

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 2122) authorizing the Uintah, 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 1922; to the Committee 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 producers and others the benefit 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 McBees 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 at or near Solway, in Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 57) to increase annual appropriations 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 Armstrong Hunter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. McGaughey; 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.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 2135) 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. Gianaros; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: 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. Shelton, 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 Scharbonaugh; 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. Gloer; 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.

By Mr. WYANT: 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 Jane Akens; 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-Reed Township Farm Bureau, Attica, 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.

249. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Foreign Service Camp No. 87, 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 Debevois 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. Leitz (Inc.), New York City, opposing an increase in tariff on microscopes and scientific equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

252. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Rev. George Mueller, John C. Schaefer, Ben Myers, J. C. Leer, and other citizens of Marion County, Mo., against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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.

#### SENATE

MONDAY, April 29, 1929

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 remorse, 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 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.

OTIS 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 concurrence 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; and

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution 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.

#### 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	Fletcher	Kendrick	Sheppard
Ashurst	Frazier	Keyes	Shortridge
Barkley	George	King	Simmons
Bingham	Gillett	La Follette	Smith
Black	Glass	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Glenn	McMaster	Stack
Blease	Goff	McNary	Steinwer
Borah	Goldsbrough	Metcalf	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Gould	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Greene	Norbeck	Townsend
Broussard	Hale	Norris	Trammell
Burton	Harris	Nye	Tyson
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hastings	Overman	Wagner
Connally	Hatfield	Patterson	Walcott
Copeland	Hawes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Hayden	Pine	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Hubert	Pittman	Warren
Dale	Heflin	Ransdell	Waterman
Deneen	Howell	Reed	Watson
Dill	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Edge	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	
Fess	Kean	Schall	

Mr. SCHALL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent owing to illness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily detained in his State on important business. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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.

#### ESTATE OF C. C. SPILLER, DECEASED

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. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the 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 want to say that I have no idea that either House of Congress would ever have passed the bill if they had known that any such claim as that would be made against the beneficiary of the measure. The lawyer brought a suit in the District of Columbia to have one-half of the amount subjected to his claim for attorney's fees. The owner of the claim lives in my State. I never heard of any attorney being connected with it at all, neither did Mr. BYRNS, of the House, who procured the passage of the bill through that body.

On Friday last the matter was brought to the attention of the House by Congressman BYRNS, who explained the facts and who introduced a joint resolution, which the House unanimously passed, which would repeal the act as it was passed at the last session and reenact the legislation with a proviso that no attorney's fee shall be paid in excess of 5 per cent of the amount of the claim. The House passed the joint resolution purely as an emergency matter. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, so that this unjust claim for attorney's fees shall not be permitted to become effective.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, certain documents with reference to the claim have come into my hands this morning, but I have not had time to examine them. One of the attorneys in question is a former Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin and he alleges that a contract exists between him and the claimant. In any event, in order that the orderly process of the business of the Senate at this

session may be observed, I am constrained to object to the present consideration of the resolution.

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

#### FARM RELIEF—VIEW OF HON. FRANK O. LOWDEN

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I submit a newspaper clipping, which I ask may be read by the clerk, by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

LOWDEN APPROVES HOOVER FARM AID—FORMER GOVERNOR SAYS PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCED PROGRAM WAS INDORSED AT POLLS

CHICAGO, April 26.—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 indorsed 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 debenture 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 assumed 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 inadequate, 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 Waiters' 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. 80, 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.

He also laid before 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 urgent that in 1924 Congress passed the Johnson Act, wherein was adopted the restriction of immigration to 2 per cent of all nationals based on the census of 1890, to be in force until July 1, 1927, when the quotas would be based on national origins, which would serve as a permanent immigration policy; and

Whereas the national-origins clause of the said Johnson Act has been postponed from year to year until the present, when it will go into effect July 1 next unless again postponed or repealed at the special session of Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Junior Order United American Mechanics represented by councils assembled at this district convention, held at New Bern, N. C., April 5, 1929, that as a durable regulative measure of immigration the national-origins provision of the Johnson 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 Senators 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.

ADRIAN M. REA,

Secretary.

I. 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:

#### House Joint Resolution 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 P. HOLADAY, 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 regulation within and by the United States of America of a nationwide system of durable hard-surfaced post roads by means of an issue of road bonds of the United States; and

Whereas this bill follows closely the general principles of our own notably successful State road bond issue act; and

Whereas actual and continued use of the connected, high-type State bond roads of Illinois has demonstrated beyond question that a nationwide system of durable hard-surfaced highways would be practicable, desirable, and of very great value to our common country: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the State of Illinois, in legislature assembled, does, from its own road-building experience, strongly recommend to the National Government the construction of the system of straight transcontinental and trunk-line hard-surfaced highways provided for in the aforesaid Holaday bill, and respectfully and earnestly urge the early passage of this bill by the Congress; and be it further*

*Resolved, That duly certified copies of this preamble and resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to Congressman HOLADAY to be by him presented to the President, to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

Adopted by the house April 11, 1929.

DAVID E. SHANAHAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*  
GEORGE C. BLAUER,  
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

Concurred in by the Senate April 18, 1929.

FRED E. STERLING,  
*President of the Senate.*  
J. H. PADDOCK,  
*Secretary of the Senate.*

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 Augustana Brotherhood of the Salem Lutheran Church, of Naugatuck; the Swedish Lutheran Church, of South Manchester; members and friends of the Swedish Congregational Church, of Middletown; the Logen 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 repeal of the so-called national-origins 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 letter 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 19, 1929.

Hon. LAWRENCE D. TYSON,

*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR GENERAL TYSON: Supplementing my letter of April 15, the following is in response to your letter of April 12 inclosing letter from Lieut. Charles A. Loughin, 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 retirement system now in effect in 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 disabilities were rated 30 per cent or more permanent, which list numbered approximately 3,250, many of whom have since died. Since the passage of the act there have been over 4,000 disabled emergency officers retired with retirement pay, and indications are that the final 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 drawing disability compensation of 10 per cent or more for 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 disabling should feel that they, too, are entitled to retirement with pay, and naturally want to leave nothing undone in their efforts to secure such benefits. The majority of disabled officers—at least those of our enrolled membership having 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 an equitable one or apparently not in accordance with law.

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 few men as possible on the retired list, and that if there was any conceivable 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 4 and 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 that 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 official records clearly disclosed that they were not legally entitled to compensation in the first place. For example, one emergency officer entered the military service 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 defective hearing 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 considered his application for retirement it was discovered 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 those officers who were actually and seriously disabled in service 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.

No applicant for retirement under the emergency officers' retirement act is denied the opportunity of submitting additional evidence to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to show that his disability is due to service and meets the requirements as to degree of permanent disability which entitle him to retirement. If when the decision of the Veterans' Bureau is unfavorable and the applicant has additional evidence which

would show that such decision was unjust or illegal, such evidence can be submitted and his application reconsidered. We have had numbers of adverse decisions of this type reconsidered after the applicants submitted additional evidence.

All the recognized veterans' organizations, including ours, employ experienced men to act as service or liaison officers. If an applicant 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 direct with General Hines. We do 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 veterans' act 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 entitling to retirement with pay, a service officer is not always able to secure reconsideration of the claim. However, we would say that if the evidence on file strongly indicates 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.

You 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 show that the physical disability is of a permanent nature.

We understand that the awards division of the emergency officers' retirement section of the bureau has been definitely instructed to clearly explain to the applicant why retirement is denied, or why retirement is certified without retired pay. However, we regret to find that these instructions are not always carried out in an intelligent manner because the notification of disallowal, or retirement without pay, is frequently stated in such technical terms that the poor, long-waiting, and anxious veteran has no conception of what it is all about, except that his application for retirement has for some reason been disallowed. The only suggestion that we feel we could logically offer at this time would be that you write General Hines requesting that the officer concerned be informed in no unmistakable terms exactly why his retirement has not been, and can not reasonably expect to be, awarded.

Summarizing, while we may have failed in our attempt to fully explain the so-called appeal procedure we hope that we have covered the matter in a way which will prove that the whole retirement situation is not as bad as some quite naturally feel it is.

We now have pending in the Comptroller General's office appeals, through the Director of the Bureau, on decisions which the comptroller rendered excluding certain beneficiaries of the act. Reference is made to the old enlisted men who came up from the ranks, served with distinction as emergency officers during the World War, and when discharged from their commissions their World War disabilities, if any, were waived and they were permitted to reenter the Regular Army for the sole purpose of completing their 30 years' service for retirement—not disability. The Comptroller General held that these men were excluded from the emergency officers' retirement act. We hold that they are not and we are reasonably confident that, in cooperation with Capt. Watson B. Miller, of the American Legion, we may be able to present arguments to the comptroller which will result in his altering his decisions respecting these men.

Assuring you of our deepest appreciation of your heartfelt interest in all our problems and continued efforts to see to it that all who should be retired under the emergency officers' retirement act are retired, I am,

Faithfully yours,

H. TURNER LEWIS,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

#### NATIONAL-ORIGINS CLAUSE OF IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I submit two telegrams and a letter relating to the subject of the proposed repeal of the national-origins clause of the immigration law, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Immigration and printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 24, 1929.

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,  
Senate Office Building:

The Senate put national origins in the immigration act of 1924 because it was sound in principle and abolished all legitimate ground of charge Congress wanted to discriminate by reason of race or creed. 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, dis-

crimatory, or subject to political abuse. National origin has been indorsed by 80 organizations, including American Legion, represented in national immigration restriction conference, and by 40 allied patriotic societies. Urge you to speak against suspension or repeal.

JOHN B. TREVOR,  
Chairman National Immigration Restriction Conference.  
DEMAREST LLOYD,  
Chairman National Immigration Legislative Committee.  
F. H. KINNICUTT,  
Acting President Allied Patriotic Societies.

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 24, 1929.

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,  
United States Senate:

Respectfully urge you to oppose all attempts repeal or postpone national-origins provision, immigration act, which apportions 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.

FRANCIS H. KINNICUTT,  
Acting President Allied Patriotic Societies (Inc.),  
Far Hills, N. J.

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

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The American Legion from its very beginning has favored restrictive immigration. This question has come before our national conventions ever since our first meeting in 1919. While the Legion 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 indorsed the act of 1924, and in 1928 specifically indorsed 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.

Any method of selecting immigrants based upon the foreign born—whether upon the censuses 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.

Now, Senate Resolution 37 is before the Senate. This proposes to discharge 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 37 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 just propaganda on the part of certain steamship companies who are selfishly interested in making 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.

Mr. KING. The Senator denominates this propaganda. I can show him 20 letters opposed to the legislation as against 1 upon the other side. I wonder if I should denominate that propaganda?



Mr. HARRIS. The affidavits will show that it is propaganda of the steamship companies, who are selfishly interested in making money bringing more immigrants to this country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The affidavit was read and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK, STATE OF NEW YORK,

*County of New York, ss:*

John Lang and John P. Vienne, being duly sworn, depose and say:

That on April 24, 1929, we visited the following-named steamship lines for the purpose of securing blanks to petition Congress to repeal or postpone the national-origins provision of the immigration act of 1924:

At the North German Lloyd Line, at 57 Broadway, we were referred to a Mr. Emerly's office in the landing department, where we were informed that they had no blanks and did not know anything about them.

We then proceeded to the Hamburg-American Line, at 39 Broadway, where a Mr. Lederer said: "We do not handle any such petitions they should come through the various societies who are interested in the matter and not through the steamship companies. If they would come through us [meaning the steamship companies] they would do more harm than good."

We then visited the Norwegian-American Line, at 8 Bridge Street. A boy at this line said: "How many do you want," after we requested the petition blanks. Later on he spoke to another man, who again asked us what we wanted, and when we told him we wanted petition blanks on the immigration law he said: "We haven't got any."

We then proceeded to the Scandinavian-American Line, at 27 Whitehall Street. The clerk at the desk said: "Mr. Peterson has those blanks." He then went into Mr. Peterson's office and returned with two blanks, which are made part of this affidavit and are hereto attached.

From there we proceeded to the Swedish-American Line, at 24 State Street, where a Mr. Lillius gave to us one-half of a petition blank. Mr. Lillius said: "Instead of using the blanks it is better to write a personal letter to your Representative in Congress, as well as to your United States Senators."

JOHN LANG.

JOHN P. VIENNE.

Sworn to before me this 24th day of April, 1929.

WALTER M. JACKSON,

*Notary Public, Bronx County.*

Bronx County clerk's No. 2, Bronx County register's No. 3125.

Certificate filed in New York County. New York County clerk's No. 145, New York County register's No. 1198. Term expires March 30, 1931.

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 wish 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. I shall put those 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 leave to send 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 present to the Senate, when a controversial question is before 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 may be pending 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 who is so insistent upon reading them whether he has 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 Senator would 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 opinions of a 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 a word, 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 have the national-origins clause repealed are being inspired by various 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 partisanship standing by the President upon a matter of this sort while regular Republicans, who prate 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 liberty in the United States to-day and making a glorious fight for 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 assaulting a repeal of the national-origins proposition.

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 distributed by officers of 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-

mately 2.30 p. m. and did personally obtain six copies of said petition from one of the clerks of the above-named steamship office.

And further this deponent says not.

HERBERT TREBLE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of April, A. D. 1929.

NELSON E. HEWITT.

My commission expires February 10, 1932.

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, being advised of the fact that anti-national-origins petitions were being circulated by offices of steamship lines in the city of Chicago, I called at the offices of the Hamburg-American Steamship Line at 177 North Michigan Avenue, and the North German Lloyd Steamship Lines at 130 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill., on Monday afternoon, April 22, 1929. At the Hamburg-American Steamship Lines' office, in response to my query for anti-national-origins petitions, the clerk was uninformed, but upon interviewing another clerk, returned with a program of an anti-national-origins meeting held at Orchestra Hall, Chicago, on Wednesday evening, March 27, 1929, under the auspices of the National Historical Society, and referred me to the National Historical Society for the petitions. Calling at the office of the North German Lloyd Steamship Lines at 130 West Randolph Street I was advised by a clerk that petitions had been available at this office, but none were at hand at this time. He referred me to another clerk who, in turn, referred me to the National Historical Society, looking up the address, 105 West Adams Street, in the phone book and supplied me with same.

And further this deponent says not.

HERBERT TREBLE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22d day of April, A. D. 1929.

NELSON E. HEWITT.

My commission expires February 10, 1932.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The affidavits will be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 60) to amend subsection (a) of section 26 of the trading with the enemy act, so as to authorize the allocation of the unallocated interest fund in accordance with the records of the Alien Property Custodian, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 4) thereon.

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Joint Committee to Investigate Northern Pacific Land Grants, submitted a report (No. 5) accompanied by a bill (S. 669) to alter 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, 1864, 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 roads and to secure the same by mortgage, and for other purposes," approved May 31, 1870; to declare forfeited to the United States certain claimed rights asserted by 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, which was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 26, 1929, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 179) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to dispose of the marine biological station at Key West, Fla.

#### PRINTING OF HEARINGS ON FARM RELIEF BILL

Mr. MOSES. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), submitted by Mr. McNARY on the 23d instant, was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on farm relief legislation, Seventy first Congress, first session.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire for the present consideration of the resolution?

LXXI—40

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 Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but my assumption is that it includes all of the Senate hearings on the subject.

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 say further to 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 specified by law.

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 held an executive session. It is for the committee to determine 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 another 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. McNARY. The committee asked the chairman to take the matter up with Mr. Olsen, 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 for 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 was able to ascertain from the discussion 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 note in a moment, 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.

It must be understood 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 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 upon the so-called debenture plan, 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 and, I think, adopted by unanimous action of the committee, that the chairman be



directed to see these witnesses, and if they desired to strike out from their testimony the opinions which they had given in answer to the urgent question 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 anyone 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—

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

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

Mr. NORRIS. 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. NORRIS. 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 the result of their investigation 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 the opinion of his superiors 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. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. My point is that Congress might prefer the opinion of an expert who had experience and who had made an investigation even to that of the head of 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. NORRIS. Mr. President, the experts were called to tell the committee what study they had made 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 investigation and study. Then they were asked to express an opinion as to what they thought the plan would do here. 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 stated 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 superior to them in the public service, with whom they had not 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 pass judgment on them, 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. CARAWAY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. I 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 this plan had been in foreign countries. They also estimated its cost and covered the question very fully. I merely wish to call attention to that fact.

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

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. NORRIS. 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. NORRIS. 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. NORRIS. 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. NORRIS. 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 RESOLUTION 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 McCowan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

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

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 675) granting a pension to Bart 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. TYSON:

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 Solway, 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 McBees Ferry, in Knox County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

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. Larney a warrant officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORBECK:

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. CAPPER:

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. Buckson, executrix of E. C. Buckson, 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. Knedlik;  
A bill (S. 693) granting a pension to Gustava Deamude (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 steamship *Kyleakin* 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. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 697) providing for payment of \$100 to each enrolled member of the Chippewa 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. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 698) granting an increase of pension to Tide Owens;  
A bill (S. 699) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Fain;  
A bill (S. 700) granting a pension to Mattie Wood;  
A bill (S. 701) granting a pension to Abe Erlich;  
A bill (S. 702) granting a pension to Mattie Johnson;  
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;

A bill (S. 705) granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Spence;

A bill (S. 706) granting an increase of pension to Annie N. Sullivan;

A bill (S. 707) granting an increase of pension to John L. Dick;

A bill (S. 708) granting an increase of pension to Anita Stephens;

A bill (S. 709) granting an increase of pension to Percy H. Allen;

A bill (S. 710) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Howell Butler;

A bill (S. 711) granting a pension to George A. Huffar;

A bill (S. 712) granting a pension to Florence Storr;

A bill (S. 713) granting a pension to Patrick S. Horton;

A bill (S. 714) granting an increase of pension to Murray Pierce;

A bill (S. 715) granting a pension to Mary A. Huckaba;

A bill (S. 716) granting a pension to James Besheers;

A bill (S. 717) granting a pension to George W. Hacker;

A bill (S. 718) granting a pension to Albert M. Griffith;

A bill (S. 719) granting a pension to Lissie Young;

A bill (S. 720) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Taber;

A bill (S. 721) granting an increase of pension to George Milams;

A bill (S. 722) granting a pension to Robert C. Kistler;

A bill (S. 723) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hart;

A bill (S. 724) granting a pension to Roger James Richmond;

A bill (S. 725) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Simpkins;

A bill (S. 726) granting an increase of pension to Bessie L. Christie;

A bill (S. 727) granting a pension to Laura Barker;

A bill (S. 728) granting a pension to William Estes;

A bill (S. 729) granting a pension to Oscar M. Simpkins;

A bill (S. 730) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Benton;

A bill (S. 731) granting an increase of pension to Israel W. Bennett;

A bill (S. 732) granting a pension to F. W. Gerding;

A bill (S. 733) granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Wells;

A bill (S. 734) granting a pension to William M. Robinson;

A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to George W. Pinion;

A bill (S. 736) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Brown;

A bill (S. 737) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Driggs;

A bill (S. 738) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hawkins;

A bill (S. 739) granting a pension to John P. Gray;

A bill (S. 740) granting a pension to Essie Horton;

A bill (S. 741) granting a pension to Minnie Davis;

A bill (S. 742) granting an increase of pension to Mattie E. Russell;

A bill (S. 743) granting a pension to Ella Z. Sweany;

A bill (S. 744) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa E. McCormick;

A bill (S. 745) granting an increase of pension to J. H. Williams;

A bill (S. 746) granting an increase of pension to William Estes;

A bill (S. 747) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Johnson;

A bill (S. 748) granting an increase of pension to Lucy Queen;

A bill (S. 749) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Holt;

A bill (S. 750) granting an increase of pension to Carlton Wright;

A bill (S. 751) granting a pension to Mary F. Gross;

A bill (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to Polie Hamby;

A bill (S. 753) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Kuykendall;

A bill (S. 754) granting a pension to Jasper O. Craig;

A bill (S. 755) granting a pension to Van Letsinger;

A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Pitts;

A bill (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Bateman Hahn;

A bill (S. 758) granting a pension to Ethel Hay Norton;

A bill (S. 759) granting an increase of pension to Capt. C. M. Park;

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.

A bill (S. 762) relative to the acquisition of oil lands by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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.

A bill (S. 764) for the relief of Jacob D. Nelson;

A bill (S. 765) for the relief of the Shelby Medical College, of Nashville, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 766) for the relief of Eureka Cotton Mills;

A bill (S. 767) for the relief of Cabell Rives Berry;

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. 769) 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 Whitaker Moffatt;

A bill (S. 773) for the relief of the legal representatives of Enoch Ensley, deceased;

A bill (S. 774) for the relief of Daniel M. Whitaker;

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) granting increased compensation to Wilson S. Jaynes by the Employees' Compensation Commission;

A bill (S. 781) for the relief of Walter W. Price;

A bill (S. 782) for the relief of the legal representative of Samuel Mosby, surviving partner of Mosby & Hunt;

A bill (S. 783) for the relief of E. B. McHenry, receiver of the Bank of West Tennessee;

A bill (S. 784) for the relief of the legal representative of the Bank of West Tennessee;

A bill (S. 785) for the relief of Barney Thompson;

A bill (S. 786) for the relief of H. C. Jaquess;

A bill (S. 787) for the relief of Mary Frances McConnell; and

A bill (S. 788) for the relief of Horatio S. Hubbell; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 789) to authorize certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps to accept certain decorations conferred upon them by the Government of Greece;

A bill (S. 790) for the relief of Robert K. Christenberry; and

A bill (S. 791) relative to retired pay to Rear Admiral J. K. Robinson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 792) reappointing Edgar C. Campbell as pay clerk in Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, with rank of second lieutenant;

A bill (S. 793) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sergt. Alvin C. York as a captain in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list;

A bill (S. 794) authorizing the acquisition of land and suitably marking the site of the Battle of Franklin, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 795) relative to discharges of certain soldiers and sailors who served in the war with Germany;

A bill (S. 796) to authorize the reinstatement of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors to former positions in Government service and restoration to eligible register of the names of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors;

A bill (S. 797) to equalize the promotion list of the Regular Army;

A bill (S. 798) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920;

A bill (S. 799) to authorize the State of Tennessee to organize and maintain an observation squadron, Air Corps, as an independent National Guard unit;

A bill (S. 800) to correct the military record of James W. Smith;

A bill (S. 801) interpreting the construction to be placed upon the words "child" and "children" as used in certain sections of the acts approved May 18, 1920, June 10, 1922, and June 1, 1926;

A bill (S. 802) authorizing an appropriation for improving road in the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 803) authorizing the President to reappoint E. C. Callahan, formerly a captain of Infantry, United States Army, a captain of Infantry, United States Army;

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) to correct the military record of Thomas H. Nolley;

A bill (S. 807) to correct the military record of William Mullins;

A bill (S. 808) authorizing the President to appoint J. H. S. Morison 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; and

A bill (S. 810) for the relief of Robert C. Wilcox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

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 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 725 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 offices of Representative and Senator 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 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 259 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 825) declaring the Obey River, in the State of Tennessee, a nonnavigable 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 10, 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 Ripley, Tenn.;

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

A bill (S. 829) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Trenton, 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 Milan, 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. Bal-  
lew; and

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

A bill (S. 837) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of 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;

A bill (S. 839) allowing credit to postal and substitute postal employees for time served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States; and

A bill (S. 840) to reduce night work in the Postal 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 on Saturdays throughout the year for all employees in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) for the payment of certain employees of the United States Government in the District of Columbia and employees of the District of Columbia for March 4, 1929; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### RELIEF OF STORM AND FLOOD STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. GEORGE. I introduce a joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let it be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) to provide further relief for farmers and fruit growers in the storm and flood stricken areas of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the unexpended balance of the sum appropriated by the second deficiency act, fiscal year 1929, to carry out the purposes 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, shall be available for making advances or loans, and the procuring of seed, feed, and fertilizers for sale, to farmers and fruit growers in areas in such States affected by storms or floods subsequent to the date of approval of such joint resolution, but prior to the date of approval of this joint resolution. Such advances, loans, and sales shall be made for the purposes specified in such joint resolution of February 25, 1929, and subject to the provisions thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator from Georgia kindly explain the purpose of the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to do so, Mr. President.

This joint resolution does not appropriate any additional money, nor does it devote any money already appropriated to purposes other than those provided in the original measure. It is simply intended—and that is all it does—to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make advances to farmers in the path of storms that have occurred in my State and in the State of South Carolina, as well as in the flood area in Alabama since the passage and approval of the original joint resolution. It does not carry any additional appropriation, and the people who would receive benefits under it were in the area affected by the storms covered by the original joint resolution.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. As the Secretary of Agriculture construes the present act, he has no authority now to make that appropriation?

Mr. GEORGE. The Secretary of Agriculture does not construe that he has not the authority, but his authority is not very clear; and in order to relieve him of any embarrassment in the administration of the fund this joint resolution is introduced.

Mr. WATSON. I see no objection whatever to the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Indiana that I communicated with the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is of opinion that he has no authority to appropriate this money for the relief of conditions subsequent to that for which it was originally appropriated.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, this is a joint resolution. I do not think I have any objection to it, but I think it ought to go to the committee. The Agricultural Committee meets to-morrow morning, and probably will act upon the joint resolution if it has no objection to it. I ask that it may go to the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I very much hoped that the Senator would not ask that the joint resolution go to the committee, but of course he is thoroughly within his rights in doing so. If the Senator will permit me to explain, I will state that I have consulted the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Extension Service, who is administering this fund, and they expressed a willingness this morning to carry the matter even before the Budget if necessary, but they did not think it was necessary. In view of the storm that occurred last week in Georgia and South Carolina I very much hoped that this joint resolution might be passed without a day's delay, so that it might go to the House, and thus expedite the administration of the fund.

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

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 many precedents established in the Senate. 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 can not 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 not 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 here. It is not a complicated matter 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 other 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 measure, 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 Agricultural Department who are handling 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 proceeding 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 its business and give unanimous 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 not be in the frame of mind to grant 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 course I have suggested has been taken 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.

#### AMENDMENTS TO FARM RELIEF BILL

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 bill (S. 312) to provide for 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 "Points 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. 46), which was referred to the Committee to 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 a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

#### REINSTATEMENT 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. 1358) 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 attorney assigned to the case, suddenly 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 of serving the ends 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 greater assurance of safety from attack than before, is set up by the majority members of the Federal Trade Commission as justification for dismissing the complaint against the Continental Baking Corporation made by the commission, notwithstanding the fact that the "consent decree" entirely ignores the well-grounded charge made both 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" left the Continental Baking Corporation entirely unpunished and entirely intact to continue the monopolistic course which called forth the public protest above referred to, and of which the Federal Trade Commission itself complained; 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 in the interest of 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 reinstate, forthwith, the complaint against 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. 48), 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 documents and papers as it deems fit, to administer oaths, to take testimony of witnesses, and to make its report to the next session of the Senate, in December, 1929. The expenses of such 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 peonage is the rule; (4) whether enormous dividends are being paid by the textile corporations that are made possible by the oppression of the wage earners in their employ; (5) whether the appeal of the textile interests of the South for higher tariff protection is justified; (6) whether United States citizens entering 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 employ such clerical and other 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 it deems advisable. Every 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 provided 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 subcommittee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from 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 that I have, seemed to me to be such that no one could possibly be expected to live upon 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 refer to strikes occurring in the South alone. It proposes an investigation of the labor conditions in certain Southern States where, I understand, that labor troubles are pending at the present time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then it proposes an investigation of labor conditions?

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 tariff that they are asking for before the House committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not 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 that they can broaden it; or I would be perfectly willing, 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 wage scales 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?

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 we have the Ways and Means Committee and 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. I thank my colleague. I had 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 the wage scale in the factories in New England, because we have now a Tariff Commission whose 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 the 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 cost of production here and abroad, in reaching a just protective rate, to inaugurate that sort of investigation; and it is their custom ordinarily to call upon the Tariff Commission for the evidence which they have secured 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.

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 is whether these agencies will make the investigations which they are authorized by law to make, whether they will make the investigations which they are provided with a personnel to make, and 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 whatsoever these agencies we provide are not adequate and sufficient, then I insist that the investigation shall not be a sectional one, shall not be confined to the one section in which the particular mills referred to are located, but shall apply 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 for the purpose of framing a tariff upon the principle of 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 storehouse of information. It has been 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 with reference to the same classes of labor in the woolen and cotton industries in England and continental Europe. They have been investigating that matter for 16 years, and all the information along that line I could obtain from them was a conversion of the wages of painters and bricklayers, and so on, into pound loaves of bread in two countries, but I could not get any definite information in regard to the relative wages in those two industries in Europe and America.

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 abroad 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. If it is not functioning, I have heard of no effort on the part of the other side of the Chamber, which has control of legislation at this time, to abolish it, to change it, or to strengthen it, although they are about to enter upon the consideration of a bill which probably may extend its scope to all the schedules of the tariff.

The point I make is that we have these instrumentalities, 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.

When strikes were in progress in New England there was no proposal to investigate wage conditions up there, or to investigate strike conditions. The Senator from Massachusetts did not offer any resolution looking to that end, and nobody on either side of the Chamber offered any resolution of that sort. The portion of the country in which those strikes were going on showed no solicitude to have Congress go up there and undertake investigations, which probably would more appropriately be expected to come from the State.

The southern people have not to-day, 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 State is competent to deal with the matter, that the State is dealing with it, and dealing with it in a very effective way.

I do not blame the Senator from Massachusetts for not offering a resolution. Southern Senators have not under like conditions offered resolutions. This resolution comes from another part of the country. I am not, of course, in any way question-



ing the right and privilege of any Senator from any part of the country to inaugurate a movement of this sort if he sees fit to do so. I am simply saying now—and this is all I mean to urge now—that this resolution, if it is to be considered, ought to be broadened in its scope, and ought to apply to every section of the country where cotton is manufactured.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to call the attention of Senators to the fact that debate during the morning hour is limited to five minutes, without unanimous consent being granted otherwise.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I shall have something to say about this resolution if it shall subsequently come before the Senate for consideration. I will show the purpose for which it has been presented, and remind the Senate of the hundreds and thousands and perhaps millions of dollars which have been expended for investigations that have not amounted to the snap of the finger. I propose to show the Senate how much money we have been spending for such purposes and the scandals which, in some instances, have resulted. There 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 the investigations authorized by the Senate. I expect 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.

The tariff is not responsible so much as other things; and I 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 has been down there, and ask them for the information they have 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."

That is the kind of thing that is going on down there, and to have such a resolution as this presented at this time merely lends encouragement to the agitators.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is very much agitated because of the fact that I have introduced the resolution, and he suggests that the committee consult with Mr. Green, 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 also say to the Senator that some of us who have lived in labor centers are used to having everyone who dares to take the part of striking laborers characterized in the way that he has been characterizing many of those who have sought to take the side of the striking textile workers of the South. But the fact remains that there are men, women, and children working in the mills of the country and working in the 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 stop and I am not going to be frightened into not asking an investigation because of the fact that somebody comes along every time some unfortunate working men go on a strike asking for higher wages, asking for better working conditions, asking for enough to keep their bodies and souls together and brands them as undesirable citizens. I am not going to be frightened and I hope the Senate will not be frightened when men and women are knocking at our doors pleading that this body investigate their working conditions, merely because they are characterized as undesirable, when at the very time, from all over the country, manufacturers are coming here asking for special favors in order that they may enrich themselves at the expense of the laborers and consumers of this country. If it is necessary to protect American manufacturing interests against foreign competition I shall not oppose it, providing the men, women, and children who really produce their wealth share in it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, so far as Mr. Green is concerned, of course, I have had no conference with him. He is a good man. I have seen interviews with him in the papers in which it was stated that he does not indorse what is going on

in my State, but condemns it, as others in his organization condemn it in plain terms.

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 you please, back up the resolution. It was at his instigation and at the suggestion of the American Federation of Labor that I introduced the resolution this morning.

Mr. OVERMAN. That question will come up hereafter; but, in view of what is going on in the South, it is not proper just at this time to present such a resolution of investigation as this. Let us take this matter up at another time, and not encourage the agitators who went down there from New York and from abroad to arouse our people to strike. Mr. Green and 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. He refused to mediate on account of the action of the labor agitators down there, the communists and Soviet adherents, an element which we have never before had in my State.

While not imputing any improper motive to the Senator from Montana, it is unfortunate that just at this time he should introduce such a resolution when a lot of I. W. W.'s, communists, and soviet adherents are carrying the red flag and arousing our people. This resolution will merely serve to encourage such activities. That is the only point I make. I shall have something further to say about it when the resolution shall again come before the Senate.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that I have 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 the conditions of that community were so bad—

The VICE PRESIDENT (rapping for order). Let the Senate be in order. Visitors to the floor will please retire to the cloakroom if they desire to hold conversation. The Senator from Montana will proceed.

Mr. WHEELER. I have never seen the sort of people mentioned by the Senator from North Carolina get any foothold in any community unless the conditions in that particular place and that particular working community were 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, and the thing that every other right-thinking person in this country 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 word of the representatives 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 now to discuss this question, 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 South Carolina, and whom I particularly represent upon the floor of the Senate, because without their votes I would 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. [Laughter in the galleries.]

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 having passed for its application, and to devote that sum to the eradication, control, and prevention of the great scourge that has come upon a part of our country through the ravages of the Mediterranean fruit fly. I send the joint resolution to the desk and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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. J. Res. 56) to provide funds for the eradication, control, and prevention of the spread of the Mediterranean fruit fly, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the presence of the Mediterranean fruit fly in the United States, not to exceed \$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 1928, is hereby made available until June 30, 1930, for necessary expenses 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 fiscal years 1929 and 1930 under the heading "Salaries and general expenses, plant quarantine and control administration," and for necessary investigations, for printing, and for the purchase, maintenance, repair, 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 individuals or organizations.

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 a radio address delivered by the senior 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 \$3,500,000,000 annually. This money is expended to accomplish thousands of purposes. Among them are: Support of the Army and Navy; Federal courts; law enforcement; forestry; irrigation and drainage; prevention of the spread of disease to plant life; aids to agriculture; stimulation of commerce; operation of the Post Office Department; maintenance of the Congressional 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 these 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 galleries contain many of the world's masterpieces, painted or done by their own citizens. 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 objects.

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, expanse, natural resources, and in our Army and Navy. 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 point with pride to our educational system as we note the 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 worth while. In no manner can the soul of a nation so well

develop 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 desire is there but it is latent. A few public-spirited men have greatly stimulated it with private endowments. We are rich and powerful, but have we not too much of the harshness of any new civilization—the harshness which always comes from rapid progress? The balancing 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 viewpoint comes a sense of proportion, and the physiology 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, and to secure for our Government the works of the most eminent of American artists, 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. Those submitting the five best paintings and those submitting the five best objects of sculpture would receive awards as follows: First, \$10,000; second, \$5,000; third, \$2,500; fourth, \$1,500; fifth, \$1,000.

Certificates and appropriate medals would also be given to the five painters and the five sculptors whose works entitle them to the money awards. The paintings and the sculpture of the winners would then become the property of the Government of the United States. Eventually, I hope, it would find its way into the United States Gallery of Art, to be preserved for the people of this country.

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 can not be termed extravagant. Indeed, it is my belief that over a period of years the value of the paintings and art objects would be many times more than the amount of money expended to conduct the exhibition.

To 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 fame in the field of art, increase the appreciation of our citizens in the realms of the beautiful, and secure for our Government works by American citizens which are destined in cases to be of great worth.

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 Nation'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, of the cities, of life along our rivers, of the great 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 history. They would show and tell so much better than can the printed work 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 rotunda of the National Capitol 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 Cornwallis surrendering to Washington at Yorktown; there is Washington at the conclusion of the Revolutionary War resigning his commission as Commander in Chief of the American Army to Congress, which was sitting in the little Senate Chamber in the State House at Annapolis, Md. 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.

Recently, near Baltimore 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 had been preserved by this railroad. Those who were privileged to attend saw the early beginning of modern transportation and its development to the present giant engines and palace Pullman cars. To view that exhibition was in a measure to view the history of the last 100 years. 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 embrace the whole gamut of American



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; the rush to Alaska; life on the frontier; the building up of American industry; the launching of gigantic ships; the development of the cities; horse racing; dueling; stirring moments in our national life at Washington; the war with Spain; aviation; and the World War.

If during each year during the past century five paintings and five objects of sculpture had been secured by the American Government, and all of these were now preserved in a national gallery at Washington, we would have in picture the story of the country which is the United States of America. We have not that because it was never begun. We can begin it now, and at very little cost.

No nation is perfect. Many of the transitory ills from which we suffer are psychological. It is my belief that a rational espousal by any people of art, by which the beautiful and detached things of life are expressed, is no small cure for narrowness, sectionalism, intolerance, and the smaller actions of mankind. It is a force of great value and worthy of the support of any people who wish to carve out of the Rock of Time a noble destiny.

#### JUDGES OF THE WORLD COURT

Mr. BLEASE. 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's court. 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 we do not voluntarily submit to it.

Q. What do you mean?—A. A peculiarity of this court is that the council of the League of Nations can submit to it any conceivable question for an "advisory opinion."

Q. You mean the league could ask its court to decide whether we had 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 condemnation of the world's opinion.

Q. Then, 14 foreigners and 1 lone 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; Dionisio Anzilotti, of Italy; Antonio Sanchez de Bustamante y Sirven, of Cuba; Robert Bannatyne, Viscount Finlay, of Great Britain; and Bernard C. J. Loder, of the Netherlands.

Q. Well, well; who else?—A. Yorozu Oda, of Japan; Charles Andre Weiss, of France; Didrik Gjaltrup Gjedde Nyholm, of Denmark; Max Huber, of Switzerland; and Epitacio da Silva Pessoa, of Brazil.

Q. Then who?—A. Dumitriu Negulescu, of Rumania; Wang Chung Hui, of China; Mikhailo Iovanovitch, of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State; and Frederick Valdemar Nikolai Beichmann, 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. That's it.

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 23d 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 considered at this time and should he be recognized, would he 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 resolution considered this morning.

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 question, but I should like to see the hour hurried when we may have some assurance as to the consideration the subject will receive after the farm relief bill and after the census and reapportionment bills shall have been disposed of. The Committee on Immigration of the Senate, to which was referred a number of resolutions and bills having reference to the repeal or postponement of the national-origins clause of the immigration act of 1924, hurried its action and determined that it would not, as a committee, approve any of the resolutions or bills for repeal that had been submitted to it. The committee was unanimous in determining to dispose of the matter as quickly as it was possible to do. The result was that the resolutions and bills before it were voted down by a vote of 4 to 2. The committee, for reasons of its members, declined even to report the bill out adversely. Consequently, the Senate is deprived of any opportunity to voice itself upon the question. Since the committee has not seen fit to report the bill in any form to the Senate, the purpose of Senate Resolution 37, in asking for the discharge of the committee, is merely that 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 restricted immigration, is a movement to break down our immigration laws. I deny and resent that charge, Mr. President. No one is a firmer believer in restricted immigration than am I.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NYE. I wish 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 not be material.

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 immigration upon the earlier population of the country; in other words, to fix immigration quotas upon the basis of our population as constituted at this time, an altogether desirable purpose, but there are those of us who have not been sufficiently well convinced that it is possible to follow out that theory with any degree of accuracy, with any degree of fairness. Instead, and quite to the 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.

The claim is made—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 as 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 becoming effective 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 it quite necessary that I make that much of a statement at this time.

I should like to ask 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 defeat the Senator's resolution, as I hope it will.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEBERT 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. NYE. I am going to yield the floor immediately. 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 this morning.

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. BINGHAM. 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 over from 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 relief 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 vote on it until busy Senators whose minds 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 or to agree to make it 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 passes the tariff bill his time is going to be taken up entirely in connection with the committee hearings on that bill and the very long debate in connection with it. On previous occasions when we were called in extra session to consider a bill of that kind the debates have lasted more or less all summer, 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 farm bill is out of the way, with the understanding that 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 heard 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 disposing of the racial make-up of the United States of America 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.

I spoke on March 4 for about 20 minutes, and half 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 that 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 said, "Young man, the bill that has just passed this body 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 generations if you have allowed the filtration into our population of elements that do not harmonize with those that are now here; if you have gone on building foreign blocs where to speak the English language in their community makes you an outcast—and there are such places in the United States to-day; if you have gone on filling your jails and your asylums and your hospitals with the diseased and the feeble-minded paupers of countries of a blood alien to ours.

Look at southern California at this moment!

Mr. BINGHAM. 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 about 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 the farm bill is concluded, and that was that it must not 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 taken from the 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 given a preferred place, and I for one would much 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. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator.

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 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. JONES. I can 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 suggestions that possibly there will be considerable opposition to the apportionment provisions.

Mr. BINGHAM. Can the Senator, as assistant leader of the majority party, tell us whether any plan has been made for the Senate to be 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 has been 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 our getting even a test vote on the matter 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 and others, who are opposed to the measure, as well as the friends of it, will give us an opportunity to get a vote on the matter, 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 him to cooperate to the end that we can have the Senate voice itself with relation to these immigration questions?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senate voiced itself in 1924 when it adopted this policy. The national-origins amendment was then debated at length. The bill was before the Senate for more than six weeks. I never heard a legislative measure more fully discussed than that was at that time. Twice since then the Senator from North Dakota has made some effort to strike down what the Senate so deliberately did in 1924. Both times

the Immigration Committee, by decisive majorities, has voted down the Senator's resolution. In spite of that he wants to ignore that reiterated action of the Immigration Committee, and 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 from a matter on which it has taken action by a decisive 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—

Mr. HEFLIN. 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. REED. If the question 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 minority 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 Chair.

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

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

Mr. BINGHAM. I am endeavoring to finish the sentence, Mr. President. Evidently the Senator from Pennsylvania believes that the effect of that one line in the President's message was not great enough to make the difference of a vote in the action of the committee in the last Congress and in this Congress.

What I am endeavoring to do is to call attention to the fact that four members of the committee have been successful so far in preventing the Senate from voting on this important 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 who are opposed to the President's 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.

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope so.

Mr. REED. But as long as I am here it is not going 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 totaling 164,000. Under the national-origins clause there would be 153,000 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 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 proposed 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 very much larger proportion of immigration.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the fact remains that it does further restrict immigration, nevertheless.

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

Mr. REED. I yield for a question.

Mr. BLACK. There seems to be a good deal of argument between the various alien blocs as to which will have the most admitted into this country. I have a bill pending before the Committee on Immigration which would absolutely restrict all foreign immigration in this country for a period of 10 years. I would like to know, if we are to have a chance to vote on whether there will be more Germans or more Englishmen, whether the Senate will also have the privilege of voting to restrict all foreign immigration for a period of 10 years?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I can only answer for myself. I should say that if the foreign groups who are now agitating so effectively against this national-origins clause, are effective in controlling the legislation of the American Congress, I for myself shall be in favor of the total suppression of all immigration into the United States until such time as the people of this land have learned to think as Americans and not as hyphenated citizens of some European country, as well as this.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wanted to ask just one question in response to the remark I just heard. Whence comes the agitation, I want to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania? Who is it who represents the hyphenated groups in America? If he is correct in his statement, that all of those who want to repeal national origins are seeking to repeal because they are influenced by foreign groups, who is it that bids them and who is it that demands of the Congress to-day that there be a repeal? It is your President and mine, the President of the United States and the head of the Republican Party, of which the Senator is such an ornament, and in which I am such an outcast. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. There is more joy over one sinner saved like the Senator from California than over ninety and nine regulars like me.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that there will come a time, perhaps not very far in the future, 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—

Mr. REED. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, we are having a little family talk on this side. [Laughter.]

Mr. GLASS. I just wanted to break in long enough to understand whether or not 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 there is 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 had no chance to study it then. The evidence before our committee 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 matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

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 immigration problems as I believe him to be of economics and of 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. HARRIS. I want to say that I believe the candidate of the Democratic Party supported Mr. Hoover in the national-origins matter, but it did not influence me or many others on this side, I believe. He had the same view Mr. Hoover had and expressed it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we have wasted 15 or 20 minutes without the slightest profit. We have talked politics when I wanted about five minutes for a chance to explain some of the aspects of this problem, which I do not think many of the Senators have yet considered.



Senators discuss this proposition as if there were involved in it some idea of prejudice against the Germans or against the Scandinavians. Nothing could be farther from the fact. All of 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 has been no more desirable strain than that of the 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 attacking them to their prejudice as compared with other groups is unfair to them and unfair to us. They are a magnificent strain and they are entitled to their full proportionate share of the immigration into this country. But certainly they are not entitled to more.

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 absurd to try to defend an immigration basis such as the 1890 foreign-born basis, which gives the Germans almost twice as much out of each year's immigration as have the British? What possible justification can there be for giving to Germany 31 per cent of the total quotas of immigration when in their own publications, their own studies of the German element in the United States, they claim to have been the origin of but 17 per cent of our population? What justification could there be for such a disparity as that?

The same is true of the Irish. To put it in a way that seems to me rather vivid, do Senators realize that at the present time out of every million persons in Ireland 9,609 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 1890 basis has twelve times the chance of migrating 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 those 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 evident that we were getting too many people.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 2 o'clock p. m.). The Senator will suspend. The resolution will go to the calendar, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business. The Senator from Pennsylvania will proceed.

Mr. REED. It was decided then that, primarily for the purpose of cutting down the aggregate inflow, but secondarily 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, obviously, we disregard everyone of us and people like us. Should it be based on the composition of a migration of the foreign born, half of whom were not even naturalized? Half of those people at the time that census was taken were not even American citizens. They were temporary lodgers within our borders. That method ignored all of the present-day descendants of the men who settled this country, all of the descendants of the men who fought the Revolutionary War, who built up 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 condescend 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). Senators 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 the English were superior in their 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. [Laughter in 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, a matter 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 discriminate 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 meet him 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 excused from penitentiary sentences 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 own ancestry is. It came here in large numbers from Syria and the Turkish Provinces and from different countries 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.

That is not a fanciful saying. The fact is that it has taken our ancestors and us centuries to learn how to govern ourselves even as badly as we do it to-day. How can anyone expect an Arab, who has lived under some patriarchal government where he did not even dare whisper his views, to come over here and participate intelligently in the American processes of democracy? That is not fanciful, I say. We have only to look at some of our big cities to see how that population tends to govern itself.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Speaking about the Levantine Provinces, and taking Syria for instance, what would be the difference so far as immigrants from that country were concerned as between the national origins and the other plan?

Mr. REED. I have not the figures for the moment, but I do not think there is any difference.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How pertinent is the discussion of the Senator on the question before us as to the character of the people who come from those countries?

Mr. REED. It is very pertinent when we recall the fact that down until immigration was stopped in 1921 we were getting population of that sort very fast, indeed, and I am trying to show the necessity of restrictive immigration.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I suppose we all agree on that.

Mr. REED. I hope we do.

Mr. EDGE. 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 3 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 since 1924 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?

Obviously, if 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. And the accuracy.

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. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I had no desire to carry on beyond the morning hour in this matter, but I wish the Senator would make it more clear than he has just how national origins is going to give us a cleaner population, an immigration that 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 we bettered our social conditions through the United States, and national origins, which admits fewer than the 1890 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 recognized 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 pre-war geographical terms. One-fourth, and only one-fourth, came 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 1890 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 any Estonia, nor any 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 inaccuracy.

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 and no less accurate in that respect; the two systems are on a par there, but as to the foreign born who are here to-day, the millions of residents in this country who were born abroad, it is more accurate than the other method, because it is in terms of postwar geography. So when it is said that the national-origins scheme is all based on the 1790 census, please remember that only one-fourth of the calculations of national origins goes back to colonial days, and therefore has to have resort to 1790.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the resolution has gone to the calendar, I do not feel called upon to discuss it at any further length, but—

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Alabama will bear with me a moment, I desire to say that if any Senator cares to pursue the subject further or to obtain the expression of opinion of the best students of this subject we have in America, he will find them in the report of the hearings before the Immigration Committee in the last Congress, all printed in one volume, where they may be easily and rather speedily read. I think Senators will find it worth while to refer to the record of those hearings.

#### INTERFERENCE WITH SENATOR HEFLIN'S RIGHTS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I agree very heartily with practically everything the Senator from Pennsylvania has said about the need for continued restriction of immigration. I recently had an experience with some of these recently arrived foreigners when they were trying to suppress free speech in Massachusetts. Some Senators here seem now to be greatly concerned about them; they seem to be afraid they will wound their feelings if they declare here in favor of the Constitution of the United States and profess friendship for the institutions of free speech and peaceful assembly.

Doctor Lowell, the great poet of New England, was once asked, "How long will the American Republic live?" He said, "Just so long as it is true to the principles upon which it was



founded." Mr. President, that is true. Abraham Lincoln once said:

It will be no child's play to prevent the principles of Jefferson from perishing from the earth.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." It is the sworn duty of every Senator to protect and safeguard in every way possible the constitutional guaranties of free speech and peaceful assembly—the two bulwarks that will preserve our liberties when a free press ceases to be.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is opposing the resolution which I have introduced calling upon the Senate to declare its support of the institutions of free speech and peaceful assembly and to declare its condemnation of a group of foreigners, mixed with those who have been here a little longer, for attempting to assault and assassinate a United States Senator. I am going to repeat that the opposition to this resolution is the most remarkable display of un-American spirit and fear of Roman Catholicism that I have ever witnessed in this body or in any other body in which I have served, and I have served in the legislature of my State, I have served in the House of Representatives, and I have also been a Member of this body for eight years.

This morning I asked one of the Government employees to look up the resolutions introduced by the Senator from Idaho, and it is an interesting batch. The Senate has passed, as I said the other day, resolutions covering nearly every subject under the sun. I am going to have looked up all resolutions introduced by Senators and voted on and those not voted on by the Senate during the last 25 years; I am going to compile them for the benefit of the American people who wish to know the real reason for the opposition to my resolution. It will help the people back in the States to know how flimsy and feeble is the excuse given by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] for opposing a resolution that proclaims the doctrine that the right of free speech and peaceful assembly must be preserved.

I have found one resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho, in which he called on the Secretary of State to lay facts before the Senate "with reference to the charge made that a noted American correspondent of the New York Herald, William T. Ellis, is now detained, if not actually restrained of his liberty, by the British authorities at Cairo, Egypt." The Senator from Idaho is willing to reach out his strong, long distance, protecting arm to rescue a New York newspaper man who has gone abroad, because somebody is interfering with his rights as an American citizen in a foreign country, but he is not willing to have the Senate express condemnation of those who have recently interfered with American citizens' rights here at home, and not willing to have the Senate express condemnation of those who assaulted a citizen and Senator here in his own country.

Further, the resolutions asked for the facts "with reference to the charge that the American consul general and other American consular officials at Cairo have connived with the British authorities in depriving or denying said Ellis of his rights and privileges as an American citizen."

Here is an instance where a Senator is demanding that the Senate pass his resolution for the protection of a New York newspaperman's rights as an American citizen in a foreign country—and I concur in it—but that same Senator is opposed to having the same Senate demand protection for the rights of American citizens here at home. I have urged the passage of the resolution mainly in the hope that it would help to prevent such occurrences in the future and that it may be a stern warning to those who seek to kill public men in America for speaking their honest beliefs, as they have killed them in Mexico, as they killed Obregon, and as they sought to kill the present President of Mexico.

Again I read from the Borah resolution. The Senator from Idaho wanted to know "the facts with reference to the refusal of the British Government to permit said William Ellis to visit Syria and Palestine, and the reasons for such refusal."

The Senator did not want this man traveling abroad to even be inconvenienced or disturbed in any way; he demanded senatorial action immediately upon the matter. Again I say I am in agreement with him, but how can the Senator reconcile his 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 opposes a resolution now which seeks to condemn a mob for molesting, exciting, frightening, and terrorizing American citizens—men and women—in Massachusetts where a United States Senator was delivering a public address?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

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 unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside in order that the Senate may take a vote immediately on his resolution. Will the Senator agree to 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 in every State may know just what is going on here 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 how every Senator stands regarding American rights and liberties, 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 names of those who vote for and 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 do this for me personally because I would like to succeed in passing 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 to vote for it because the facts disclosed 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, those who are appealing to Senators 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 in a spirit of retaliation no Roman Catholic would be permitted 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 poltroons and cowards if they did.

Suppose the Senate shall not adopt my resolution, that is not going to deter me; I am going to continue to speak what 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 Protestant 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 Indiana want me and the people 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 their friends would have us pursue?

Mr. President, I assert that the American citizen in his own right has a right to protect his rights. He has a right to prevent people from denying him his constitutional rights; and I have the right, without asking any Roman Catholic or anybody else, to go anywhere under the American flag to speak upon questions that affect the welfare of my country. This is not Spain, and this is not Italy; but we have some of the same tactics here that they have in Italy. Mussolini's tactics



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 here.

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.

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 where a Member of this body was delivering a public address on "the dangers that threaten the American Government," where a Roman mob assembled outside the hall before he spoke—not one of them went inside—offended and annoyed the speaker and the people there and hurled insulting epithets at the speaker as he walked from the automobile to the hall. I had something to say about that un-American and cowardly conduct outside. When I came out of the hall this same group of Romanists who had waited two hours to assault a Senator who had spoken under the provision of the Constitution that gave him a right to speak, and annoyed people who had assembled as they had a right to assemble, this disturbance and attack occurred.

The Constitution says you can not do that and get away with it; and the Senate, whose duty it is in part to preserve the Constitution in its integrity, and to be ready at all times to denounce any attack upon the constitutional right of a citizen anywhere, is asked to express its condemnation of the interference with free speech and peaceful assembly and express its regret that an attempt was made to assault a Member of this body. How mean, measly, and cowardly it seems to me for any American Senator to oppose a resolution like that! What are we coming to in this body I ask again?

Is American liberty to be secretly and slowly put to death by the blighting and deadly touch of arrogant Romanism? Mr. President, here is another provision of the Constitution. That great charter and square and compass of our liberty seems to have been entirely forgotten by some Senators. Amendment IV:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons . . . shall not be violated.

The people had a right to assemble at Brockton, Mass. I had a right as an American citizen and Senator to speak to them without asking permission of any Roman Catholic there. An attempt was made to assault me. Women were frightened and fled from this local and foreign mob. A policeman was injured. Now, Senators, North and South, you have the facts before you, and they are in this Record, and other things will be said about it many times unless you settle this question in the American way. It is a serious situation. This is the first time this question has ever been presented in such a distinct and concrete form in the Senate when the Senator from Idaho has taken it upon himself to defend the Romanist side.

The Senator from Idaho said in substance the other day, if I understood him aright, that Senators could not vote for this resolution without taking sides with me on the position that I have taken upon the political activities of certain Roman Catholics against our great American Government. Let me ask him what side he will take if he votes against this resolution in its present form?

Mr. President, I believe that it is generally known here those belonging to the group that assaulted me do not want this resolution passed. They ought to be the first to condemn it. Is there anything un-American in it? Not a thing. Does it not say that free speech should be preserved? Yes. Does it not say that the right of peaceful assembly should and must be protected and preserved? Yes. Does it not say that you have heard with regret of an assault made upon a United States Senator for speaking in behalf of his country? Yes. And then does it not say that you disapprove and condemn that assault? Yes; and yet Senators stand up here and say, "I can not afford to vote for that." Well, why—why can you not? The Senator from Idaho said it was out of the line of the Senate's business; but here is a newspaper man that he follows up with a resolution away over in Cairo, Egypt.

This boy wanted to go to Palestine and Syria, and the Senator called on the Secretary of State and asked the Senate to help him make them stand out of that boy's way and let him go on his pleasure trip. But when a Senator of the United States goes out to make a speech upon the invitation of American citizens here at home and an attempt is made to assassinate

him and he calls on the body in which he serves to condemn that act the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Indiana lead an onslaught against it!

Mr. President, after this unfortunate and terrible thing had occurred a group of fine citizens—one a brave, fine, ex-service man, with a splendid record overseas—asked me if there was not some way in which we could get some public expression in the way of condemnation of such conduct. He said, "Trouble is going to arise at one of these meetings some time if this keeps up." He said, "The man whose wife stood up there and hollered at you, 'Long live the Pope' and 'We don't need but one religion in the United States, and that is the Roman Catholic religion'—he said, 'I did not like the looks of her husband standing there with both hands in his pockets.' He said, 'Did you notice that he had both hands in his pockets?' I said, 'Yes.' He said, 'He never would have gotten one of them out. I would have attended to that.'"

There you have it; and he would have, no doubt, and he ought to have, killed this man if he had tried to kill me. Why not? Would not a Protestant American have a right to defend himself when he was doing his duty as he saw it and doing what he had a right to do as an American citizen and Senator? I kept my eye on him; and this Army officer, a brave, upstanding American and a fine man and, like George Washington, was a master Mason, said, "He never would have drawn any pistol out on you, Senator." And he said, "This is the most outrageous thing I have ever witnessed. Is there not some way to get a public expression against such conduct and to repudiate this un-American act here in our country?"

That is how I came to think about bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I said, "Yes; I think I will bring it to the attention of the Senate," and I did so; and then these Roman priests, with their collars turned around [laughter], commenced swarming about these corridors of the Capitol. Oh, they were very active around here—and many of those who are giving us trouble are foreign priests. You know, there is where our trouble is coming from, most of it—these priests and nuns that are imported, coming in from foreign countries. They are brought in here, and they have not the American viewpoint; they have the foreign viewpoint. They have, in the main, the Roman, Italian, viewpoint, and some of them are the deadly enemies of American ideals and institutions. "By their fruits ye shall know them." They have been busy around the Senate Office Building also. I saw three coming out of there the other day. Oh, no; they do not want this resolution passed. They said, "We are going to punish HEFLIN and lead him to a terrible defeat now."

Yes; old Haman once erected a scaffold on which to hang Mordecai, and when the hanging took place it was Haman who was hanged. Esther had trouble in presenting her cause to the king, just as I am having trouble here presenting the cause of my country. They told her that it was dangerous to go in to the king if he did not invite her to broach this subject; but finally she said, "My people's rights and liberties are at stake. I will go, and if I perish, I perish." Her people were saved. Mordecai was not hanged. It was Haman that was hanged.

Now, I want to relieve the mind of the Senator from Idaho of the idea that the question of religious liberty is concerned in this matter from his standpoint. I refuse to hide behind that plea. I am for religious liberty. I am for the religious liberty that Jefferson fought for. I do not want religious liberty interfered with. I have said here and I have said elsewhere, everywhere I have spoken, that I would not disturb the Roman Catholic in his right to worship as he chooses; but disturbing free speech in America is not a part of his religious liberty. That is dangerous political action against my Government's principles and her citizens' rights and liberties. His attempt to destroy the right of peaceful assembly does not interfere with his approaching the throne of grace. I repeat I am in favor of religious liberty.

When the Senator says we are not far removed from the thumbcrew and the rack and all that, I reply that we are going to come back to them unless such things as I am complaining of here is stopped.

If trouble comes upon these Roman Catholics, they will bring it on themselves—20,000,000 of them out of 120,000,000 of people, and those doing the devilment, thick-headed foreign priests, most of them. There are some good priests among them, I am told. But none of them, so far as I know, have ever condemned the Roman attacks upon our American institutions. I want the Catholics themselves to get the truth about this question. The Roman priests and nuns are not going to give it to them. The young newspaper man, where I spoke that night in Massachusetts, a Catholic, told the old newspaper reporter that I had "opened his eyes," and that he was sorry that many



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 to excuse his action by seeking to 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 down in Virginia in the old days that Jefferson 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 the church and who finally went in and disturbed them 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. The Senator was unfortunate in referring to that. I stand with Jefferson upon that, and I stand with him on another thing, and I invite the Senator's attention to that—equal rights to all, and special privileges to none. I want this constitutional provision in behalf of free speech and peaceful assembly invoked for the Protestant, for the Jew, and for the Catholic. Would the Senator favor giving special privilege to interfere with these rights to the Roman Catholic? Would he let him violate free speech and peaceful assembly, but not the Protestant and Jew?

The Constitution says that Congress shall make no law that will disturb or abridge free speech and peaceful assembly. Yet a Roman Catholic group, a mob, is permitted to disturb and abridge the right of peaceful assembly. The Constitution will not even let Congress do it. Can an outsider, an outlaw, a would-be assassin, do it and get away with it? That seems to be the program of some of you here.

Mr. President, here is the oath every Senator takes when he comes into this body:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same—

True faith and true allegiance!—

That I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion—

Are some trying to evade it now?—

and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter; so help me God.

Then when a resolution comes before us reciting that it is the duty of the Senate to stand firm at all times in the promotion and protection of the American citizen's right of free speech and peaceable assembly, some Senators balk and back up and think they will get away with it. But not so. The Protestant people back home are gradually getting their eyes open and they are going to let you know it soon. You have not begun this fight with me. It is now in its incipient stage. Unless I am murdered I will continue this fight. How would some of you who are afraid to vote in favor of my resolution want me to act if our places were reversed; and I am speaking to those on both sides; I am no respecter of persons in this, because I can not understand how any big, broad, brave American would hesitate a minute to vote for a measure of this kind. How many of you think I would hesitate a minute if this had happened to any Republican on the other side? If you had brought a resolution in here, I would have made a speech in favor of it, and I would have helped you put it through.

It is a great American principle, Senators. I can not understand your attitude. Some of the newspaper boys say you are playing politics with the dearest rights and liberties that ever came to mortal man.

Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget!

It is an awful and a dreadful thing if you are playing politics. Are you trying to stand from under some of the things asserted in the campaign last year. They want to make you apologize for the fight you made in the campaign last year. As Americans, you had a right to make any clean campaign you wanted to make, and I presume that some of you now vividly recall that that same group tried to tell you and to force you at headquarters to make the fight along the lines they wanted you to make it on. You know that is true. They used to give out statements that you had better repudiate somebody's speech here and yonder. That went on all through the campaign.

Listen! That is not a circumstance to what will happen in the campaign of 1932. They are bent on controlling the United States. In saying that I am not guilty of religious prejudice, 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 for him to decide. But I am going to give you some of the reasons. It is because the real, 100 per cent Roman Catholic does not believe in the American Constitution, strictly construed, as we understand it. Why do I say that? Roman Catholic priests will not allow Catholics to attend divine service in other churches. I am giving you facts. Is there any religious freedom in that? I have a right to go to any church I want to go to. But the Roman Catholic is forbidden to go to other churches than the Catholic Church.

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 Chichester 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 in France. A Roman Catholic 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 also in the Episcopal Church, but the Catholic 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.

This 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 said he came here 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 bit of light. There was a Catholic priest, or bishop, who 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. If I am 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 talk 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 bigoted that bunch is when Protestantism and Romanism clash. 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 Catholic and a Protestant or a Jew. You are given unlimited 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 at night one of the managers of the paper phoned down 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, "I think I can give you a good headline for that. Say 'Another Parson Caught.'" He told him a little more about it. He said, "Who is this bird, anyhow?" He said, "He is Father o' Something," or words to that effect. He said, "Oh, hell! 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 headed for 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 Friday night Senator HEFLIN will lecture on the Mexican situation.

When those signs went around the town in the street cars, in the newspapers, and in circulars, 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 wanted to use it to make a public address. He said, "I 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. Twelve hundred tickets have been sold, the seating capacity of this place." The general manager said, "You cut it out. Lock those 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 bitter about a matter. Priests are walking 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 have him issue an order to open the theater but he is off somewhere on the circuit. We have a judge over here who is sick in the hospital, but we have sent for him." This judge, propped up in his bed, good, whole-hearted American, issued an order. He said, "Yes; I will issue it and they had better not come before me in court." He signed the order to open the theater, to permit the theater to be used as agreed to and that the people who had all those tickets should have their seats.

Now, listen: A Roman Catholic county officer whose duty it was to serve that writ hid out and they could not find him and the writ was never served. One thousand two hundred Americans held at bay in the dark by the intolerance of Roman Catholics. They came back to the hotel and told me the situation. Listen, you who still love your country, you who still are unafraid of this Roman group! They said, "What are we going to do?" I said, "I don't know. It is a little cool to speak outside. Have you a hall you could get them into?" "Yes; but we haven't got more than 250 seats in it and there are 1,200 to 1,500 people there." I said, "Put them in it if they will stand."

I went up there and spoke. I never had such a crowd jammed about me in my life. A Protestant preacher, who had been weak kneed and who had been vacillating just like some Senators I know, wobbly and afraid to touch the subject, when I got through with my speech rolled up his sleeves and said, "Senator HEFLIN, will you let me say a word?" I said, "I will." He said, "God being my helper, from this time on I am going to stand for everything that is American and I am not going to be timid any more. 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."

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." "Yes; we built it as a memorial to the boys who were killed in France." I said, "It is a magnificent memorial." "By the way," a gentleman said, "did I tell you about the difficulty we had in getting it for to-night? We already had permission from the chairman of the board, but when the Catholics found you were going to speak on the Mexican situation they went and demanded that the permit be canceled. 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 6 to 3 for you to have the hall." I said "I can tell you the complexion of the committee. Six of them are Protestants and the other three Catholics." "No; you have it nearly right. Two of them are Roman Catholics and one of them married a Catholic." I said, "I knew 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 exercise free speech and the people in the community 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 reprehensible and un-American things and there will 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?

Senators, that is plain talk, 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 their mouths on the subject. I know a heap about this question 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 to Catholics throughout the Nation. Did any of you who oppose 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 the un-American doctrine of union of church and state, and you never let it pass just because I had that provision attached to it. It went over. Is not that true?

Now, listen: Doctor Ryan, a Catholic professor and priest of the Catholic University, is an appointee of the king, the Catholic king, in Rome. He holds his office to-day under the Catholic Pope and king. Here is what he said the other night in New York in debate with Mr. Marshall who had something to say about Governor Smith and his isms. Doctor Ryan was asked, "Do the Roman Catholics in America accept the doctrine of 'the union of church and state'?" He said, "Yes." Then ask me whether I will vote for a Catholic for President or not when their mouthpiece and leader stands up on the mountain top and trumpets it around the country that that group is antagonistic to and dares to proclaim its opposition to the fundamental doctrine of the American Government?

Then 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.

I repeat I am wholeheartedly for religious freedom. The Senator from Idaho can not hide behind the untenable and ridiculous issue that he has raised. I am giving you my reasons why I am trying to get the Roman Catholic group in America to get right, to come into the American system and be like we are in it, worshipping as they choose, but all locking hands with one purpose around the flag to preserve it and to perpetuate the institutions it represents. That is my position.

But these are not all of the reasons I have for being against a Roman Catholic for President. Doctor Ryan said in his book—and I invite the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to read it. I assert that these things are in it and I ask him to prove to the contrary, not merely to get up and say how dangerous it is to stir up religious bias and prejudice. What are you going to do, in the name of God and in the name of our patriotic forefathers dead and of those living and of the children yet unborn, when these activities come out in front of us and when the climax is reached; after killing Obregon in Mexico and undertaking to kill the President and then beginning their program



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 heroic 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. If I was a judge on the bench and 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 the Jews; 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 it is where, thank God, we have religious freedom and the right of free speech, peaceful assembly, and free 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 the policeman, 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 shaken his gory locks in many a struggle; 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 issue. It is the first time that it has been presented. He invited this comparison. He said if you voted for my resolution you took sides with me, and I answered back if that is true and you vote 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 provision 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 HEFLIN'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?

Mr. Lincoln, when quite a 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 proscribe 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 continually despised and disregarded—

Free speech and peaceful assembly—

if their rights to be secure in their persons—

If they are disregarded—

if their rights to be secure in their persons and property are held by no better tenure than the caprice of a mob—

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

the alienation of their affection from the Government is a natural consequence, and to that sooner or later it must come.

There Mr. Lincoln is talking to you and stating that if you do not come to the rescue of the citizen when his rights are trampled upon, when his liberties are taken from him—if the Gov-

ernment permits it, if it smiles at it, if it condones it and sanctions it, then the citizen will turn against the Government in time.

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 methods 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 and 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 he was selling it for; it looks 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, to find out the wages 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 and hereby expresses its disapproval and condemnation of the conduct of those who may be guilty of the same.

Sensors, what do you think of that? What will the country think of that? That is as far as I have gone with the batch of resolutions presented by the Senator from Idaho; I have not had a chance to peruse 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 mistreat 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 the 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. I have two other important 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 BORAH says if you vote 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 even express your regret at an attack upon 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 voting against the resolution you refuse to disapprove and condemn those who attempted to murder a Member of this body. It has long been a fine and beautiful custom here, when a Member of the Senate dies, for the Senate unanimously to pass 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 opposing the passage of a resolution expressing regret 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. Nobody denies that the people of Brockton, Mass., were interfered with in the exercise of their American rights under the Constitution that every Senator here has taken an oath to support and defend. Nobody denies that on that occasion an assault with a deadly weapon was made upon a United States Senator for exercising his constitutional right of free speech.

The passage of this resolution would have a wholesome effect upon those who have already interfered with the right of free speech and peaceful assembly in the past and who may hereafter be tempted to do so, and it will indeed be comforting and reassuring to law-abiding citizens everywhere to know that the Senate of the United States is courageously on guard at all times and quick to resent and condemn attacks from any source upon the American citizen's constitutional rights and liberties. But your failure to pass this resolution is a declaration to loyal Americans everywhere that you are not concerned in the protection of the constitutional rights and liberties of the average American citizen.

What are the American people to think of your action here if you refuse to express your regret and disapproval of interference with the right of free speech and the right of peaceful assembly—two of the mightiest bulwarks of constitutional government in America? What will they think if you say by your votes that you have not heard with regret of an effort to assassinate a United States Senator for daring to speak about what he considers are "the dangers that threaten the American Government"? What strange influence will they think is at work here if you decline to express your disapproval and condemnation of the conduct of those who, in their desire to prevent the discussion in free America of a question they did not want discussed, sought to assassinate a Senator?

Now, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Indiana if he will permit us to have a vote on my resolution and to have a roll call?

Mr. WATSON. Not at the present time, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana objects.

Mr. HEFLIN. I give notice that I shall discuss another phase of this question on to-morrow.

#### FARM RELIEF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing, and in the control and disposition of the surplus, of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] for a moment? What does the Senator understand was the action of the House as regards perishable agricultural products? Does he understand that they are given the same treatment as the more substantial and stable products?

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator ask with reference to the provision of the bill which provides that cooperatives may organize clearing houses?

Mr. COPELAND. No; I am speaking now about the House bill.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that.

Mr. COPELAND. Was there a provision in the House bill for the same clearing-house arrangement?

Mr. McNARY. Precisely.

Mr. COPELAND. Is that the only place in the bill where perishables are dealt with—I mean to say, where the phrase "agricultural commodities" occurs?

Mr. McNARY. Oh, no; it is within the discretion of the stabilization corporation to take over the surplus of any commodity, whether it be perishable or nonperishable.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will remember that last year we had a discussion in the Senate on this subject.

Mr. McNARY. May I obtrude there for a moment? That was with respect to the imposition of an equalization fee, whether it applied to perishables or nonperishables. There being no fee in this matter, consequently there need not be any division of agricultural commodities. They come right along with any other commodity of which there might be a surplus, or which it would be necessary to have receive the treatment of the stabilization corporation for the purposes of orderly marketing.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will recall that last year, on my motion, perishables were excluded from the equalization fee, in so far as the action of the Senate was concerned.

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

Mr. COPELAND. But they were afterwards restored in the conference. May I ask the Senator what is his attitude now toward the application of this bill to perishables? Does he feel that it should be applied to perishables in the same way as to stable commodities?

Mr. McNARY. I can see no reason why the bill should not have full application to all agricultural commodities; but, as I said a moment ago, in the bill we had before us last year I can see why it was proper that an equalization fee should not apply to perishables, because of the fact that they are difficult to carry over and to store from one period to another period of a season.

Mr. COPELAND. I assume that the Senator is aware that the same groups that were in opposition to perishables being included in the equalization fee last year are just as positive in their belief that they should not be included now.

Mr. McNARY. That is information which is not now in my possession. I have never heard of it before.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me say, for the benefit of the Senator and others who may be interested, that I have a number of letters and telegrams in opposition to the inclusion of perishables. I mention that now simply in order that it may be a matter of record. Furthermore, I find that the dairy interests of my State are in opposition to the bill. Has the Senator had any communication or testimony from the dairy interests regarding the matter?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I discussed at length with the representatives of the various associations their objections last Saturday.

Mr. COPELAND. In the same connection, I should like to call the attention of the able Senator in charge of the bill to page 17, section 9, with reference to the clearing-house associations. I notice that in the committee print of the bill, at line 19, the first line of the section, are included not only cooperative associations but also "other organizations controlled by producers of any perishable agricultural commodity."

Mr. SMITH. What page is that?

Mr. COPELAND. 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 provision in the House bill. Indeed, the drafting bureau prepared 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. COPELAND. 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 the dairy interests opposed clearing houses, and probably the producers of some perishables. I am not sure whether it will be successful or not. The Department of Agriculture thought great good probably would come from these clearing houses assisting the cooperatives in preventing gluts and famines, and bringing 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 benefits if that whole provision were stricken out; but so long as it is there, and in the judgment of the board, upon the petition of cooperatives, that instrumentality can be used for the benefit of those producers who desire its employment, I can see no harm in permitting it to remain in the bill.

That is my answer to that inquiry.

Mr. COPELAND. Would the Senator seriously protest against limiting the operation of this bill to the nonperishables and omitting from it the reference to the clearing-house associations?

Mr. McNARY. Certainly. The committee has reported this bill in its present form. As far as I can, personally, as chairman, I want to keep the bill in its present form. I do not think a substantial number of producers of perishables want their commodities removed from the operation of the provisions of this bill. There may be a few up in the city of New York who do; but, taking the producers of the country generally, in my opinion they believe that many advantages and much assistance may be derived from being included within the operation of the bill.



Mr. COPELAND. One purpose of the questions I have asked of the Senator is to ascertain what is the attitude 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 my State are concerned, I am satisfied that they do not wish to be included in the bill now any more than they did last year.

Mr. McNARY. May I make an inquiry of the Senator? He had a very substantial reason last year for taking out from under 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 those commodities that are perishable. Consequently, they did not want to have the board given power to levy an equalization 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 come 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. Suppose 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 lasting 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 successfully with perishables; yet, after all, Mr. President, I am satisfied to have 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, and I shall be 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.

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

Ashurst	Fletcher	Keyes	Simmons
Barkley	Frazier	King	Steck
Bingham	George	La Follette	Steiger
Black	Gillett	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Blaine	Glenn	McNary	Smith
Blease	Goff	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Goldsborough	Norris	Townsend
Bratton	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Brookhart	Harris	Overman	Tyson
Broussard	Harrison	Patterson	Vandenberg
Burton	Hastings	Phipps	Wagner
Caraway	Hatfield	Pittman	Walcott
Connally	Hebert	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Heflin	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Couzens	Howell	Robinson, Ind.	Watson
Deneen	Johnson	Sackett	Wheeler
Dill	Jones	Sheppard	
Fess	Kean	Shortridge	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I shall propose to the McNary farm relief bill. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. This amendment in regard to the disposition of Muscle Shoals is the same as a bill which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative WRIGHT, of Georgia, one of the ablest and best men in that body and a member of the Military Committee, in charge of this bill. This is a matter we have been considering here for years, and as it is indicated that we will have several weeks' recess waiting for the Finance Committee to report the tariff bill, it seems to me the Senate ought to stay here and decide what is to be done with Muscle Shoals. Why should Senators go home on vacation and neglect to make this matter a part of the farm relief bill? The Government has spent over a hundred million dollars on this project; we have now a President who is one of the great engineers of the world, and it seems to me there could not be a better time than the present for the consideration of that matter.

I voted for the Norris bill and for the Underwood bill and for the bill which was passed and vetoed by President Coolidge. I did not like some of the provisions contained in all these measures, but I believe in including Muscle Shoals in the farm relief bill, and if we can not pass the Norris bill, which was

vetoed, then let us pass the Madden bill with amendments, or some other measure. At present the Government is losing several million dollars a year by not leasing the project, and I think something ought to be done about it without delay. I merely offer this amendment so as to bring the matter before the Senate, and I shall support this or any other measure which I believe will be in the interest of what I think ought to be done for national defense and to give the farmers cheaper fertilizers, just as it was intended by the original law to develop Muscle Shoals—it was to help the farmers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what his amendment provides?

Mr. HARRIS. The amendment is the Madden bill, with some changes in it, but I offer it simply to get the matter before the Senate. I believe we should take the best provisions from all the bills so as to really benefit the farmers by giving them cheaper fertilizers and enabling them to make their crops cheaper. I supported the Norris bill, and I shall be glad to support it again, but if we can not get that, I want to get some other measure that both Houses of Congress will pass. Every day this legislation is delayed the farmers of the South are becoming poorer, and, through no fault of their own, as they have worked hard and denied themselves and families many necessities of life, to say nothing of luxuries.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I want to submit an inquiry to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There is now pending before the Senate Senate bill 1, and there is likewise before this body House bill 1. My inquiry is as to the procedure that is to be followed, whether or not we shall consider the Senate bill to its completion, or whether at some stage in the proceedings we shall substitute the House bill for the Senate bill, and take final action upon the House bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was just about to explain that very matter when I was anticipated by the Senator from Oklahoma. 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 usual 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.

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If I understand 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 true.

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 is now?

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.

Mr. NORRIS. 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 debenture 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 is now pending 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:

But pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

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. McNARY. Probably I could bring that about by a motion.

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

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I had forgotten for the moment that the Senator's request for unanimous consent was not only to consider the House bill, but that all after the enacting clause in that bill be stricken out, and the Senate bill be inserted in its place. To make it certain that we could still go on under parliamentary rules and consider amendments, after that had been done, it seems to me the Senator should, in accordance with the suggestion made by the Senator from Arkansas, add to his unanimous-consent request a request that after that is done, the inserted part should be considered as open to amendment, just the same as though it were an original bill.

Mr. McNARY. I am willing to so amend the request.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to ask the Senator if he could not remove this complication altogether by having the Senate proceed with the consideration of the Senate bill, and when all amendments have been acted upon by the Senate, then move to substitute the Senate bill as amended for the House bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I would have no objection to that procedure. The one I am suggesting is the uniform practice. I think it is immaterial whether I should ask for the substitution at this time or later.

There is a situation I was trying to correct. The House bill has reached the Senate. There are no copies of that bill available. If my request should be agreed to, each Member would have, under the rules, as many copies as he wanted. If we shall go ahead with the consideration of the Senate bill without reference to the House bill, I shall then have to request that a thousand more copies of the House bill be printed for the use of the Senate. In order to obviate that printing I thought at this time I would ask for the usual substitution, which has been the uniform practice. That conforms with the practice of the Senate for a long time, but if anyone desires that we go on in the regular parliamentary way, I shall not persist in my request; but in order to get the matter into such shape that we may go ahead with the Senate bill, I ask unanimous consent that a thousand copies of the House bill be printed for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Reserving the right to object, did I understand the Senator to say that if the Senate bill were substituted for the House bill, it would not be necessary to print a thousand copies of the House bill?

Mr. McNARY. As it is now, no order has been made. The House bill simply lies on the desk of the clerk of the Senate. Many inquiries have come to the chairman of the committee for copies of the House bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well—

Mr. McNARY. Just a moment. If my suggestion, as embodied in my request for unanimous consent, had been followed, the bill would have been printed, and the print of House bill No. 1 as a substitute for the Senate text would have appeared to-morrow. Some one has suggested that possibly some complications might follow. Therefore I have recalled my request and now am asking unanimous consent that a thousand copies of the bill as it passed the House be printed for the use of the Members of this body.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, before the Senator withdraws his request, I suggest that he submit it to the Senate. No one has actually objected to the request, or indicated a purpose to do so. As modified by the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska, I can not see anything to object to.

Mr. McNARY. I can not, either, but I understood the Senator from North Carolina—

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I did not understand him to object. I understood him to say that the Senator should defer his request for a short time.

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 bill for the bill as it passed the House until 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 parliamentary confusion, while the course proposed by the Senator from Oregon, I think, would lead to a good deal of parliamentary confusion.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

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 rates in the tariff schedules shall be correspondingly lowered in order to discourage industry. We certainly ought to be willing that the farmer shall have as square a deal as anybody else. I say there is not another industry in America that any Senator would propose we should prescribe a penalty for if it overproduces; 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 so 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 more next 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 agricultural-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-spread 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 that 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."

Why 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 eradicate the corn borer when he was doing more to restrict the corn production than any other agency? Why did we try to stamp out the Hessian fly that restricts the production of wheat? Why do we want to legislate against the boll worm which threatens cotton 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 brawn and make the best of your facilities and produce more cotton, we are going to deny you your equal right under the law and penalize you for your industry." It seems to me it 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 industrial 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 treat you like a criminal and we are going to 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 destroyed by excess water. Why do we do that if 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 does not contain it, but it seems to me to be indefensible, 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 all the time, would it?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. DILL. What I would like to get the Senator's view about is why it 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 stimulant when the collapse of the industry was complete, as it now is. If the produce, whether wheat or corn or meat, 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 nobody wants to invoke that remedy.

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 section 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 effectual upon agricultural products because we have an exportable 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—50 per cent of what they have now written in the law. The average protection upon industry or manufactured goods in this country is 42.5 cents and the average on agricultural products is 21.2 cents, and we only ask for one-half of one-half of what they get 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 are more industrious, 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 that.

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 demand it, of course, there is nothing under the proposed legislation 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 colleague 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 whenever 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's conclusion as to whether the estimated 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 11½ 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 would need it?

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. 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. NORRIS. Yes; so that if there was an increased production during the five years up to 39 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. NORRIS. So 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. 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, or 44 or 45 cents. It will make 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 Senate 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

William D. L. Starbuck, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Federal Radio Commission for a term expiring February 23, 1930.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Chief Boatswain Richard E. Hawes to be an ensign in the Navy from the 18th day of February, 1929, in accordance with a provision of an act of Congress approved that date.

Dental Surg. John R. Barber to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 28th day of August, 1926, 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 Schudt, Coast Artillery Corps (detached in Militia Bureau), with rank from October 2, 1927.

##### CHEMICAL WARFARE SERVICE

Capt. James Emerson Troupe, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from March 31, 1928.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be lieutenant colonel*

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

*To be major*

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

*To be captains*

First Lieut. Glen Teter Strock, 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 Kay Ladd, Air Corps, from April 23, 1929.

*To be first lieutenants*

Second Lieut. James Stewart Willis, Signal Corps, from April 16, 1929.

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

Second Lieut. Augustine Davis Dugan, 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 23, 1929.

##### MEDICAL CORPS

*To be captain*

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

#### APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### GENERAL OFFICER

*To be brigadier general, reserve*

Brig. Gen. Frank Elisha Reed, Minnesota National Guard, from April 24, 1929.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 29, 1929*

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Alfred C. Coxe, southern district of New York.  
Clarence G. Galston, eastern district of New York.  
Francis G. Caffey, southern district of New York.  
John M. Woolsey, southern district of New York.  
J. Lyles Glenn, eastern and western districts of South Carolina.

##### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGES

George T. McDermott, tenth circuit.

Orie L. Phillips, tenth circuit.

##### ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Seth W. Richardson.

##### COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS

Earl D. Church.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Emmett O. Hall, northern district of Indiana.

##### ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Julius Klein.



## DIRECTOR COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Raymond S. Patton.

## COAST GUARD

*To be ensigns*

Romeo J. Borromey.  
George H. Bowerman.  
Carl G. Bowman.  
Bret H. Brallier.  
William B. Chiswell.  
Peter V. Colmar.  
Marius De Martino.  
John A. Dirks.  
Lowell C. Gibson.  
Garrett V. Graves.  
William P. Hawley.  
Harry A. Loughlin.  
Perry S. Lyons.  
Donald B. MacDiarmid.

George W. Nelson.  
Palmer A. Niles.  
Charles M. Perrott, jr.  
Oliver A. Peterson.  
Stanley F. Piekos.  
Edwin J. Roland.  
Richard M. Ross.  
William B. Scheibel.  
Hans F. Slade.  
James C. Wendland.  
Allen Winbeck.  
Henry J. Wuensch.  
John N. Zeller.

## POSTMASTERS

## CALIFORNIA

Alva M. Smith, Chino.  
Mary B. Buswell, Delhi.

## INDIANA

Howard T. Himes, Ladoga.

## KANSAS

Glen D. Rose, Eureka.

## NEVADA

Erwin E. Frost, Golconda.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Ozro N. Barclay, Bridgeville.  
Edwin D. Brigham, Tioga.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, April 29, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

At each step of our onward path, O God, some gift of rare blessedness Thou dost bestow. We thank Thee that Thou dost hold us in Thy mighty arms with love divine and wilt not let us go. Enable us, O Lord, to make these days most significant; but high over every other motive may we strive to love Thee sincerely and to serve Thee humbly. Do Thou lead us on and on until the eternal morning breaks and we reach the crowning miracle of the best life, in which truth in its beauty and simplicity are established forever. We can not see far ahead; but for what lies beyond may we trust the hand of our Heavenly Father. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 26, 1929, was read and approved.

## SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. LANHAM appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

## THE RECORD

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to expunge from the RECORD of April 26, 1929, on page 612, the word "[Applause]," appearing after the statement:

He fired five shots at the left rear wheel. Four of those shots hit the car within a radius of 8 inches and the fifth shot in line, from a vertical standpoint, but 2 or 3 feet higher than the other four shots, passed through the back of the car, struck the driver in the back of the head, and killed him.

Also, on the same page of the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to expunge the word "[Applause]" after the statement:

Does not the gentleman think we ought to reprimand this officer for wasting those four shots instead of using just one?

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from New York must stay within the RECORD, because the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] called attention at the time to the fact that all of that applause was on the Republican side. We Democrats were willing for the court to try the case.

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

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. LAGUARDIA. This is not correcting a mistake. It is a request to expunge. I am sure the gentleman wants that word expunged from the RECORD, because future generations will not understand all of the details and the temperament of the House at the time.

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

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON 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 \$6,000,000 for relief of farmers in a certain designated area of 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 and in Georgia a series of cyclones, certainly the worst that ever occurred in the history of the State of Georgia. The path of the cyclone extends from west to east through the first and twelfth 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-odd 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 two, and even an eagle in the air 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 \$6,000,000 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 same States. There was left from that appropriation in round numbers about \$2,000,000, or perhaps a little more. The Agricultural Department gave me an estimate last Saturday in which they said that up until the 20th of April there was expended of that \$6,000,000, \$3,250,000. On the 24th there was expended \$3,678,000. At the time other checks were out for notes which had been approved. So, you see, the fund is being used at about the rate of something like \$100,000 a day, but it is thought that there will be at least \$2,000,000 remaining over.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, and I do not think any Member of the House has any objection to the purpose of the resolution. But carrying out the suggestion I made, the phraseology 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 phraseology 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 \$6,000,000 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 extend the period during which 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. This phraseology says "the funds are hereby made applicable to any storm or flood occurring in such area subsequent to the date of the enactment of this resolution." That clearly applies to storms that may come hereafter.

Mr. LARSEN. That applies to 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 the crop the fund would not be available in any event.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Would not the objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin be met by inserting just before the word "subsequent" the words "heretofore 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. Wood, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, been consulted with reference to this resolution?

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it important that that resolution 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 cottonseed 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 does approve it.

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 this 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 believe 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 who have returned as much as 25 per cent?

Mr. WILLIAMS 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 \$6,000,000, 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 and after the Members of the House have 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 his 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 of order 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 first 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 \$3,000,000 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 I 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 amendments as I should 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 had consideration by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee before it was brought before the House; but being assured 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 loans 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. I ask the House to indulge me for a moment. I am heartily in favor of the passage of the resolution. I had 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 \$6,000,000.

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 resolution now.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want the gentleman from Alabama to understand that my objection is not at this time based upon the question of the merits of his proposition. It does not necessarily indicate what my own 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 I am hoping will be favorably reported by that committee as soon as the committee has opportunity to consider it in the usual way. The committee has been busy with the farm relief bill. 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 permit its conversion to a different use but merely extends it to 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; it is an extension of a former appropriation.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Speaker will permit, there would have been no appropriation in order for relief in the State of Georgia and the other States named except by reason of an act previously passed, authorizing an appropriation for use in Georgia and the other States named. Now, we are told that that appropriation heretofore made shall be available in 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. The money could not now be spent 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 clearly right if this were an appropriation, but it occurs to the Chair—

Mr. CRAMTON. And further, if I may suggest to the Speaker, while I believe it is an appropriation, let me make this further suggestion on 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 given this aid. 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 Larsen amendment has nothing to do with anything except the question of the particular storms creating the damage. Now the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] introduces an entirely different subject, not the question of what storms shall be considered but the question of what States shall be considered, and therefore it is not germane to the Larsen amendment. Whether or not it may have been germane to the original legislation, it is not germane to the Larsen amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold with the gentleman if the Chair believed this to be an appropriation—

Mr. CRAMTON. But, Mr. Speaker, my argument now is not on the question of whether it is an appropriation. My argument now is not on the question of the authorization but is purely on the broad question of germaneness, which rule is the same whether it is an appropriation bill or a legislative bill. I am urging that whether the Rankin amendment would have been germane to the original legislation or not, it is not germane to the Larsen amendment because the Larsen amendment has only to do with the question of what storms shall be considered, while the Rankin amendment considers the question of what States are to be considered.

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 to any storm or flood occurring in any such area subsequent to the date of the enactment of this resolution.

The resolution applies to a certain definite and specific area. The question is, Is it germane to enlarge the area by adding another area. The Chair thinks not and sustains the point of order.

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

A motion by Mr. LARSEN to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANTS

Mr. COLTON, from the Joint Committee on Investigation of the Northern Pacific Land Grants, submitted a privileged report, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

#### PROCEEDINGS UPON THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged concurrent resolution from the Committee on Printing.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That there be printed and bound, with illustrations, the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, upon the acceptance of the statue of Robert M. La Follette, presented by the State of Wisconsin, 10,000 copies, of which 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 3,000 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

SEC. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders made for to-morrow may be transferred to Wednesday. I also ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week it may be in order for the Committee on Agriculture to call up bills reported by that committee and that they be considered under the Calendar Wednesday rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the special order agreed to for to-morrow may be in order on Wednesday. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Connecticut further asks unanimous consent that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday it may be in order for the Committee on Agriculture to call up certain bills under the Calendar Wednesday rule. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Reserving the right to object, is it the purpose to call up the amendment to the oleomargarine bill?

Mr. PURNELL. It is, and three or four other bills reported by the committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I object.

#### THE REMAKING OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting the addresses given last week at the Friday night session arranged by Secretary Mellon upon Washington development—the addresses of Governor MONTAGUE, Mr. Bennett, Major Atkins, and myself. Permission was given on Friday for the addresses of the first evening to be printed, and this has to do with the second evening.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought that leave was given the other day for the addresses of all who spoke.

Mr. CRAMTON. That was only with reference to the first evening's proceedings. This has to do with the second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Andrew W. Mellon, who has under his direction the extensive Federal building program now under way in the Capital City, in bringing that program to the attention of the Nation, arranged the two meetings held Thursday and Friday evenings,

April 25 and 26, in the auditorium of the United States Chamber of Commerce Building. The addresses Thursday evening by the President; the Secretary of the Treasury; Senator SMOOT, chairman of the Public Buildings Commission; Representative ELLIOTT, chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; and Mr. Milton B. Medary were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26, by Mr. ELLIOTT, and appear on pages 603 et seq.

At the Friday evening meeting the Secretary of the Treasury introduced as presiding officer for the evening Mr. Charles Moore, chairman of the National Commission of Fine Arts. Under the leave given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the addresses delivered at that time by Mr. Moore; Mr. Edward H. Bennett, chairman of the Board of Architectural Consultants, Treasury Department; Maj. L. E. Atkins, assistant engineer commissioner of the District of Columbia; and myself. I greatly regret that the very interesting extemporaneous address delivered on that occasion by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] can not be included, as no manuscript for it exists.

The addresses follow:

#### ADDRESS BY MR. CHARLES MOORE, CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

To-night the past rises before me as a dream. Last night I listened to the powerful Secretary Mellon take the executive responsibility in formulating and carrying out plans for the greatest group of public buildings ever constructed at one time in the history of the world. Then President Hoover placed behind the project the force of his office and his personality. Senator SMOOT and Representative ELLIOTT told of securing the abundant legislation from the Congress inspired by their patriotic appeals.

As I listened to these paeans my memory went back over the 27 years to that snowy afternoon of January 15, 1902, when, at the Corcoran Gallery, Senator McMillan, on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, revealed the plan of 1901 to President Roosevelt and his Cabinet, notably to Secretaries John Hay and Elihu Root, all three of whom became its aggressive and effective supporters, and by their official acts drove the firm pegs that fastened that plan for the ages to come.

Through the bewildering fogs of indifference, over the treacherous shoals of misunderstanding, amid the sharp reefs of opposition, the staunch plan of 1901 has been steered into its appointed harbor of realization, there to discharge its cargo of benefits and blessings.

Later in the evening you shall see on the screen the achievements of a quarter century; and also goals for future striving; for so long as the Nation lives its Capital never will be finished. What you will not see depicted are the struggles, often heart-breaking struggles, that marked every one of these now lauded triumphs. Those conflicts are now swallowed up in victory.

Time fails me to name the noble host who have come forward in time of peril to do battle for the unity, the dignity, the beauty of the Capital of the United States.

There is fascination in the fray—something akin to the lure of the crusaders to rescue the Holy City from the infidel. It means thought and time and patience and rebuffs and misrepresentation of motives, but it is worth the sacrifice.

It may be only fancy on my part, but I suspect strongly that no future triumphs possible in national finance are so alluring or stimulating or satisfying to Mr. Mellon as is the quest on which he is now embarked—the quest of good order and beauty made incarnate in the National Capital.

#### ADDRESS OF EDWARD H. BENNETT, CHAIRMAN ARCHITECTURAL CONSULTANTS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

I am to speak about the development of Washington, with special reference to the areas in which the new departmental and other Government buildings will be placed. This area, roughly speaking, lies between Pennsylvania Avenue and Maryland Avenue, the Capitol, and the Monument. I shall refer most specifically in my remarks to the area now known as the "Triangle," between Pennsylvania Avenue and B Street, and, since this whole subject has been so splendidly covered in the speech of the Secretary of the Treasury recently at Pittsburgh, I shall quote in places from his statement.

It is obvious at the start that this, although an element in the plan of Washington, is a very important one in the composition of its plan, and particularly of the plan of the future Washington. I should like to emphasize at the start the orderly relationship of the plan of this great section of land to that of the whole Mall.

"Congress has made the necessary appropriation to initiate this work and to carry out the most important features of that long-neglected plan of Washington and L'Enfant for the development of the city. The responsibility for carrying out this plan, by the purchase of sites and the erection of buildings, was placed by Congress on the Secretary of the Treasury and has become, therefore, an integral part of Treasury activities."



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 trip out into the cosmos under the guidance of a great scientist like Jeans, Eddington, or our own Milliken. We encounter nebulae, galactic clusters, solar systems, myriad masses of suns, and so-called cosmic dust, into the infinite. But spirals, whorls, everywhere! No tangible arrangement 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 of which all relate to a simple plan in which there are dominant and subordinate elements.

We are this evening to get a glimpse of the beauty of Washington in its past, present, and future. To do that we must first see and appreciate the underlying system or order of its great plan.

An architectural plan! We may well rejoice that the original plan was made. Suppose, for example, there had been no plan of L'Enfant and General Washington. It might easily have been the case, as has been the fate of most other great capitals early founded, whose plans have been later rectified, and as in the case of Paris, made superb. Most cities have grown from a congeries of huts, evolved more or less according to the necessities of the situation as controlled by the growing intelligence of the inhabitants. But in the case of Washington enough great precedent had been established—a conscious idea of city planning existed in Europe and very distinctly in the early days of the United States.

The orderly 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 pulsed just as keenly in humanity as to-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 was becoming apparent, the instinctive, if not conscious aim to lay foundations in an orderly and comprehensive manner. Hence the Washington of the past.

The Washington of the present is the expression of the early plan of 1790, stimulated and corrected by the great plan of the Park Commission of 1901, but as yet incomplete in its execution.

The Washington of the future, based on that which has gone before, must be the result of our efforts of to-day. Let alone, it would end in chaos, as has been demonstrated by some of the attempts ignorantly proposed in violation of the original plan. Given meager support, the final result will be no better than it is to-day, but given great and concentrated attention and enthusiastic support by the Nation through its representatives and that collection of splendid men who are giving their time freely in its interest, officially and unofficially, it will become superb.

That is why to-night we are looking at the plan of Washington, and I hope, with the keenest appreciation of the fact that there was the original plan of the Capital. The perspective we have, the past experience of civilization centering on the original plan, its renewal in the plan of 1901, and to-day substantial expansion of that plan, an expansion which is also a consolidation.

Through all this development there have been great personalities involved. Most of them are known to you in history. It is my personal desire to acknowledge our good fortune in that the work of to-day has received not only the support of our leading Executive but an important part of it has been under the direction of the man who, having had the power to help the realization, had also the vision and desire to do so. I allude, of course, to our great Secretary Mellon.

I hope what I have said will not seem too far afield, because I think it is so important that we should realize that this great group of departmental buildings to which I refer in general outline is so strongly related to the general composition of the plan of Washington. The main axis of the Triangle group is parallel to the Mall, not yet completed, stretching from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial. The L'Enfant plan did not have compositions lateral to the Mall, although they might well have been incorporated even in that day, as that would have resembled an arrangement of the great eighteenth century French plans, from which the plan of Washington was really evolved, the main axis of the Triangle plan has this further justification in precedent. It is traversed by a series of great axes in extension of existing streets. All this can be seen on the plans and diagrams in the moving pictures.

Important as is this group of the Triangle, it must be remembered that similar developments, though not so extensive, are proposed for the south side of the Mall, and in order to complete the picture of this great composition, which will slowly be realized, one must include the planning of the Capitol approach from the Union Station, including the new park area to the north of the Capitol and the magnificent

approach from the gateway of the city by the Union Station to the head of the Mall. These plans, if carried out, founded as they are on a great and substantial ideal, should measure up to the requirements of the Capital of this great country.

"It is intended to carry through, as rapidly as possible, the most pressing needs as regards housing of Government departments and activities. These will include a new and larger building for the increased activities of the Department of Commerce, a Supreme Court Building, a building for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, an archives building, a building for the Department of Agriculture, still another for the Department of Labor, and several others besides. One of these buildings, that for the Supreme Court, will be placed on Capitol Hill; but, as regards the others, advantage will be taken of this opportunity to group them together in such a way as to contribute in the greatest measure possible to the beauty of Washington.

"The general principle has been established that no large departmental buildings are to be placed in the Mall, as was at first proposed, but that the Mall is to be reserved for park purposes and as a site for buildings of a museumlike character.

"Departmental buildings are to be placed along the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Treasury to the Capitol. In addition to facing on Pennsylvania Avenue, these buildings will face also on a grand boulevard, which is to be cut through the city, bordering the Mall and stretching from the Capitol to the new Memorial Bridge on the Potomac near the base of the Lincoln Memorial. It is intended the buildings, while having each a separate and distinctive architectural treatment, shall be of harmonious design and grouped around two large interior courts or plazas somewhat after the arrangement of the Louvre in Paris."

A uniform corner height has been observed, although the architecture is varied. The ground contains 70 acres, and it is upward of 3,000 feet in length on B Street. There are upward of 1,000,000 square feet in the Commerce Building alone. The plazas are actually three in number; that on Twelfth Street, the circular one, being in a sense the pivot of the composition. In it we have proposed a great commemorative column. The vistas will extend from this circular plaza through into the other plazas, and especially into the great plaza, which, in turn, opens through an arched way onto Pennsylvania Avenue and toward the Mall, where it has been suggested shall be placed the National Museum of Art. The vital element binding the entire group is the connection between the two larger plazas. A happy solution adjusted to the scale of both has been found, crowned by a pavilion giving variety to the silhouette of the group.

"It is easy to see what the effect will be. As one proceeds down Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Capitol, on the south side will be a succession of beautiful and harmonious buildings, all of a design in keeping with the semiclassical tradition so well established in Washington. On 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 bordered on one side by the new boulevard lined with beautiful buildings, a wide parkway of greensward 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 for views of 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.

ADDRESS BY MAJ. L. E. ATKINS, ASSISTANT ENGINEER COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

#### MUNICIPAL CENTER

The completion of the municipal center of the city of Washington will give to the world a more adequate expression of Washington as a municipality. As the Federal development of the triangle will express the growth and importance of the Federal Government, so the municipal center will express the dignity and importance of Washington as a city. These two groups of buildings will form a magnificent nucleus for the new and greater Washington of the future.

The present District Building, constructed in 1908, has for some time been too small to accommodate the various executive departments of our city government. When this structure was erected it was expected that future expansion would be provided by building an addition on the square to the south of the present building, which would be connected by bridges over D Street. The execution of the plans of the Federal Government for a monumental group of buildings to house the different governmental departments south of Pennsylvania Avenue not only precludes the possibility of constructing this addition but also requires the replacement of the present District Building by a new structure in harmony with the general development of the Federal triangle. Therefore it was necessary for District officials to find a

new location on which to erect buildings to properly accommodate the functions of the city government.

A committee was appointed March 12, 1927, to study the situation and to recommend a new location. After a careful study, it was finally decided to locate on both sides of John Marshall Place (Four-and-one-half Street), north of Pennsylvania Avenue, and to provide for practically all departments of the District government in one group of buildings.

Bad as is the need for additional space for the executive departments of the city government, it is even more imperative that provisions be made at once for the police court, the municipal court, the juvenile court, and the recorder of deeds, which are now housed in quarters wholly inadequate and unsuited for their purposes.

The city has in the present District Building a very valuable asset. This should be recognized and credit allowed by the Federal Government in granting the appropriations for the new municipal center. The area of the ground on which the building stands is 46,000 square feet. As a conservative estimate the land is worth \$30 per square foot, giving a total value for the land of approximately \$1,380,000.

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 \$5,380,000. 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 John Marshall Place, which forms the north and south axis 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 these two levels will be placed a great court 280 feet in width by 500 feet in length. The approaches 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 pool in the center.

The architecture of the building on Pennsylvania Avenue will harmonize with the Federal buildings on the south side of the Avenue, carrying practically the same belt courses and cornice lines. Due to the difference in elevation of the street, the north front, facing the District Supreme Court Building, will harmonize in scale and style with the architecture of that building.

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 of the United States Capitol.

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 populousness and \* \* \* to be erected on a scale worthy of the uses for which it is intended. \* \* \* Also to be constructed with a view to durability which will extend beyond the age of any of the living, 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 its occurrence 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 our proposed municipal center should have 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 accommodations 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 governmental departments 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. EXPRESSES 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 Senator SMOOT in the Senate both of these houses amended the bill 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 in the beautification 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 Capital in the world.

#### ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS C. CRAMTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The development of the National Capital, 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, well deserves to be brought vividly to the knowledge of the Congress, the residents of the Capital City, and the people of the Nation, as our great Secretary of the Treasury is bringing it in this series of meetings. The hope of George Washington, the dream of the Nation, that this Capital City be the most beautiful city in the world, nears realization. But the dream is more than that.

"This is more than the making of a beautiful city," last night said President Hoover in this hall. "Washington is not only the Nation's Capital; it is the symbol of America. By its dignity and architectural inspiration we stimulate pride in our country, we encourage the elevation of thought and character which comes from great architecture." So great an advance in so important a national program deserves to be known and understood of the Nation.

With fortunate and characteristic vision Washington located the new Capital where nature was most charming and gave the great city-to-be a splendid background. Then he brought the young French engineer, 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 Capital, 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 in location.

L'Enfant planned the rectilinear arrangement of streets, with diagonal avenues radiating from Capitol and White House, and with circles at the resultant intersections of more than two thoroughfares. Contributing 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 speedy than any of the horse age could have dreamed of.

#### NATIONAL CAPITAL IDEA DOMINANT IN THE CITY PLAN

L'Enfant planned for the location of all public buildings in appropriate architectural settings, grouped along a beautiful park, the Mall, connecting Capitol and White House. This being a city created to



serve as the National Capital, that purpose is dominant in the L'Enfant plan. It should ever be so in the planning for this Capital City. The city, holding an unrivaled position as the National Capital, never should seek industrial supremacy. To do so would endanger its certain prestige without grasping the industrial mirage. Keeping predominant always the National Capital purpose, this will certainly become a city possessing unrivaled charm and interest, with a minimum of that which would detract.

#### L'ENFANT PLAN IS REVIVED

The influence of Washington made the L'Enfant plan a reality at once in important respects and then for close to a century its development languished. But upon the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of Government in the District of Columbia, President McKinley brought about a revival of interest in the plan and the McMillan Commission followed. Senator McMillan, of my own State, at that time and for many years played a highly creditable and influential part in the development of Washington. A part in which the able gentleman who presides to-night, Mr. Charles Moore, shared largely as he was then at the Senator's side. The resultant plan of 1901 recommended a return to the L'Enfant plan of a century before, with such extension of it as might be required to meet modern conditions and the city's growth. And the L'Enfant plan began again to come into its own.

In 1910 Congress created the Fine Arts Commission and considerably later the Zoning Commission and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Nothing is more imperative now from a legislative point of view with reference to the architecture of Washington than the grant of much greater authority to regulate the character, height, use, and location of private structures conspicuously located, especially adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, public parks and public buildings of the District or Federal Governments. Why should the Nation plan and create and then permit the individual, through heedlessness or through selfishness or greed, to negative the national effort and conflict with the common good? The national purpose should be really dominant.

As one looks back one can clearly see a constant acceleration of movement toward the fullest possible realization of the L'Enfant plan since the McMillan report. A great deal has been accomplished in the past score of years. We are now on the threshold of glorious things.

#### ON THE THRESHOLD OF GLORIOUS THINGS

Measured in money, the figures are quite astounding, even in this day, when the common talk of billions make millions seem commonplace. Much has recently been completed of great importance—the development of East Potomac Park, the Spanish-American Amphitheater at Arlington, the Lincoln Memorial, preeminent among numerous great gains now accomplished. We have now under construction or authorized for early construction the following highly important and desirable improvements at the sole expense of the Federal Government, and this list is not at all complete:

Botanical Gardens.....	\$820,000
National Arboretum.....	300,000
Congressional Library, additional site.....	600,000
Walter Reed Hospital buildings.....	1,012,000
New Army air field.....	1,010,000
Government Printing Office.....	1,250,000
Restoration Arlington Mansion.....	160,000
Completion Tomb Unknown Soldier at Arlington.....	400,000
Arlington Memorial Bridge.....	14,750,000
Mount Vernon Memorial Highway.....	4,500,000
Addition House Office Building.....	8,400,000
Enlargement of Capitol Grounds.....	6,244,472
Supreme Court site and building.....	7,500,000
Triangle land.....	25,000,000
Department of Agriculture buildings.....	8,100,000
Archives Building.....	8,700,000
Department of Commerce Building.....	17,500,000
Internal Revenue Building.....	10,000,000
	<b>116,246,472</b>

#### \$265,000,000 FOR NATIONAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

That total includes only projects, permanent improvements, many of great interest, now under construction or now authorized, and paid for by the Nation. But it does not include all of the proposed triangle program of Federal buildings, to which program this administration and the Congress are in effect fully committed and for which authorizations and appropriations are very sure to follow as rapidly as construction is feasible. In his address in this hall last night Senator SMOOT, and no one is better qualified to speak with authority on this, Senator SMOOT named \$200,000,000 as the amount necessary to complete the present triangle building program. Accepting that figure, and including the full triangle program in my tabulation of expenditures now under way and committed, the total is above \$265,000,000. Possibly L'Enfant never dreamed there would be that much money in this Nation, in his day thinly scattered along a seaboard, only 6,000,000 of them, citizens of several contending and jealous States, jealous of each other, but above all jealous of increase of power in the Federal Government. That people have swept across a continent and beyond, have become a hundred and twenty million, with 48 strong and prosperous States, and a respected and trusted Federal Government, which now is spending its

money by the hundreds of millions in the improvement and beautification of the National Capital. And while they could not have dreamed 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 will match the present House Office Building, to the east the new Supreme Court building will rise, adjacent to the Congressional Library. To the north the Capitol Grounds will extend to the Columbus Memorial and the Union Station. A boulevard will extend from the Union Station to B Street NW, and along B Street to the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and on to Arlington or to Mount Vernon. This boulevard 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 Chinese emporiums and the tattooing places which now give that conspicuous area a character of its own, better to be remembered than endured.

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 shacks, which have so longed outstayed their welcome, will vanish; 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 landscaped will succeed the present strange mixture 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 unsung. From the White House to the Capitol, the south side of historic Pennsylvania Avenue, where have 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 contributing to a beautiful whole that will add something to the world's 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 echoing 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 Creator. It must not be all 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, in the midst of wooded 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 so chosen. Just as he inspired the L'Enfant plan of development we now promote, he would have preserved those beauties.

It is wonderful 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 50 years ago may be done now, and 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 Building may yet come out of its architectural cocoon and take on 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 woods which Washington loved are disappearing; those charming ravines are being leveled; 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 of thought by our leaders, has been the subject of wise planning, but the plans have been disastrously slow in realization. The beauty is passing and can not be restored.

## DISASTROUS DELAY IN PARK AND PLAYGROUNDS PLAN

Through the legislation of 1924 and 1926 the National Capital Park and Planning Commission came into being with remarkably able personnel, all characterized by high zeal and great ability. 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 \$15,750,000 if promptly carried out. Under the act 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 \$6,000,000 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 was not unfair as to lands in the District. But under that authority only \$600,000 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 that 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," many of which are still well preserved. The development of the city makes this now difficult. If action is not soon taken, it will be impossible. Encroachment on the sources of the Rock Creek in Maryland threatens 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 Palisades, are in process of destruction or are in peril.

## LEGISLATION PENDING WOULD SAVE SCENIC CHARMS

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 save \$30,000,000, will preserve the scenic beauties of the Capital 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 from taxation. Assessor Richards recently stated in House hearings that increased valuations adjacent would equalize the situation and that the money paid for such lands would seldom leave the District but would instead be used in desirable development elsewhere in the District. For instance, the money the Government paid for the square on which was built the Senate Office Building was used to develop six squares of desirable residences in Mount Pleasant.

## A GLORIOUS FUTURE THROUGH FAITHFULNESS TO THE IDEALS OF THE FATHERS

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 our 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 farm relief.

Mr. JONES. Why does not the gentleman eliminate that bill and ask unanimous consent as to the others?

Mr. TILSON. 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 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. LINTHICUM. I do not consider that farm relief.

Mr. CLARKE 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 way again.

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. WINGO. As I understand, 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 and Friday, 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 the consideration 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 making Calendar Wednesday business in order on Thursday and Friday for the consideration of these bills.

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 the committee on Wednesday can call up the bill, notwithstanding objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What other bills does the Committee on Agriculture propose to bring up besides this bill?

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 Service bill.

Mr. WINGO. And is the Foreign Service bill a farm relief bill also?

Mr. PURNELL. Yes. The committee seriously regards these bills as proper parts of a farm-relief program. 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 that to which he is objecting.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Of course, there is a difference of opinion upon that subject.

Mr. WINGO. Those in charge of the boards and agencies that have to do with credit are very much alarmed over the effect that stock-market speculation 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 can not 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 I have to get in confidence. But I am very much inclined to break out if we do not have either a special committee or have the Banking and Currency Committee organized. Then we might do something here that might protect the farmer's interest against the evil effect of the stock-market controversy.

Mr. PURNELL. I think the gentleman could find ample time to do that under general debate.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I want to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] a question. At the last session of Congress we passed through the House here a bill that in my opinion had more real farm relief in it, so far as the cotton farmers are concerned, than any other bill that has passed the House for many years. It was to prohibit or regulate gambling in cotton futures. If that bill is introduced at this session of Congress, will the gentleman's Committee on Agriculture give it consideration?

Mr. PURNELL. It has not yet been introduced. We have not taken that up.

Mr. RANKIN. The committee is not precluded by the—

Mr. PURNELL. No. The committee has not adjourned sine die, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. It is admitted that the gambling in cotton futures has a depressing effect on the price of cotton. Is it contemplated to relieve that situation by a bill at this session?

Mr. PURNELL. No such bill has been introduced.

Mr. WINGO. I suspect several bills were introduced the first day to suppress cotton gambling. Can we hope to get any relief? I got a chance to get the Clarke amendment up on the floor here a few years ago. We came within a few votes of getting the Clarke amendment adopted. It was adopted in the Senate. Had this House adopted it cotton gamblers would have been put out of business.

Mr. PURNELL. I can not speak for the committee. I can not speak for anybody else. But speaking as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I may say we have been on the job since the 6th day of March, and we are anxious to give consideration to any measure that may properly be regarded as part of farm relief.

Mr. WINGO. The Clarke I mentioned is not the gentleman from New York, a Member of the House, but a former Senator from the State of Arkansas. If the gentleman can promise to give us the relief desired I can have the bill introduced if those already introduced are not sufficient.

Mr. PURNELL. I may say to the gentleman that the Committee on Agriculture is not soliciting business, but we are ready to consider business brought before us.

Mr. WINGO. I thought you were soliciting business.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—did you hear me, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Very plainly. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL], on the farming committee, if any consideration of the warehouse bill, my own bill, or any other bill on that subject, will be taken up before the farm bill proper, prepared by the committee, shall be presented?

Mr. PURNELL. I wish to say to the gentleman that the committee this morning reported out a warehouse bill. Probably it is not as good as the one which the gentleman introduced, but I am sure the committee will consider what the gentleman has to offer, or any persuasive argument he has to substitute his bill for our own.

Mr. HOWARD. 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 Shoals 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 Shoals for lack of time. Will the leaders this session take steps to organize the Committee on Military Affairs for the purpose of considering and reporting 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 to-day, 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, sale, importation, 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, 25, 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 organized are 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 chairman 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 is 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. I would call up that bill which I believe the most important of all of them. I think it is the duty of the chairman to protect the committee.

Mr. JONES of Texas. In calling up the bills I believe the gentleman should follow the order in which 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. 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 well aware.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I do 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. CRAMTON. 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.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CABLE (at the request of Mr. ARENTZ) 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 President 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.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, May 1, 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 alter 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, 1864, 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 claimed rights asserted by 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; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2046) for the relief of Henry C. Perrine, and the same was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 2151) to alter 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, 1864, 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 claimed rights asserted by 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; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. KETCHAM: 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; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 2153) to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station at Waukegan, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE: A bill (H. R. 2154) to provide for the regulation of the use of certain sugars; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 2155) granting pensions to certain disabled children of veterans of the Civil War and the war with Spain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESLICK: A bill (H. R. 2156) authorizing the sale of all of the interest and rights of the United States of America in the Columbia Arsenal property situated in the ninth civil district of Maury County, Tenn., and providing that the net fund be deposited in the military post construction fund, and for the repeal of Public Law No. 542 (H. R. 12479), Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 2157) to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 2158) making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the United States Marine Band in attending the Confederate Veterans' reunion to be held at Charlotte, N. C., June 4 to 7, inclusive, 1929; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 2159) to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes, approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By 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.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 2161) to convey to the city of Waltham, Mass., certain Government lands for street purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By 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.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 2163) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 2164) to define jams, preserves, jellies, and apple butter; to provide standards therefore, and to amend the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PORTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) requesting the President to propose the calling of an international conference to consider and provide for the simplification of 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:

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress of the United States to appropriate the same amount of money to bring about the enforcement of section 2 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States as is appropriated for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging Congress of the United States to repeal the national-origins clause of the immigration act of 1924, and substitute therefor an apportionment of immigration quotas on the basis of foreign-born population in the year 1890; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Illinois, strongly recommending to the National Government the construction of the system of straight transcontinental and trunk-line hard-surfaced highways provided for in the aforesaid Holaday bill and respectfully and earnestly urge the early passage of this bill by Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELVIG: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the Congress of the United States to repeal the national-origins clause of the immigration act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2165) granting an increase of pension to Jennie S. McKinsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of W. M. Kittle; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of Sarah E. Edge; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 2168) for the relief of Eva A. Kramer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 2169) granting a reward to Cora Walden; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) for the relief of Clyde Cornish; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) granting a pension to Louise Burchfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 2172) for the relief of the heirs of Haym M. Salomon; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CAREW: A bill (H. R. 2173) for the relief of Thomas F. Nicholas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 2174) granting an increase of pension to Annie Sargent; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 2175) for the relief of the Great Western Coal Mines Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 2176) for the relief of George W. Adams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) for the relief of Harvey H. Anno; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) granting a pension to Ethel Aylesworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) for the relief of Vito Basile; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of John Bedard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) to authorize the appointment of Joseph M. Berman to the grade of lieutenant commander, retired, in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Berry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) for the relief of Harold G. Billings; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) granting a pension to Clara Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) for the relief of Edwin G. Blanchard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) granting a pension to Major Blasdel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) granting a pension to Tillie Boes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) granting a pension to Gabriel Boiler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) 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. 2191) for the relief of the heirs of John Buck; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) granting a distinguished-service cross to James C. Burke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) 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 Burson; 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. 2199) granting a pension to Rebecca Phillips Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) 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 correct 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 Bogustas 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 Mary 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 Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) for the relief of Laurin Gosney; 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 Lainey A. Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. G. G. Gross; to the Committee on Claims.

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 Hilbert 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 Healy; 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 A. Kean; 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 relief of Harry J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) granting a pension to Annie B. King and her helpless and dependent daughter, Jean 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 Lange; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) for the relief of Vercy A. Leadbitter; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) for the relief of Elijah 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. Littleton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting a pension to John Lorensen; 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. Mallory; 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) granting a pension to George A. McAmis; 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 McDonnell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) for the relief of E. O. McGillis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) to renew and extend certain letters patent to Thomas M. McKee; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting a pension to George McMullen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting a pension to Ida A. MacNish; to the Committee on 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 Sterrett E. McNulty; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) for the relief of Thomas F. McVeigh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) for the relief of Arden C. Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) to authorize the appointment of Staff Sergt. Charles Mingus, retired, United States Army, to master sergeant, retired, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting an increase of pension to Emma W. Mitchell; to the Committee on 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. Moutgomery; 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 Nannie H. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) granting a pension to John W. Moshier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) for the relief of Edwina R. Munchhof; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) for the relief of W. F. Nash; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting a pension to Edward J. Neitzer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

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 a pension to W. F. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting a pension to Stella Mae Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting a pension to Don C. Prather; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting a pension to Warren L. Raynes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting a pension to Thomas Regan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) granting a pension to Baury Bradford Richardson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) granting a pension to Mina Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) granting an increase of pension to Bessie S. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) granting a pension to Mary Rosentall; 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. Sharon; 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 to Edward Everett Sharrard a commission as captain in the Medical Corps, United States Army, as of July 1, 1918, and an honorable discharge as of November 11, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) for the relief of 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) for the relief of 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.



Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) for the relief of Edward W. Stewart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of Walter Perry Story; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) granting a pension to Arthur Sutcliffe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2312) for the relief of Arthur W. Taylor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) for the relief of D. W. Thickstun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) for the relief of Harry J. Thiessen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2315) for the relief of Leo B. Thome; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) granting an increase of pension to Robert Trexler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) for the relief of Kenneth B. Turner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) granting a pension to Ida M. Uline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) for the relief of Grover C. Van Nest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) for the relief of Edgar S. Webb; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) granting a pension to Ernest Wilkesmann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2323) granting a pension to Ellen E. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) for the correction of the military record of Joseph N. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2325) for the relief of Charles Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2326) for the relief of George Woolsey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) for the relief of Joseph Zittle; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2328) granting a pension to Dave Yettra; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 2329) granting a pension to Ola Tower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2330) for the relief of Stephen Cole, alias Steven Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) for the relief of Leonard T. Newton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) granting a pension to Margaret J. Newlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 2333) granting an increase of pension to Hannah R. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 2334) to reimburse Yalmar G. Swanson for injuries sustained and for damages to his car in an accident with a truck operated by a United States marine; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) providing for the promotion of Chief Boatswain Edward Sweeney, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of lieutenant on the retired list of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) for the relief of George D. Johnson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HALSEY: A bill (H. R. 2337) granting a pension to James C. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) granting a pension to Lou Shoemaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 2339) for the relief of Ivan H. McCormack; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HUDSON: A bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to Maude Alice Cross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 2341) granting an increase of pension to Catherine A. Ryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 2342) granting a pension to John P. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KADING: A bill (H. R. 2343) granting a pension to William G. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2344) granting a pension to Mary Manley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) granting a pension to Lizzie Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) granting a pension to Sarah Copher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) granting a pension to Kate Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 2348) granting an increase of pension to Anna Kistler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) granting a pension to Joseph Vanderpool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 2350) granting an increase of pension to Hugo Klutke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2351) granting a pension to Marcus W. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) granting a pension to Francis E. Gould; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: A bill (H. R. 2353) granting a pension to Emma Blackmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2354) granting an increase of pension to Hiram E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) granting a pension to Rebecca Tackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 2356) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2357) granting a pension to Missouri Bach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) granting a pension to Sarah J. Phipps; 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 1727 and 5148 during the session of 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 tariff 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; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

259. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of DeWitt Pecan 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 inclosing copy of a letter from the Board of Commerce, Industry, and Agriculture of Cuba, also protesting against any raise in the tariff on products of the earth of Cuba; 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 more 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. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Hon. H. O. Ferguson, of Bryan, Tex., and Stephan Ice & Bottling Co., of 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.

268. 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.

269. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the National Society, Daughters of 1812, 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.

270. 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.

271. Also, petition of the National Society, Dames of the 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.

272. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of A. S. Engebretson, 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.

273. Also, petition of Carl Stomgren and Alvin Stomgren, of Bronson, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

274. Also, petition of Jalmer E. Pearson, of Kennedy, Minn., in favor of a large increase in tariff duties on competing farm products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

275. Also, petition of A. O. and Carl Brink, Ray and John Halvorson, Art Potucek, 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.

276. Also, petition of 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.

277. Also, petition of A. Skoglund and four other residents of Holt, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

278. Also, petition of Jacob A. Vatnes, resident of Gully, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

279. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. P. B. Hole, Anne and Hulda 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.

280. Also, petition of Pedor Olson, Harold Olson, Walter Christopherson, C. J. Johnson, and John Nord, all of Fosston, Minn., urging the repeal of the national-origins clause of the present immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

281. Also, petition of Otto J. Fridlund, 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. 92, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### RELIEF OF STORM AND FLOOD STRICKEN AREAS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 92, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929, was read twice by its title.

Mr. GEORGE. A similar joint resolution introduced by me on yesterday 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. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 842) for the relief of Gilbert McNicoll; 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. GILLET:

A bill (S. 845) granting a pension to Josephine E. Lang; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

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; A bill (S. 848) granting a pension to Anna E. Burgess;

A bill (S. 849) granting a pension to Anna C. Stewart; and

A bill (S. 850) granting an increase of pension to Louisa V. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 851) for the relief of Homer C. Rayhill; and

A bill (S. 852) for the relief of Thomas B. Wikoff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 853) granting compensation to Lawrence F. Morris; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 854) for the relief of Herman Gerlach; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 855) for the relief of the estate of Gualupe Zazueta, deceased;

A bill (S. 856) authorizing the payment of a claim to Alexander J. Thompson;

A bill (S. 857) for the relief of Gilbert Peterson;

A bill (S. 858) for the relief of J. A. Perry;

A bill (S. 859) to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Clara E. Nichols;

A bill (S. 860) for the relief of C. C. Moore & Co., engineers;

A bill (S. 861) for the relief of Ellen B. Monahan;

A bill (S. 862) for the relief of John H. Hughes;

A bill (S. 863) for the relief of Estella Howard;

A bill (S. 864) for the relief of Laurin Gosney;

A bill (S. 865) for the relief of W. P. Fuller & Co.;

A bill (S. 866) for the relief of Timothy Fennessy;

A bill (S. 867) for the relief of William Eckman;

A bill (S. 868) to extend the provisions of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to James E. Dethlefsen; and

A bill (S. 869) 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.