that is absolutely true. I want to say just this, and then I am through.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment provides, for instance, that if the board shall find that in the preceding five years there has been an increase of 20 per cent or less than 40 per cent, they
shall reduce the debenture rate 20 per cent. Twenty per cent would make a reduction of a little over 4 cents.

Mr. CARAWAY. It would be one-fifth of 21 cents.

Mr. NORGIS. Yes; so that if there was an increased production during the five years up to 30 per cent, the reduction would be less than 5 cents a bushel on wheat, and the same proportion in the case of other commodities.

Mr. CARAWAY. I understand.

Mr. NORGIS. In the Senator must concede that if production increased between 20 and 40 per cent, it would represent a very material increase, while the reduction in the debenture would be only a few cents.

Mr. CARAWAY, Mr. Chairman. I realize that; and I am very hopeful that the Senate does not think it ought to legislate against the industry and intelligence of agriculture.

I wish to say—and then I shall be through—that the greatest effect that the debenture plan will bring to the industry—and therefore it ought to be an argument for keeping it high—will be that if put into effect the farmer will not long be depending upon the debenture for his real benefit under the legislation. The minute the surplus shall be disposed of the farmer will be able to take advantage of the tariff, whatever it may be; and instead of the debenture being in the case of wheat 21 cents, the minute there shall have been taken out of the country one bushel more than the domestic demand the tariff will become effective to the farmer, and he will get 42 cents plus the cost of transporting wheat from some other country to this country. If 44 or 45 cents. It will take the tariff effective because it will carry out of the country the surplus, which always sells at the world's market price.

The minute the debenture shall be put into effect, at once the surplus will leave the country; the minute it is gone the tariff will become effective, and the farmer will be just as much protected as is the industrialist protected by the tariff. He will have 42 cents a bushel plus the cost of transporting wheat to this country as a guaranty under the law; he will always be able to get it because the surplus will immediately leave the country, for the 21 cents a bushel above the world's market will take it out, and the tariff will become effective at once. If the Senator really wants the farmer to have protection, leave the plan as it is, and the farmer will get his protection just as much as the textile manufacturers get theirs or the manufacturer of aluminum gets his.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill, Senate bill No. 1, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be printed and lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 29, 1929

SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Charles A. Page, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, and a vice consul of career, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

George O. Barnes, of Colley, Pa., to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States in place of Frank F. J. Thiel, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James C. Tyler, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal, southern district of Mississippi, vice Frank G. Dyer, appointed by court.

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RADIO COMMISSION


Promotions in the Navy

Chief Boatswain Richard E. Hawes to be an ensign in the Navy from the 15th day of February, 1929, in accordance with a provision of an act of Congress approved that date.

Dental Surgeon John R. Barber to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 28th day of August, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 28, 1929.

Appointment in the Regular Army of the United States

CHAPLAIN

To be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant

First Lieut. Thomas Edward McMahon, Chaplains Reserve, with rank from April 22, 1929.

Appointments, by Transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Lieut. Col. Charles Otto Schmitt, Coast Artillery Corps (detailed in Militia Bureau), with rank from October 2, 1927.

CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

Capt. James Emerson Troupe, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from March 31, 1926.

Appointments in the Regular Army of the United States

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Calvin Pearl Tyson, Infantry, from April 20, 1929.

To be major

Capt. Charles Nash Stevens, Infantry, from April 20, 1929.

To be captains

First Lieut. Glen Teter Strick, Infantry, from April 17, 1929.

First Lieut. John Frederick Quensen, Infantry, from April 20, 1929.

First Lieut. Harvey Irvin Cassedy, Infantry, from April 21, 1929.

First Lieut. Arthur Ray Ladd, Air Corps, from April 23, 1929.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. James Stewart Willis, Signal Corps, from April 18, 1929.

Second Lieut. Frank Jay Thompson, Cavalry, from April 17, 1929.

Second Lieut. Augustine Davis Dungan, Cavalry, from April 20, 1929.

Second Lieut. Clarence Everett Rothgeb, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 21, 1929.

Second Lieut. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., Field Artillery, from April 22, 1929.

To be assistant captains

First Lieut. Lester Maris Dyke, Medical Corps, from April 20, 1929.

To be first lieutenants

First Lieut. Frank Jay Thompson, Cavalry, from April 17, 1929.

Second Lieut. Clarence Everett Rothgeb, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 21, 1929.

To be assistant captains

First Lieut. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., Field Artillery, from April 22, 1929.

To be warrant officers

Capt. Charles Nash Stevens, Infantry, from April 20, 1929.

To be lieutenants

First Lieut. Thomas Edward McMahon, Chaplains Reserve, with rank from April 22, 1929.

Second Lieut. Frank Jay Thompson, Cavalry, from April 17, 1929.

Second Lieut. Augustine Davis Dungan, Cavalry, from April 20, 1929.

Second Lieut. Clarence Everett Rothgeb, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 21, 1929.

Second Lieut. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., Field Artillery, from April 22, 1929.

Medical Corps

To be captain

First Lieut. Lester Maris Dyke, Medical Corps, from April 20, 1929.

To be lieutenants

First Lieut. Frank Jay Thompson, Cavalry, from April 17, 1929.

Second Lieut. Augustine Davis Dungan, Cavalry, from April 20, 1929.

Second Lieut. Clarence Everett Rothgeb, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 21, 1929.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. James Stewart Willis, Signal Corps, from April 18, 1929.

To be lieutenants

First Lieut. John Frederick Quensen, Infantry, from April 20, 1929.

To be captains

First Lieut. Glen Teter Strick, Infantry, from April 17, 1929.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. James Stewart Willis, Signal Corps, from April 18, 1929.

To be lieutenants

First Lieut. Harvey Irvin Cassedy, Infantry, from April 21, 1929.

To be second lieutenants


To be ensigns

First Lieut. Harvey Irvin Cassedy, Infantry, from April 21, 1929.

To be lieutenants

First Lieut. Arthur Ray Ladd, Air Corps, from April 23, 1929.

To be ensigns

First Lieut. Harvey Irvin Cassedy, Infantry, from April 21, 1929.

To be ensigns

First Lieut. Arthur Ray Ladd, Air Corps, from April 23, 1929.
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A Missoula from New York?

Mr. LAUGUARDIA: Yes. Mr. JOHNSTON of Washington. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington objects.

EXTENDING RELIEF TO CERTAIN STORM AREAS

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 59

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama," approved February 25, 1929, and any appropriations made thereunder, are hereby made available to any storm or flood occurring in any such area subsequent to the date of the enactment of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think we should have some explanation of the resolution. As I understood the reading of the resolution, it extends the appropriation for all time.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, on February 25 of this year, during the Seventieth Congress, there was appropriated $8,000,000 for relief of farmers in certain designated areas in the Southeastern States, to wit: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama—because of devastation wrought in those States by hurricanes and floods last year. The department is at this time engaged in the disbursement of that money in said area, with headquarters located at Columbia, S. C. It is intended to complete the disbursement within the next few days. I believe on the 1st of May. Some two or three weeks ago a cyclone occurred in the State of Alabama destroying quite a deal of property, livestock, dwellings, farms, farm implements, and so forth; and on Thursday of last week there occurred in South Carolina a severe storm with considerable damage. It is that over occurred in the history of the State of Georgia. The path of the cyclone extends from west to east through the first five counties with Congressional districts of the State of Georgia: roughly speaking, from Macon to Savannah. The cyclone itself extended over a narrow strip from something like 300 to 500 yards in width. Seventy-old people were killed, houses were destroyed, and considerable livestock was killed: in fact, practically everything in its path for something like 125 miles through that State was destroyed. It cut through one of the finest farming districts in the State. This cyclone was followed by a terrific hailstorm; I understand the hail on the ground through most of the area was 6 inches in depth. People were blown for a distance of 350 yards. In my home county, within about 12 miles of where I live, a lady and child were taken up by the storm and carried 350 yards. The child was killed, but, miraculously as it may seem, the woman was not. Chairs were blown for a distance of 10 miles. Automobiles were blown in the air and even an eagle, which was blown to the ground and was on exhibit in my home city.

What we seek to do under the provisions of this resolution is simply to make available for use the unexpended balance of the $8,000,000 that was appropriated on February 25 of this year for the relief of the other storm areas in the last year so that it will be available for relief in this instance. It is in exactly the same territory, in the same communities, and in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been here for some time and I never knew these reporters to make a mistake. I do not want to vote for anything which would be a reflection upon the official reporters.

Mr. LAUGUARDIA. This is not correcting a mistake. It is a request to expunge a gentleman's name that word expunged from the Record, because future generations will not understand all of the details and the temperance of the House at the time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Washington. Is the gentleman asking unanimous consent?

Mr. LAUGUARDIA. Yes. Mr. JOHNSTON of Washington. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington objects.
Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, and I do not think any Member of the House has any objection to the proposal that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] made, namely, that the phrasing of this resolution would make this a continuing resolution, applying to all catastrophes in different States. Would the gentleman object to incorporating at the end of the resolution the phrase "and prior to the adoption of this resolution"?

Mr. LARSEN. The original act of appropriation only applies to the crop of 1929.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that the gentleman only wants to have the relief apply to present conditions. The phrasing of his resolution as it reads would make it a continuing appropriation. I do not think it is the policy of this House to make a resolution of this kind a continuing appropriation for any and all kinds of catastrophes that may arise.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. As to the objection raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] the original resolution or bill authorizing $8,000,000 provided that it should be for the year 1929. This resolution provides that the $2,000,000 that has not been used shall be made available for the relief of farmers suffering from the recent cyclone.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; the resolution goes further than that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have had opportunity to examine the resolution, which the gentleman from Wisconsin has not had.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I have examined it.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am quite clear that the pending resolution does not provide for the funds of the original appropriation can be made available. It does not extend the time of the expenditure at all, but it does extend it to some of the storms that have already occurred, but which were not contemplated in the original resolution.

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. As drawn, it would not permit expenditures in connection with storms that hereafter occur.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman allow me to read the phraseology of the resolution?

Mr. CRAMTON. In my judgment the language suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin would not alter the effect of the resolution.

Mr. LARSEN. I do not think it would.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me to read the resolution? I think it will bear out my contention.

Mr. LARSEN. I have no objection to the phraseology suggested but I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think it should be a continuing appropriation. The phraseology says "the funds are hereby made available for a storm or storms occurring in any area, subsequent to the date of the enactment of this resolution." That clearly applies to storms that may come hereafter.

Mr. STEAGALL. The language in the original act. The gentleman from Wisconsin fails to catch this point: The original act provides for advances made on growing crops for the crop year of 1929. After the season has passed for planting crops the fund would not be available in any event.

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

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Would not the objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin be met by inserting just before the word "subsequent" the words "hereinafore and"?

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand the gentleman from Georgia does not object to the language proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LARSEN. I do not object.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia, Has Mr. Wool, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, been consulted with reference to this resolution?

Mr. LARSEN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wool] was not in his office, but I talked with his secretary.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, it is important that resolution that should be passed to-day instead of to-morrow.

Mr. LARSEN. Yes. It is a great emergency. Some of our cotton is planted. On last Saturday they wired me for 2,000 bushels of cotton seed from one town in my district. Cotton comes up very quickly, and if they can get the seed in the ground they can get a crop started.

Mr. CRAMTON. In view of what the gentleman states, I am not going to object; but hereafter I shall be obliged to object to legislation which makes an appropriation, as this does, without the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LARSEN. I went to the committee room, but the chairman was not there. May I say to the gentleman that the Department of Agriculture has been consulted with reference to this resolution?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think we should have definite information on as important a matter as that.

Mr. LARSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

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

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. In my own home town of New Albany, Ind., a week ago we had a hailstorm that did $250,000 worth of damage. Some of the hailstones measured a quarter of an inch. Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment, if it would be in accordance with the rules of the House, to the effect that a part of the unexpended appropriation might be used to reimburse those who had suffered loss in that hailstorm?

Mr. LARSEN. I would say to the gentleman that this amount is not sufficient even to meet the situation in South Carolina and Georgia. I think it ought to be increased, but I do not think it would be the part of wisdom to attempt to increase it. I hope that the gentleman will not ask that his suggestion be followed. I sympathize with the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. This does not authorize any personal compensation for losses incurred, but is to relieve the sufferers from this terrible visitation by furnishing them with seeds for planting a crop this year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman familiar with the figures of the percentage of such loans that have been repaid? Does this gentleman from Illinois know what is the percentage of those that have returned as much as 25 per cent?

Mr. WliILLIAMS of Illinois. Eighty per cent has been returned.

Mr. CRAMTON. There has been an improvement, then, since the showing made before our committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the gentleman from Georgia has no objection to incorporating my suggestion.

Mr. LARSEN. No.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment: At the end of the resolution add the words "and prior to the adoption of this resolution."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution strike out the period and insert "and prior to the adoption of this resolution."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEAGALL: At the end of the resolution, after the amendment just adopted, insert "and the additional sum of $3,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment. As I recall, there was a bill passed authorizing the appropriation of the original $8,000,000, and, as I understand, the full amount authorized has now been appropriated, and this is a new amount beyond the original authorization.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the second amendment first.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I want to observe that it is not quite fair to the House to bring up a piece of legislation of importance by unanimous consent after the Member who the House has been induced to grant that unanimous consent with reference to the thing before them then to bring in, when the objection stage has passed, an important new proposition. We should not appropriate $3,000,000 as a new appropriation without consideration by any committee of this House or recommendation from a department.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan state what the point of order is based on?

Mr. CRAMTON. I make the point of order that the original authorization for this purpose has been fully complied with and that there is no authority of law for an additional appropriation. Mr. Speaker, do I understand this authorizes an appropriation?

Mr. LARSEN. No; this simply makes available the appropriation already made.
Mr. CRAMTON. The Steagall amendment, I am now advised, is an authorization. If that is the situation, I make the point that it is not germane.

The Speaker. Does the gentleman from Alabama desire to address himself to the point of order?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask permission to withdraw the amendment and offer the second amendment. I intended that to be read first.

The Speaker. The Clerk reported the second amendment, as the Chair understands, which does carry an authorization. However, without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution add "and an additional sum of $5,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that is not germane.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Alabama will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the appropriating amendment, and ask the Clerk to read the other amendment. The amendments were drawn in a rush, when I did not have the main resolution before me, and I did not separate my amendment from what I have done.

Mr. CRAMTON. That indicates the danger of legislating in this way, when the gentleman himself is not sure that his language is what he would like to have.

Mr. STEAGALL. If the gentleman will permit, I will have read the amendment which I desire to have considered.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have strained my judgment in withholding an objection to the original resolution, which I felt should have been withdrawn by the gentleman of the Appropriations Committee before it was brought before the House; but being advised there was an emergency and being in sympathy with it, I made no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will withdraw the amendment to which the gentleman objects and now offer another amendment.

The Speaker. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution insert the following proviso: "Provided further, That sums under this resolution may be made for the purchase of work stock."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve a point of order if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] does not.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was not sure all the amendment had been read. If the Clerk has concluded the reading of the amendment, I make the point of order, first, that it is not germane, and, second, that it is in effect an appropriation for a purpose not authorized by existing law.

The Speaker. The Chair thinks this amendment clearly is not germane to the resolution before the House and sustains the point of order.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to indulge me for a moment. I am heartily in favor of the passage of the resolution. I have prepared a resolution, which was sent to the Committee on Agriculture for their consideration, providing amendments to the original resolution passed during the last session of Congress and providing for an increase of the appropriation made under that resolution of $2,000,000.

In the resolution which I introduced at this session I sought to liberalize the former resolution and, among other things, to provide for loans to farmers to purchase work stock with which to cultivate their crops, which would take care of one of the worst difficulties that our people are confronted with in the sections where we have had these severe floods and storms; and it was my thought to undertake to amend this resolution by making provision for the purchase of work stock. I simply want to make this explanation to the House. It was not my desire to take advantage of the liberality of the House in considering this amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I say this in view of what the gentleman from Michigan has said.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman from Alabama to understand that my objection is not at this time based upon the question of the original amendment of this gentleman. It does not necessarily indicate what my personal action would be if legislation comes in a proper way from the Committee on Agriculture, but I do not feel that I should sit here and let two or three million dollars be appropriated without consideration by any committee of Congress. It is a matter of procedure at this time rather than of the merits.

Mr. STEAGALL. I introduced the resolution contemplating that it would take the very course the gentleman has suggested, and my resolution is now before the Committee on Agriculture, and it is hoped will be reported at the earliest moment as soon as the committee has opportunity to consider it in the usual way. The committee has been busy with the farm relief work. When this resolution was brought up this morning I thought possibly we might make short work of it, and that is why I offered the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Speaker. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 1, in line 8, after the word "area," insert "and in the State of Mississippi."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that would constitute an appropriation not authorized by law and also that it is not germane. There is no law now authorizing such appropriation for the State of Mississippi, and the amendment in question would permit an appropriation for use in the State of Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this merely extends the relief to the flood-stricken and storm-stricken areas of the State of Mississippi and does not increase the appropriation. It does not authorize the conversion of this amendment into an appropriation for the use of the flood and storm-stricken areas of a State not covered by the original resolution, and I think it is germane.

The Speaker. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that this is not an appropriation, but it is an extension of a former appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Speaker will permit, I would have no objection to the amendment in question. I sought the particular amendment to be an appropriation, and I think it is not. I simply found it necessary to do that in order to make the application different from that of the original, and that is why I offered the amendment.

The Speaker. The Chair will hold with the gentleman if the Chair believed this to be an appropriation, but it occurs to the Chair to suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that it is not an appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. And further, if I may suggest to the Speaker, while I believe it is an appropriation, let me make the point of order that the question of germaneness.

The resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia has nothing to do with the question as to what States shall be made a relief. It has nothing to do with the location of the relief. It only has to do with the question of what storms shall be considered. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, in the language which he used, that shall be available for those same States for a different use than originally intended, in the respect that it shall apply to different storms.

Now, whatever may have been the situation with reference to the original amendment, no point of order was made. Now, an amendment is offered that proposes that $2,000,000 now in the Treasury may hereafter be expended in the State of Mississippi, because it will be in the discretion of the department to spend all or any part of the $2,000,000 in Mississippi, and any part that is spent in that way is to that extent an appropriation. While it is a reappropriation, while the language is different, it is in effect an appropriation of money to relieve distress in Mississippi, but this makes it available for that purpose and is in effect an appropriation.

The Speaker. The Chair thinks the gentleman would be right if this were an appropriation, but it occurs to the Chair to suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that it is not an appropriation.
The SPEAKER. The resolution is as follows:

The provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama," approved February 25, 1929, and any appropriation made thereunder, are hereby made available being rains or flood occurring in any such area subsequent to the date of the enactment of this resolution.
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The present gathering meets in a sense to pay a tribute to order, as I see it, a human order, the product of centuries of civilization as expressed in the thoughts of men and the works of their hands. It is not the order of nature so far as one can see. That we may realize by taking a glance at the cosmos under the influence of man, like Jeans, Eddington, or our own Millikan. We encounter nebulae, galactic clusters, solar systems, myriad masses of suns, and so-called cosmic dust, into the infinite. But spirals, whirls, everywhere! No talking of discipline and order as recognized by the cultivated intelligence of the human being.

One returns with a sense of relief to considerations of order as related to the human mind, expressed in its architectural works, and with joy if we can see the beauty of this order and its rhythm. It is an order more nearly related to that natural to the smaller expressions of the creation as evidenced by the structures of crystals, plant life, and animal life, the compositions which all relate to a simple plan in which a consistent plan and sequence is evident. But in the case of great precedent has been established—a conscious idea of order, as I see it, a human order. The beauty of a city planned on formal lines—formal, or perhaps more accurately the planning which results in a coherent idea of city planning existing in Europe and very distinctly in the early days of the United States.

The mind of the great Washington saw the necessity of planning ahead of the actual needs and he must have seen the possible beauty of a city planned on formal lines—formal, or perhaps more correctly, regular lines. It was essentially a formal age. No doubt life itself was as well as in a day, but it seemed more disciplined and in its social contacts, ordered. Hence the ordered and rhythmic expression of the architecture of the day, and hence, added to the great new outlook in life on a vast continent, the potentiality of which has been demonstrated, if not completely realized, to lay foundations in an orderly and comprehensive manner. Hence the Washington of the past.

The present district is the result of an effort on the part of the United States to acknowledge its good fortune in having the work done. As one proceeds down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Capitol, on the south side will be a succession of beautiful and harmonious buildings, all of design in keeping with the semicentennial tradition as well established in Washington.

The north side vistas will be opened up, so that groups of buildings, such as the beautiful District of Columbia courthouse, on John Marshall Place, shall be brought into the general plan of Pennsylvania Avenue. At the same time the Mall will present the spectacle of a great park boarded on one side by the new building lined with beautiful buildings, a wide pathway of greenwood with its four rows of trees, its drives and walks, statues, and reflecting pools, all arranged in such a way that long vistas will be opened up on the Capitol in one direction and of the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial in the other.

To realize the force of this axial arrangement one must see it after dusk. Sounds of the activities of the city are heard in the distance, but the Mall, with its three great structures—the Capitol, the Monument, and the Lincoln Memorial, aglow and reflected in the pools,—is silent and conveys a sense of strength; the strength and confidence of a nation.
new location on which to erect buildings to properly accommodate the functions of the city government.

A. Marshall courts and the recorder of deeds building on the northwest square, bounded by John Marshall Street, Third Street, Sixth Street, and Pennsylvania Avenue. As a conservative estimate the land is worth $20 per square foot, giving a total value for the land of approximately $1,350,000.

The cost of the present building, when built in 1908, was $1,970,000. In the meantime building costs have more than doubled. If built to-day, the estimated value is about $4,000,000, giving a total value for land and building of $5,300,000. Approximately this sum should be credited to the municipal center by the Federal Government.

The proposed site for the new municipal center faces on the south Pennsylvania Avenue from Third to Sixth Street; on the west Sixth Street; on the north Louisiana Avenue, D Street, and Indiana Avenue; on the east Third Street. This comprises four squares, two on either side of Pennsylvania Avenue, which forms the north and south sides of the group. The difference in level between Pennsylvania Avenue and D Street, directly in front of the District Supreme Court Building, is 33 feet. Approximately midway between those two levels will be placed a group of buildings, with 500 feet between. The approach to the court from Pennsylvania Avenue will be by a series of steps. Other flights of steps will be placed at the north end from the court level to D Street. The court will be surrounded with an arcade giving direct access to the various parts of the building, offering shelter in inclement weather, and a shady passageway during the hot summer months. The court will be treated as a great garden with trees and flowers and a large one in the center.

The centralization of the various functions of the city government in one group of buildings tends toward a lower cost of construction than would be possible with the erection of separate buildings at different locations.

The present District Building is one of the most charming and beautiful relics of early architecture of that building.

The court will be surrounded with an arcade giving direct access to the various parts of the building, offering shelter in inclement weather, and a shady passageway during the hot summer months. The court will be treated as a great garden with trees and flowers and a large one in the center.

The District Supreme Court Building, located at the head of John Marshall Place, is one of the most charming and beautiful relics of early Washington. It was designed in 1820 by George Hadfield, an English architect, for use as a city hall. Hadfield came to this country in 1795 to assist Doctor Thornton, who was at that time in charge of the building.

The cornerstone of this building was laid August 22, 1820, and it is interesting to note the following from the mayor's proclamation on this occasion:

"An edifice devoted to municipal purposes, to be the seat of legislation and of the administration of justice for this metropolis when it will have reached its destined population and be * * * erected on a scale worthy of the uses for which it is intended. Also to be considerate the durability of such an edifice to all of the existing, not one of whom will ever witness the recurrence of such an event as the laying of the foundation of this fabric. On behalf of the commissioners appointed to erect this hall I therefore invite you to witness a ceremony so rare in the annals of mankind that it will be an era in our history, and withal so interesting to all who take an interest in the welfare of the city founded by the departed Washington."

The truth of this prophecy has been borne out, and it is most fitting that this important municipal center be the seat of the Supreme Court Building as its central motif. We thus return to the early city hall to develop our plans for a splendid civic center for the future.

The estimated cost of acquiring the four squares in this site is six and one-half million dollars. It is proposed to purchase all of the site at the earliest possible date and to proceed with the erection of a building on the northwest square, bounded by John Marshall Place, C Street, Sixth Street, and Louisiana Avenue, to accommodate the three courts and the recorder of deeds.

What are the advantages of the site selected and the establishment thereon of a group of municipal buildings which will provide accommodation for all of the city's departments?

In my opinion they are as follows:

FIRST. LOW COST OF LAND

The site is located in what is now one of the least-desirable sections of the city, and can be bought at a very reasonable price. There are very few expensive buildings to purchase.

SECOND. CONVENIENCE OF LOCATION

The city departments would be conveniently located with reference to the various government offices and the Capitol, so that business could be carried on with the maximum of efficiency and ease.

THIRD. ECONOMY OF BUILDING COSTS

The centralization of the various functions of the District government in one group of buildings tends toward a lower cost of construction than would be possible with the erection of separate buildings at different locations.

FOURTH. ECONOMY OF ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION

Administration and control would be more direct and efficient in a closely knit organization than in different buildings widely separated. Likewise the operation and maintenance would be less costly and more efficient.

FIFTH. EXPRESS Importance OF CITY GOVERNMENT

In a group of important buildings the civic life of the city would be exemplified and the city government, as distinguished from the Federal Government, would find adequate and proper expression.

SIXTH. A LOGICAL LOCATION IN HARMONY WITH THE FEDERAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

This location will serve as a dignified and harmonious link between the Federal buildings south of Pennsylvania Avenue, Judiciary Square to the north, and the Capitol Plaza development to the east. It will also be a big step in the development of the proper treatment of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue.

A bill authorizing the development of these four squares as a municipal center was drafted by the District Commissioners and submitted to the Budget Bureau during the last session of Congress. When transmitted to Congress by the Budget Bureau the bill was changed to cover only two squares. Through the able support of Mr. Underhill and Mr. Simmons in the House of Representatives and of Mr. Smoot in the Senate, the amendment was made to authorize the purchase of the full four squares.

Requests for appropriations to purchase the land will be made in our next appropriation act, and it is expected that this splendid group of buildings will begin to take definite form by the erection of the courts building in the near future.

In conclusion, the municipal center will form a vital part in the Federal development of Pennsylvania Avenue and the identification of Washington. The city will do its part to carry on the great work begun by Washington, Jefferson, and L'Enfant to establish on the Potomac the most beautiful and impressive Capitol in the world.

ADdresses BY HON. LOUIS C. CRAMP, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The development of the National Capitol, to which the Federal Government is now definitely committed, along lines so comprehensive and far-reaching, so in harmony with the plans of Washington and L'Enfant, will forever be the most beautiful, the most populous city in the world.

So great an advance in so important a national program deserves to be known and understood of the Nation.

Major L'Enfant, to plan with Jefferson and him its development. Now the tomb of L'Enfant, on the brow of Arlington, overlooks all this marvelous fruition of his planning, while his name is imperishable as long as America stands. So wisely did they plan, that through all our history the development of this Capitol, now grown from a vision to a city of more than half a million people, is tested by the L'Enfant plan, our great successes in harmony with it, our tragedies of failure when we have departed from it in design or location.

L'Enfant planned the rectilinear arrangement of streets, with diagonal avenues radiating from Capitol and White House, and with circles radiating from intersections of important streets. He contributed so much to the beauty of the city, these avenues and circles are of the greatest present-day importance in the handling of a traffic far heavier and for more spotty than any of the horse age could have dreamed of.
That which man made man may replace and when he will. But the beauties of nature man can not restore when once destroyed. Those ravines which Washington never saw, or saw but dimly, are being levelled; those splendid palisades of the Potomac are daily scenes of blasting that rob them of primeval beauty. What was not done years ago may be done now, and the Capital City. And while they could not dream our progress, Washington and L'Enfant planned for the expenditure of this money. And it is sometimes suggested that the Federal Government lacks in generosity in expenditures for the improvement of the Capital City.

**VISUALIZE THE PENDING CHANGES**

We are on the threshold of glorious things, we are in the midst of their accomplishment. The realization of them should, indeed, stimulate our pride of country, stimulate and elevate our thought. Let us visualize the physical change in the city. South of the Capitol a new unit of the Capital City is taking shape. A new Supreme Court building will rise, adjacent to the Congressional Library, To the north the Capitol Grounds will extend to the Columbian Memorial and the Union Station. A classroom will extend from the Pennsylvania Avenue to B Street N.W. and along B Street to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and to on Arlington or to Mount Vernon. This building and the new municipal center to be erected by the District government will clear away from the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to Sixth Street the cheap lodging houses, the questionable resorts, the Chineseemporiums and the tattooing places which now give that conspicuous area a character of its own, better to be remembered than the Federal City.

The Union Square and the Mall come into their own; the Grant Memorial may be better appreciated; the Botanical Garden is removed and will blossom more gloriously elsewhere; the World War temporary buildings have been removed; the old Federal buildings, the Agricultural Building steps back to the proper alignment and becomes an architectural asset instead of a liability. For the north boundary of the Mall the L’Enfant vision of stately public buildings properly placed to surround the Grant statue must be the use of the useful and the tolerated in commercial architecture which now reduce this heart center of the Capital to the level of hundreds of other cities properly unng. From the White House to the Capitol, the south side of historic Pennsylvania Avenue, where has traveled these many years great democracy’s chosen leaders and loved heroes, will be the imposing Federal buildings of the triangle program, not competing with each other and swearing at each other in varying forms of architecture, but each one contributing to a beautiful whole that will add something to the national architecture. As L’Enfant and Washington would have it, the Capital City will then present to the world a clean face with beautiful features, and gone will be all the marks of tattooing, the stains of chop suey, and the plague of room-rent signs.

**PRESERVATION OF NATURE’S CHARMS MUST ACCOMPANY MAN’S IMPROVEMENTS**

There are thousands of our citizens, remote from the Capital, hoping not at all that they may ever see its beauties in the real but oohing in their hearts the same desire that President Coolidge expressed in his last annual message to Congress when he said: “If our country wishes to compete with others, let it not be in the support of armaments but in the making of a beautiful Capital City. Let it express the soul of America.”

They want it to be the most beautiful city, combining in perfection the man-made wonders with the natural charms which came from the earth. They want Washington to be the imposing Federal City, and not just a man-made city, for as such it rises not to its highest level.

Washington located the new Capital in the midst of lavish display of beauties of God’s handiwork. At the head of navigation of the great Potomac, the midst of verdant hills, its many valleys carrying creeks that enliven the landscape. While we make a reality of the dreams of L’Enfant in carrying forward man-made beauties, we must not permit the beautiful scenic realities of Washington’s time to become only mourned memories. Washington must have loved the Potomac as it flowed past his home and his great estate, must have been thrilled by Great Falls, where he went so often, must have loved the hills and streams surrounding the site he chose for his country’s Capital, or he would not have chosen. Just as he inspired the L’Enfant plan of development we now promote, he would have preserved those beauties.

We are proceeding now so rapidly and so wisely with our architectural development, but delay in this has not been fatal. What was not done yesterday may be done as rapidly as possible if the error of 50 years ago may now be corrected. I like to cherish the hope that even the highly individualistic State, War, and Navy Departments will yet come out of their architecture a beauty of exterior that will harmonize with the beauty of its neighbors.

That which man made man may replace and when he will. But the beauties of nature man can not restore when once destroyed. Those ravines which Washington never saw, or saw but dimly, are being levelled; those splendid palisades of the Potomac are daily scenes of blasting that rob them of primeval beauty. The preservation of all this has had much thought by our leaders, head of the Mayor, the subject of the Government, but the disappointment in realizing the beauty is passing and can not be restored.
DISASTROUS DELAY IN PARK AND PLAZA PLANS

Through the legislation of 1924 and 1926 the National Capital Park and Planning Commission came into being with remarkably able personnel, led by high ideals and backed by high authority. Two years ago they completed a plan of lands in the District and its environs which should be purchased for park, parkway, and playground purposes of the National Capital. This program being estimated then to cost $15,700,000 for the purpose of creating the commission the cost of such purchases is to be borne as other expenses of the District, the Federal Government contributing a lump sum or a percentage, as the case may be. As $6,500,000 of the amount named is for playgrounds, and the other areas are of great traffic use or recreational use to the people of the District, and as the Federal Government has under way the expenditure of over $265,000,000, that act of Congress is not an obstacle as put up as to make the Federal Government meet the District's request under that authority only $900,000 to $1,000,000 has been spent annually for such purchases. Those lands are increasing in value at least 10 per cent per year. Will some Einstein tell us, if the Planning Commission program goes up in cost $1,500,000 a year and they can only spend $1,000,000, as will be the case next year, how long will it take to buy the lands they want? And in the meantime the ax, the steam shovel, the dynamite are destroying much of what Washington would have preserved and no one can restore.

In the report of the Senate District Committee on the bill to create the commission that committee declared a very urgent need to be the establishment of the "Fort Boulevard following the hills encircling the city and connecting the Civil War forts," the right-of-way for which is still well preserved. The development of the city makes this now difficult. If action is not soon taken, it will be impossible. Encroachments on the scene of the Rock Creek and Potomac Park in Maryland and the very existence of that stream, the golden thread that binds together the beauty of our greatest park. The valleys tributary of Rock Creek, the Anacostia, the Potomac, the very Fallsades, are in process of destruction or in process of being destroyed.

LEGISLATION PENDING WOULD HAVE SCENIC CHAOS

With gratifying unanimity the people of the District, as well as of the Nation, are indorsing legislation now pending which proposes to relieve the District from share in such purchases outside the District and to advance from the Federal Treasury for such purchases money without interest sufficient for the prompt purchase of all the needed lands. Passage of this legislation will insure proper playground development in the District for our children, instead of waiting for their grandchildren, will see $30,000,000, will preserve the scenic beauties of this area and its environs. It will give us the George Washington memorial parkway, controlling both banks of the Potomac from Mount Vernon to Great Falls. That legislation is the next step needed in congressional authorization, and it is not to be doubted it soon will follow.

Land taken for public use under a wise policy of park and playground expansion does not injuriously affect the assessment rolls by its removal without interest sufficient for the prompt purchase of all the needed lands. Passage of this legislation will insure proper playground development in the District for our children, instead of waiting for their grandchildren, will see $30,000,000, will preserve the scenic beauties of this area and its environs. It will give us the George Washington memorial parkway, controlling both banks of the Potomac from Mount Vernon to Great Falls. That legislation is the next step needed in congressional authorization, and it is not to be doubted it soon will follow.

It is fine that as the Nation has grown stronger in numbers, in territory, in prestige; in influence, we still draw our inspiration from the founders. It is eloquent tribute to their kindred wisdom and common Americanism that Coolidge, Hoover, and Mellon carry on in the realization of the dreams and plans of Washington, Jefferson, and L’Enfant—that we prepare for a more glorious future through faithfulness to the ideals of the fathers.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman from Louisiana to object to the entire request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. O’CONNOR of Louisiana. Oh, no; only to the consideration of the oleomargarine bill.

Mr. PURNELL. I hope the gentleman will not object; otherwise it will be necessary for the committee to go to the Rules Committee and get a rule. These are necessary matters for Thursday, I understand.

Mr. JONES. Why does the gentleman eliminate that bill and ask unanimous consent as to the others?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O’CONNOR] can not stop, in the way he has undertaken, the consideration of the bill to which he objects. Wednesday will be Calendar Wednesday under the rules of the House. There is no other committee that has any business reported on and on the calendar. The call will run through the committees organized until the Committee on Agriculture is reached, and then the committee will have the same right that it would have under any other circumstances on Calendar Wednesday.

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

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I distinctly understood that when this Congress was convened in extraordinary session it was for the purpose of passing the farm relief bill and the tariff bill. Is it now proposed to bring in every measure that comes from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. TILSON. I suppose that anything in the way of farm relief would be in order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not consider that farm relief.

Mr. CLAIREK of New York. It is all a part of the program for farm relief.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of what the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has said, may I suggest the principal effect of the gentleman from Louisiana is that on Wednesday the list of committees will be called until the Committee on Agriculture is reached, and that would mean that all of the committees on the list preceding the Committee on Agriculture would have lost their day and they might not be reached in the regular course of business.

Mr. O’CONNOR of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for what is perfectly obvious. Let them approach the matter in the regular parliamentary manner.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes, and the effect of the request of the gentleman from Connecticut is to postpone Calendar Wednesday business, to do away with it, to put over special orders for that day, and postpone Calendar Wednesday business to Thursday and Friday?

Mr. TILSON. The special orders would occupy only a short time on Calendar Wednesday, and my request is that the remainder of the day on Wednesday and, in addition, Thursday afternoon might be devoted to the consideration of bills from the Committee on Agriculture, simply using, instead of a special rule, the Calendar Wednesday rule governing general debate.

Mr. WINGO. And the special orders to which the gentleman referred are for to-morrow?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; two speeches.

Mr. WINGO. And the idea is to adjourn to-day until Wednesday?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Could not the gentleman submit a unanimous-consent request now for to-morrow, for some of these bills, other than the oleomargarine bill, so that we would know what is going to come up on Thursday and Friday?

Mr. TILSON. The Committee on Agriculture undoubtedly on Wednesday would call up the bill to which the gentleman from Louisiana objects.

Mr. WINGO. Why not submit a unanimous-consent request that Calendar Wednesday business may continue over from Wednesday and to Thursday and Friday if necessary?

Mr. TILSON. My object is to obviate the calling of the committees on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. WINGO. They would come up then so that we would know to-day what will be considered on Thursday and Friday. Some gentlemen may want to go away, but if they know that something of importance is coming up they will stay here.

Mr. O’CONNOR of Louisiana. I am simply objecting to those gentlemen who said on Wednesday comes along the Agricultural Committee to the floor, that it will be reached, and they will call up the bill to which the gentleman from Louisiana objects.

Mr. WINGO. The net effect of the gentleman’s objection is that when Wednesday comes along the Agricultural Committee will be reached, and they will call up the bill to which the gentleman objects, and then a unanimous-consent request will be made, as I understand it, before we adjourn on that day to go on with Calendar Wednesday business on Thursday and Friday.

Mr. O’CONNOR of Louisiana. That will not be done without unanimous consent.

Mr. WINGO. Why not settle it now?

Mr. O’CONNOR of Louisiana. We are settling it now. I object.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman may think that he is settling it now, but I suggest to him that he is not getting what he thinks he is. Under the rules of this House, if Wednesday on Wednesday can call up the bill, notwithstanding objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What other bills does the Committee on Agriculture consider to be important?

Mr. WINGO. I do not know. I was about to try to find out.

Mr. JONES of Texas. There are two or three bills reported.
Mr. PURNELL. One of the bills we passed at the last session and the others are on the calendar—the warehouse bill, the oleomargarine bill, and the Foreign Credit bill.

Mr. WINGO. And is the Foreign Service bill a farm relief bill also?

Mr. PURNELL. Yes, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PURNELL) seriously regards these bills as a farm relief bill. I say to the gentleman who is objecting to the consideration of the oleomargarine bill that I know of no bill that we will pass at this session of Congress which could more properly be labeled a farm relief measure than the one that I have in mind. It is going to have on cotton and wheat prices this fall. Is the Committee on Agriculture going to take that up and handle the stock-market controversy also?

Mr. PURNELL. We have not undertaken to regulate the stock market yet.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You legalized that in the farm relief bill which was passed the other day.

Mr. WINGO. They will not organize our committee and tell us that we cannot even ask questions about the matter. I am not permitted to divulge to the House the confidential information that I received. All of the information that I get is not taken that up.

Mr. PURNELL. At the last session of Congress which could more properly be labeled a farm relief bill, did you hear me, Mr. Speaker? I say to the gentleman that the committee is not precluded by the rules from taking up any bill on that subject.

Mr. PURNELL. I wish to say to the gentleman that the committee is not precluded by the rules from taking up any bill on that subject.

Mr. PURNELL. I will offer my bill as a whole in order not to take anybody by surprise.

Mr. ALMON. Does not the gentleman consider the Madden Muscle Shocks bill a real relief bill? [Applause.] May I ask if the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. TILSON) will arrange to have the Committee on Military Affairs organized so as to report that bill? You are talking about adjourning here from day to day. The newspapers say we will adjourn for 30 days. Last session we did not consider Muscle Shocks for lack of time. Will the leaders this session take steps to organize the Committee on Military Affairs, and the others, and make the report that bill, so that it may be considered by the House?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut that the House, when it adjourns today, adjourn to meet on Wednesday?

There was no objection.

REPORTS ON AGRICULTURAL BILLS

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until 11 o'clock to-morrow in which to file reports on the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 6) to amend the definition of oleomargarine contained in the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon, and regulating the manufacture, adulteration, or misbranding of butter, oleomargarine, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended;

A bill (H. R. 7) to amend sections 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 29, 29, and 30 of the United States warehouse act, approved August 11, 1916, as amended;

A bill (H. R. 730) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906, as amended; and

A bill (H. R. 2152) to promote the agriculture of the United States by expanding in the foreign field the service now rendered by the United States Department of Agriculture in acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until 11 o'clock to-morrow to file reports on the bills he has just mentioned. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan desires to propound a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KETCHAM. On Wednesday, when Calendar Wednesday business will be called, will a call of the committees be in order, and will the call include any committees excepting those which have been duly organized?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that only those committees which have been organized would be called.

Mr. KETCHAM. I raise that point in order to meet the challenge that committees would lose their day if only those committees which have been duly organized would be called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that would apply only to the committees that have been organized. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairmen if it is his purpose to call these bills up in the order in which he has presented them?

Mr. HAUGEN. I reported them here as they were reported by the committee.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is it the chairman's purpose to call them up in that order?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will call them up in the regular order.
Mr. JONES of Texas. Is it the chairman's purpose to call them up in the order in which he has stated them when the committee was called on Wednesday?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Iowa commits himself too far he should remember that there is an objection pending to the consideration of one of those bills, and, that Wednesday will probably be the only day that the gentleman will have the right to call up this bill unless he gets a special rule from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is the reason I am asking the question. I want to know if he is going to follow the committee's report.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I would call up that bill which I believe the gentleman on committee is called on Wednesday?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is it the chairman's purpose to shunt aside a bill about which there is no controversy and call up a controversial bill in preference?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is the chairman's purpose to expedite the passage of the most meritorious bills, of course.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then, Mr. Speaker, if it is the chairman's purpose to exercise his own prerogative, I shall be inclined to object.

Mr. HAUGEN. There was no order made, as the gentleman is called on Wednesday?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is it the chairman's purpose to call them up in the order in which he has stated them when the committee reported them out.

Mr. HAUGEN. No order was made, but it is the duty of the chairman to protect the committee.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then, Mr. Speaker, if it is the chairman's purpose to exercise his own prerogative, I shall be inclined to object.

Mr. HAUGEN. There was no order made, as the gentleman is well aware.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I object, and I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CHAMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be sure that the request of the gentleman from Iowa applies to the bills that have already been acted on by the committee and that it does not apply to other bills which may hereafter be acted on.

Mr. HAUGEN. The bills reported this morning are bills that have been reported by the committee a number of times, and most of them have been passed by the House.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CAREL (at the request of Mr. ARENT) on account of important business.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on April 26, 1929, present to the present request for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1412. An act making appropriations for certain expenses of the legislative branch incident to the first session of the Seventy-first Congress.

AJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, May 4, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. COLTON: Joint Congressional Committee to Investigate Northern Pacific Railroad land grants, H. R. 2151. A bill to altered and amend an act entitled "An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Lake Superior to Puget Sound, on the Pacific coast, by the northern route," approved July 2, 1894, and to alter and amend a joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. to issue its bonds for the construction of its road and to secure the same by mortgage, and for other purposes," approved May 31, 1870; to declare forfeited to the United States certain claims against the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. or the Northern Pacific Railway Co.; to direct the institution and prosecution of proceedings looking to the adjustment of the grant, and for other purposes; and to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 2162) granting privileges of the floor and rights to participate in debate to heads of executive departments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 2160) to provide for producers and others the benefits of official tests to determine protein in wheat for use in merchandising the same to the best advantage, and for acquiring and disseminating information relative to protein in wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) requesting the President to propose the calling of an international conference to consider and amend the armistice signed on the calendar, or to accept on behalf of the United States an invita-
tion to participate in such a conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61) to amend the appropriation "Organizing the Naval Reserve, 1930"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CABLE: Resolution (H. Res. 33) to investigate propaganda to influence immigration legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2185) authorizing the Secretary of War to award a congressional medal of honor to Henry M. Brinkerhoff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) for the relief of Elton J. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) for the relief of the heirs of John Buck; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) granting an increase of pension to Madison M. Burnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Horace Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) for the relief of Richard T. Butler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) to correct the military record of Allen Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) for the relief of William M. Cavanaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting a pension to Henry Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) for the relief of Rebecca Phillips Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) to authorize the appointment of Capt. M. M. Cloud, retired, to the grade of colonel, retired, with the pay of a major, in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) granting a pension to Caroline R. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) granting a pension to Laura Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) granting a pension to M. P. Cranston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) to authorize the military record of Frank N. Curtis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) for the relief of Bernhard Henry Dahlke; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) granting a pension to Bernard N. Daugherty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of Bogusia De Kartowski; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) for the relief of Edward Dietrich; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) granting an increase of pension to Bridget E. Donovan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) granting a pension to William Dunn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) for the relief of Peter Dunsmore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of Squire Estes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) granting a pension to Viola Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) granting a pension to Arland E. Fine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) for the relief of Fireman's Fund Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of David Fleming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Flood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of Otto C. Fredericks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) granting an increase of pension to Alice French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) for the relief of Leslie E. George; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) granting a pension to William Gilpin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) for the relief of Laurin Goseney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Joseph Gottlieb; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) granting a pension to Laura Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. G. G. Grout; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) for the relief of John H. Grout; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.
Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Guest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) granting an increase of pension to Bessie Hagar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) for the relief of Hilbirt R. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) granting a pension to Ralph J. Hardy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) for the relief of Joseph M. Hayden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) granting a pension to Caroline Healey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of Elizabeth Seymour Hodgson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) granting an increase of pension to Sarah P. Huff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) granting a pension to Mary Hutchins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) to authorize the appointment of Q. M. Sergt. John Imhof, second grade, retired, United States Army, to quartermaster sergeant, first pay grade, retired, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) granting an increase of pension to Julia Del. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) for the relief of Arthur Jacobs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) for the relief of Bendix Peter Jensen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) for the correction of the military record of Frank Johnston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) for the relief of Charles G. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) granting a pension to Robert A. Johnstone; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) for the relief of Jacob Kaufman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) for the relief of Samuel Kaufman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Keen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) granting a pension to Frank A. Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) for the benefit of Harry J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) granting a pension to Annie B. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) for the relief of Raymond Kleinberger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) granting a pension to Emanuel Kline; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) granting a pension to Amanda B. Koontz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) granting a pension to Fred J. C. Kronfeld; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) granting a pension to John Love; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) for the relief of Versey A. Leadbetter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) for the relief of Eliah W. Leonard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) for the relief of Irving Levine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) granting a pension to Elias M. Littleten; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting a pension to John Lorenson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) for the relief of Joseph W. Macnamara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) granting a pension to Marie L. Mailroy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) granting a pension to Amelia B. Manley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) for the relief of George A. McNam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) granting a pension to Dallas R. McClintock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) granting an increase of pension to May E. McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) for the relief of Joseph McDowell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) granting a pension to George A. McMillan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) granting an increase of pension to May E. McCoy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting an increase of pension to Sterrett E. McNulty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting a pension to Thomas M. Mclaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) for the relief of Michael J. McNulty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) for the relief of Thomas P. Meigh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) granting an increase of pension to Emily C. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) granting a pension to Frank A. McMillan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting an increase of pension to James W. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) granting a pension to Rosanna Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) granting a pension to Ida M. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) for the relief of Arthur D. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) granting an increase of pension to Nannette H. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) granting a pension to John W. Mosher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) for the relief of Edwina R. Murdock; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) granting a pension to W. E. Nolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting a pension to Stella Mae Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Norris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) for the relief of James E. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) granting a pension to Sarah A. Patterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) granting to Edward Everett Sharrard a pension for service in the War of 1812; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting a pension to Don C. Prather; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting a pension to Warren L. Raynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting a pension to Thomas Regan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting a pension to Bary Bradford Richardson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) granting a pension to Ida M. Schreiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) granting a pension to Mary E. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) granting an increase of pension to Frederic R. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) granting an increase of pension to Jesse S. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) granting a pension to Frank A. Meckie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) for the relief of Frederick Rupp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) for the relief of Ida M. Schreiner; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) granting a pension to Laura A. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) for the relief of Robert Clyde Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) granting an increase of pension to Katherine L. Severance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) for the relief of Walter E. Shaw; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) granting a pension to Margaret Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) granting a pension to James J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) granting a pension to W. J. Shirley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Shumway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) granting a pension to Clyde Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2308) granting a pension to William Edward Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.
By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 2243) granting an increase of pension to Anna Kistler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) granting a pension to Joseph Vanderpool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 2250) granting an increase of pension to Hugo Klutke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) granting a pension to Francis E. Gehrke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: A bill (H. R. 2253) granting a pension to Emma Blackmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2254) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) granting a pension to Rebecca Tackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 2256) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) granting a pension to Missouri Bach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting a pension to Sarah J. Philips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

255. Petition of the Federal Bar Association, urging the Congress of the United States for the passage of Senate bills 1759 and 1748 during the 70th Congress now convened; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

256. Petition of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, opposing any tariff upon manufactured lumber products or logs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

257. By Mr. BAIRD: Memorial of Harry C. Smithers, secretary Maumee Valley Holstein Breeders Club, requesting increased duties on dairy products and other effective legislation that will better farming conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

258. By Mr. BOHN: Petition regarding national-origins clause of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

259. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of DeWitt Peckton Co., in support of increased duty on pecans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

260. Also, petition of National United Committee for Law Enforcement, 708-714 Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

261. Also, petition of Eloy D. Trujillo, department adjutant, American Legion, Department of New Mexico, in protest to the proposed moving of the United States Veterans' Bureau hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

262. Also, petition of Bartlett Collins Co., Sapulpa, Okla., protesting against any advance in tariff on agricultural products, especially sugar, imported from Cuba to the United States, and any group of a letter from the Bryan, Tex., and Stephan Ice & Bottling Co., Bryan, Tex., opposing tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

263. Also, petition of the National Society, Daughters of 1812, urging the continuance of the basic provisions of the Immigration act of 1924, including the national-origins system, as the permanent basis for apportioning the quotas; the extension of quota restrictions to Mexico, the West Indies, and the countries of Central and South America; the decrease of the total quota immigration in accordance with the principle of national-origins; the enactment of strict legislation, supported by adequate appropriations, to effect the deportation of aliens illegally here; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

264. Also, petition of National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the national-origins clause of the Immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

265. By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolutions of the Democratic Progressive Association of New York City, urging a life pension for Matthew A. Henson; to the Committee on Pensions.

266. By Mr. JOHNSTON of Texas: Petition of Hon. H. O. Ferguson of Bryan, Tex., and Stephan Ice & Bottling Co., Bryan, Tex., opposing tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

267. By Mr. KVALE: Memorial of the State Legislature of Minnesota, urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the
immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

286. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of members of the Boston Authors' Club, regarding classification of authors' manuscripts as first-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

289. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the National Loyal Legion of New York, favoring the continuance of the present tariff and the national-origins system, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

290. Also, petition of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, with reference to the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

291. Also, petition of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, with reference to the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

292. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of A. S. Engelbrecht, Halstad, Minn.; Carl Anderson, Dale, Minn.; Henry M. Halvorson, Stephen, Minn.; and M. A. Beckstrom, Warren, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins provision of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

293. Also, petition of Carl Stromgren and Alvin Stromgren, of Bronson, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

294. Also, petition of the National Loyal Legion, favoring the continuance of the basic provisions of the immigration act of 1924, including the national-origins system, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

295. Also, petition of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, with reference to the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

296. Also, petition of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, with reference to the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

297. Also, petition of Mr. H. G. Larson, resident of Viking, Minn., favoring a large increase in tariff duties on competing farm products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

298. Also, petition of A. O. and Carl Brink, Ray and John Halvorson, Art Potocky, Henry Sustad, and A. G. Sumner, all of Viking, Minn., in favor of a large increase in tariff duties on competing farm products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

299. Also, petition of Jacob A. Vatnnes, resident of Gully, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

300. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. P. B. Hole, Anne and Huldah Oman, Mrs. M. M. Webster, Mrs. J. N. Oman, and Ole H. Person, all residents of McIntosh, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

301. Also, petition of Peter Olson, Harold Olson, Walter Christopherson, C. J. Johnson, and John Nord, all of Foreston, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

302. Also, petition of Otto J. Prillutn, resident of Pelican Rapids, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, April 30, 1929

(Legislative day of Monday, April 29, 1929)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Moses). The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) to print and bind the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, of the statue of Robert M. La Follette, presented by the State of Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 95, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 95, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929, was read twice by its title.

Mr. GEORGE. A similar joint resolution introduced by me on February 25, 1929, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that resolution is before the committee. The committee has not yet made its report. I ask that this resolution may lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The House joint resolution will lie upon the table in accordance with the request of the Senator from Georgia.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Local Union No. 151, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of San Francisco, Calif., favoring a reduction of 50 per cent in the Federal tax on earned incomes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NORRIS presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, favoring the passage of the so-called Robinson bill, granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PUTTMAN:
A bill (S. 842) for the relief of Gilbert McNickle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NYE:
A bill (S. 843) for the relief of the Lehigh Briquetting Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HASTINGS:
A bill (S. 844) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Avis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT:
A bill (S. 845) granting a pension to Josephine E. Lang; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VANDENBOSCH:
A bill (S. 846) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the State of Michigan for park purposes the Cheboygan Lighthouse Reservation, Mich.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:
A bill (S. 847) granting a pension to Josephine Walrod; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 848) granting a pension to Anna E. Burgess; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 849) granting an increase of pension to Louise V. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 850) for the relief of Homer C. Rayhill; and to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 851) granting compensation to Lawrence F. Morris; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 852) for the relief of Herman Gerlach; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:
A bill (S. 853) for the relief of the estate of Guinlape Zurneta, deceased;
A bill (S. 854) authorizing the payment of a claim to Alexander J. Thompson;
A bill (S. 855) for the relief of Gilbert Peterson;
A bill (S. 856) for the relief of J. A. Perry;
A bill (S. 857) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Clara E. Nicholas;
A bill (S. 858) for the relief of C. C. Moore & Co., engineers;
A bill (S. 859) for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan;
A bill (S. 860) for the relief of John H. Hughes;
A bill (S. 861) for the relief of Estella Howard;
A bill (S. 862) for the relief of Lurline Cooney;
A bill (S. 863) for the relief of W. P. Fuller & Co.;
A bill (S. 864) for the relief of Timothy Fennessy;
A bill (S. 865) for the relief of William Eckman;
A bill (S. 866) to extend the provisions of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to James E. Deichleisen and Co.;
A bill (S. 867) to reimburse the members of Company B, California Engineers, in the aggregate amount personally expended by them for United States Army equipment; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:
A bill (S. 870) to provide for contests of certain oil and gas permits; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.