

Bridges 12380-14701



UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION

Vol. 86

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1940

No. 117

## Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 28, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, before whom the generations come and go, whose mercies are infinite, whose love is eternal: We beseech Thee to bless our country and help us here and now to advance the onward march of Thy kingdom of right and justice by the increase of our devotion to our national ideals and the reign of law and self-discipline.

Thou has shown us Thy ways and we have forsaken them; Thou hast brought us to great honor and we have wearied of Thy service; nevertheless, we beseech Thee to spare us from adversity and restore to us the vision lost in paths apart from Thee. Grant to us such calm and measured wisdom in all our deliberations, that confidence may everywhere prevail, that our people may be of one mind and one purpose in fulfilling the destiny unto which Thou dost call us. We ask it in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Wednesday, June 12, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) authorizing the enrollment with an amendment of the bill (S. 2598) for the relief of Kurt Wessely.

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

H. R. 6207. An act to amend section 2810 (a), Internal Revenue Code, to exclude petroleum stills from the requirement of registration; and

H. R. 10055. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1024. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 3578. An act for the relief of Edward Smith;

H. R. 6044. An act to regulate the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps;

H. R. 8026. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9209. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9848. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of naval works, the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	Lodge	Sheppard
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Shipstead
Ashurst	Ellender	Lundeen	Slattery
Austin	George	McKellar	Smith
Bailey	Gerry	McNary	Stewart
Bankhead	Gillette	Maloney	Taft
Barkley	Green	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hale	Murray	Tobey
Brown	Harrison	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Hatch	Norris	Truman
Burke	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wiley
Connally	King	Russell	
Danaher	La Follette	Schwartz	
Davis	Lee	Schweikert	







ing today, but still under the flag of Great Britain. If we ourselves had not done this selfish thing, we would not have today the thousands of men, women and children who are now on the farm, or to say the least, who are now in the hands of the Nation.

If there had been 50 years of agitation, women today would not have the vote. Before the Constitution was amended to make woman suffrage constitutional, it was held that woman were not "people" within the meaning of the Constitution of Independence and the Constitution of the United States and therefore were not eligible to vote. But the women started agitating, resorting to such tactics as chaining themselves to lamp posts, and in other ways making themselves so disagreeable that their agitation finally brought results.

If there had never been any agitating, there would never have been any labor unions, and if there had never been any labor unions, workers would still be working 12 and 14 hours per day at pitifully small wages as they were in the steel mills before organized labor succeeded through agitation in making the workers so discontented in improving their conditions and standards of living. Agitation has been responsible for every bit of progressive legislation that we have passed for every bit of representative government that we have in this House of Representatives in which a body have been so valiantly destroying and destroying the will cease, and agitation ceases, all reforms and improvements will cease, and we will become a decadent people and Nation.

Mr. SPEAKER, through I mention it myself personally, cannot pass by a moment's reflection upon the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, cannot bring myself to the point of which I believe is unjust, definitely unconstitutional and a violation of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. SPEAKER, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Sevarey).

Mr. SEVAREY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Mr. COLLIER, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Marcantonio).

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to pause for a moment and analyze the procedure that we are following here and then ask ourselves the question as to whether or not we should feel ashamed of ourselves. We are asking that the Congress of the United States, in all its dignified might, direct the deportation of one individual. The only basis upon which that request is being made is a statement contained in the supplemental report accompanying the bill to the effect that Bridges is a threat to the Nation. In other words, we are asked to deport one individual—all of Congress regarded in the report from this based on the conclusion contained in the report from the committee on Immigration. The man was not permitted to be heard before the House Committee. This is the first time in the history of this country that a man is being convicted and sentenced without being given an opportunity to defend himself. Any alien, before deported, is given a hearing. He is given a hearing before the immigration officials. Then that is given a hearing. It is reviewed before the Board of Appeals of the Labor Department. Then that alien has an opportunity to go to court and be heard on a writ of habeas corpus. But in this case no hearing, no opportunity to be heard at all was afforded, and we consider that perfectly sound American procedure. If that is sound American procedure and the majority of Congress is going to put its stamp of approval on this type of procedure, I do not believe I am mistaken when I say that the day is not far off when these same Members who put their stamp of approval on this procedure will be ashamed of the stamp that they are about to take today. We all know the real reason for this shameful deportation of Bridges. Bridges organized the workers on the

west coast and made the labor exploiters pay decent wages. Now, taking advantage of the war hysteria, these labor exploiters seek his deportation and our Congress for this foul job.

I have before me a letter from Harry Bridges. I think it is only fair that Bridges be accorded this opportunity to have some Member of Congress read in answer to the charges that have been made against him. unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the House should read this letter which is seven pages long. I will read to read this letter, if not, the Speaker will do so. Mr. Speaker, pro tempore (Mr. Thompson). The gentleman from New York asks permission to read a letter and that it not be taken out of the time for debate on this resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DUNN, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DUNN, Mr. Speaker, Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MARCANTONIO, I yield.

Mr. DUNN, I would like to know if it is in order to make a motion to that effect?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, The Chair will state that it can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. Speaker, since objection has been heard—

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, The gentleman from California withdraws his objection. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Marcantonio)?

Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to comment on the objections that have been made to my request, but I do think that now it becomes very, very obvious to every Member of this Chamber that you are asked to convict a man without giving him an opportunity to be heard before the floor of the House, leave alone the fact that the man has already denied him every opportunity to be heard.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey, I agree with the gentleman that he should be given an opportunity to read the letter, and I hope the gentleman will ask permission to do it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO, I would be denied this privilege under general debate.

Mr. MASON, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO, I yield.

Mr. MASON, I want to suggest that the gentleman will have plenty of time to read that letter when the bill is being read by striking out the last word, and the gentleman that I Mr. MARCANTONIO, May I say that the gentleman that I will be in no different position than I am now. When the bill is being read for amendment all I will have is 5 minutes and I will have to make the same request which has been objected to, pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Marcantonio). All right. Let us proceed with the legislative business.

Mr. HAYS, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection, to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Marcantonio) be allowed to proceed for 7 minutes without it being taken out of this time. The SPEAKER pro tempore, The gentleman from Wisconsin has withdrawn his objection. Does the gentleman from New York wish to renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to read the letter dated June 1, commencing with Bridges, addressed to me by Harry Bridges. Bridges' name is on the letter. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. Speaker, I object. This man has had 20 months time already, and the sooner you find that out the better.

Mr. MARCANTONIO, You would not hear him before the committee? Why? Do you not want the Congress to have his side before it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. Speaker, I move that the gentleman from New York be given 15 minutes additional time to read the letter. The gentleman from New York (Mr. Marcantonio) is not in order. It can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, The regular order has been demanded. The regular order is, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to read this letter?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER, The gentleman from New York (Mr. Marcantonio) is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. Speaker, the letter from Harry Bridges reads as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND STEVEDORES' ASSOCIATION  
San Francisco, Calif., June 1, 1940.

Hon. Vito Marcantonio, Washington, D. C.  
Dear Sir: My purpose in addressing this communication to you is in order that you may know certain facts concerning the statement and personal background that may not be generally known. First, as to my personal record in connection with immigration on March 20, 1940, Representative Maloney had phoned a writer in the American Legion magazine. This writer was full of misstatements and interference and unwarrented conclusions. The magazine article was a reprint from a metropolitan daily newspaper, and the statement is made that this article itself provides sufficient evidence of my unavailability.

I first filed application papers for citizenship in 1931. In 1933, I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

At that time it took me 3 or 4 weeks to earn 90, and I had a wife and two children to support. I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

Mr. second set of first papers expired in 1937. From 1937 to the present time, I have been engaged in the business of shipping and exporting goods to the United States. At the particular period my papers should have been renewed, but they were not. I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

Mr. second set of first papers expired in 1937. From 1937 to the present time, I have been engaged in the business of shipping and exporting goods to the United States. At the particular period my papers should have been renewed, but they were not. I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.

I was denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability. I was again denied citizenship because of my unavailability.



of all votes cast to be elected. Both primary and final elections in the special districts involve a majority of votes being received by the elected official.

In the last 3 years I have been unopposed for other legislative measures. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years.

During the past few years in California our men protested bitterly against the quantity of war in the Pacific Ocean and Government. Although occasionally destined for the Italian and German fronts, our men were unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years.

We have an enormous oceanic zone everything possible to bring to the attention of the Pacific coast fishing fleets. We know and everyone should know that occupying fishing craft with a cruising radius of some 6,000 miles—open-ocean, up-ocean, two-way traffic. There are some 6,000 miles—open-ocean, up-ocean, two-way traffic. There are some 6,000 miles—open-ocean, up-ocean, two-way traffic.

I did not have a defense of Dean Landis, the Immigration Department, or any others concerned, but this fact remains that no one Government witness in the hearing could point to a single example, even though I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years.

The point is made in connection with the present alien deportations bill that it is in violation of the present law. I told the truth in every detail without attempting to evade any question. I explained that as the ranking official of the Immigration Department and as the ranking official of the Immigration Department.

I should like to mention simply the fact that as president we are engaged in legislative attempts to secure a contract covering foreign work on the Pacific coast. For some months past we have attempted to have a contract with the Government for some years, aimed at preventing any stoppage of work or strikes between immigration and employers for this length of time. We have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years. I have been unopposed for other legislative measures in the last 3 years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has 8 minutes remaining. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands? The gentleman from Mississippi has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Leland M. Ford). Mr. Leland M. Ford. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, particularly the gentleman from New York (Mr. Marcus L. Struensee), I may say that he is not the first man who has been misled by Harry Bridges.

I believe that Harry Bridges is one of the most destructive labor leaders who has ever hit the United States. Many good labor people have been misled by Mr. Bridges. I think Dean Landis, wherein he sought to whitewash but did not exonerate Harry Bridges, had to go to great lengths to make the decision he did, and I am going to quote some page numbers wherein you may verify that. See footnotes and pages 122, 124, 125 clear through to page 161 of the Landis report where he refused to deny his communism.

Mr. GERTNER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER.

There is your answer to Mr. Bridges' defense. That is the complete statement. He could not defend himself because he did not have any defense. Mr. GERTNER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. No. Mr. GERTNER of California. I thought so. Mr. LELAND M. FORD. You just thought so to get your nose in. The regular order was demanded. The SPEAKER. The regular order is: The gentleman from California (Mr. Leland M. Ford) will proceed. Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Now this man comes before us and he holds and the screams for his rights under the Constitution of the United States. I read into the record, in the N. I. R. hearings, some of the letters written by his crowd, in which he said to his audience:

I also read in here the letters that went to the workers: You are going to come into our union, and if you do not come in, you had better take a look at some others who refused to come in. And those others had broken arms, their own arms broken over their knees, or jaws with broken bones that stuck out in two or three places—fingers mangled by the things of Harry Brandon Bridges. I ask you what consolation did he give to the rights of others? It seems to me that in this country individual rights are interpreted to mean that you can do what you please to do as you please. There is a man who has no respect for others. In sit-down strikes, like in the Douglas strike, they moved into those places; they got into those plants and set there. They did not own those plants. I ask you, is that the process of law when you take possession of the other fellow's property? You people scream for the rights of Harry Bridges; you scream for the rights of these others, but I ask you to square the actions of those men with their requests for recognition. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry I have not 25 minutes longer to discuss this matter.

Mr. COLLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Ramocharni). Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, George Washington, the Father of our Country, made a strikingly significant and unforgettable statement when he said: Citizens by birth or choice of a common country; that country has a right to concentrate your affections. We are increasingly becoming aware in this Nation that there are far too many individuals who, with wings loose and false prophecy, are spreading discord in the ranks of labor, bringing about unnecessary strikes, and tearing apart the solidarity of the American system of government. [Applause.]

Mr. GERTNER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER.

The Congress of the United States, by favorable action on the bill to bring about the deportation of Harry R. Bridges, will send notice, not only to him but other thousands in this country, that we are finally alert to this problem. Far too many of such persons are allowed to continue to live in the Republic and accept the privileges, the profits, and the protection of America, but assume none of the responsibilities of citizenship at the same time. [Applause.] Facts will be adduced in the debate later today which will bring clearly to our attention and to the attention of the Nation this measure should be speedily forthcoming. In many States of the Union there are populations of aliens, and it will be most regrettable that these

Naturalized citizens are just as important to America as are native-born citizens. I have called scores of men and women to receive their papers of naturalization in the United States. They have all sworn to the Constitution of the United States. They have all sworn to the fact that aliens are bespeaking the good name of those who are responsible for the granting of real citizenship. All of us are descended from those who came to our shores, either as an early or late date, and in fighting for true Americanism we fight in a common cause. In the State of Pennsylvania, to cite an example, there are today reported to be 130,000 aliens. That is not the most distributive figure. It is that only 21 percent of those 130,000 individuals have even squatted or declared their intention of becoming citizens of the country in which they reside. The percentage is believed to be approximately correct. That about the 79 percent? What is their answer? Those individuals have remained as residents of the United States on an average of from 15 to 17 years. That is a tragic situation.

Mr. Speaker, today there is more at stake than merely membership of the House of Representatives. There is a call to the Nation on the issue of Harry R. Bridges. There is a call to the Nation on the issue of Harry R. Bridges. There is a call to the Nation on the issue of Harry R. Bridges. There is a call to the Nation on the issue of Harry R. Bridges.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that Mr. Bridges has not had his day in court. He is saying that the court in the only forum in this land which has the right to exact have defining the rights of an alien to come in the right to remain. He is here by direction, and then shall not have the undoubted right to say that he is here by direction. He is here by direction, and then shall not have the undoubted right to say that he is here by direction.

Mr. GERTNER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to the SPEAKER.









as party trial and ex parte condemnation is not the foundation upon which our country has prospered.

The evidence which the committee has should have been submitted to the Department of Labor for further action by its instance of another warrant and another hearing. If the committee believes the evidence to be as strong as it claims before the Department of Labor would be an order for his deportation. That is the American way.

There has not been cited one precedent in support of this special bill. Never before has individual or special legislation singled out for deportation one individual or even a few individuals. It has provided a procedure for deportation of undesirable classes of aliens, separating the deportation of individuals from the general hearing held by the Department of Labor. At each hearing the alien was given a full opportunity to present his defense against the charges leveled at him. Today, for the first time in our history we propose to deport one individual without conforming to the usual procedure and without giving him an opportunity to be heard in his own defense.

More than any other Member in this House, I stand to gain from the deportation of aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist Party. My record and my stand with respect to communists are clear. I was elected a Member of this House at a special election held on February 6 of this year. Unlike my Republican opponent, I openly declared my hostility toward communism and successfully defeated the Communist candidate, Earl Browder, by an overwhelming majority. While the deportation of alien Communists would improve my political position, what I have to consider here, however, is not what is the easy way for me, which is to vote with the majority, but what is the proper way for me to act on this bill even though it be not the way for the majority.

If it were common to deport a single individual upon ex parte accusations, I would, of course, vote for this bill, but that is not my conception of the conception of most people in this country of democracy. We must remember that this same change would make against Bridges and that I am not holding myself out as a precedent here. That I have not held out as a precedent here, that I have not held out in the American way in our constitutional form of government and the principles which underlie our democracy if I cast my vote for the passage of this bill, I trust that a majority of this House will not support this bill, because there is no evidence to justify its adoption, because it contradicts the establishment of a vicious precedent in these troublesome days, and because it clearly is a violation and contradiction of our democratic way. [Applause.]

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

(By unanimous consent Mr. Starnes was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LESTINEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill (H. R. 9786) because I think the entire procedure is absolutely wrong. This bill contains but few lines and it enacted into law it will create a precedent which I think will be extremely bad. This bill is the first bill of its kind to be presented for consideration since the beginning of the Republic.

I am willing to concede for the sake of argument that Mr. Bridges is a most undesirable person, but I believe we have the power in the law at the present time to deal with him, and if we do not have the necessary power let us amend the law generally and not for a specific case. I do not believe in case legislation because there is no telling how far-reaching it will be in its ultimate effect.

Today we have heard employees of the Department of Labor criticized because Harry Bridges was not deported. I think it is unfair to criticize the average citizen in the Department. We all know Mr. Shaughnessy down there and his assistants, and we know how hard they work. I feel sure that there is not an employee in the Department that we know and with whom we come in contact that is responsible for the faulty administration of this law. Our Secretary of the Department should be directed to Madison Bridges case, let us place the responsibility on her shoulders. If they are all and were the law and that about aliens do not believe there is any plan to bring every alien in this country within the shadow of our law. We want it to be good Americans to be loyal sons and daughters of America, but I do not think we are going to help in that direction by passing legislation of this type aimed at one individual. Especially when the whole argument in favor of this bill seems to be that Bridges is an "alien," and the sponsors of this legislation do not like the alien and never did. It is unfortunate that they have such poor understanding of the alien and his problems. Today it is Bridges—common row it may be John Doe, et cetera, and individuals.

For these and other important reasons, I am opposed to this bill. I am opposed particularly on principle. My parents were both born in Ireland and because of that I have known many aliens from Ireland as well as from every other country. In my whole experience, I have met very few aliens who were not good neighbors and devoted friends. Let us be sympathetic in dealing with this matter, and I am sure we will do much to promote good will and understanding between all of our people here in the United States.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual procedure for the House and necessary because of the unusual conduct of the other side of the Federal Government in failing and refusing to deport undesirable aliens. [Applause.]

No one here has stated that Harry Bridges is a desirable person to live within the United States. The Congress has the power to pass whatever legislation it desires or feels necessary to protect the best interests of the country; hence this bill before us today. Those who criticize the procedure may be honest and sincere, but they have voted time and time again for private bills amending basic law in order to keep aliens in the United States. Oftentimes they have voted for private bills to permit aliens to remain in this country who entered unlawfully and who had been convicted of crime. Now, however, when it becomes necessary to pass a private bill, or a bill of this character, in order to get rid of an undesirable alien, these same people rise in great horror and cry out on the floor of the House, "Un-American!" "Un-American!" [Applause.]

There has been sufficient evidence advanced before congressional committees—more than one of them—to the effect that Harry Bridges has associated with and has cooperated with Communists, and there is very strong evidence in the records of congressional committees given under oath by records of congressional committees to the effect that a Communist and that he has been convicted of a crime. No one can point to a single word that he has done which would entitle him to the reward of being allowed to continue to live in this country. He has done more to disturb the peace and the security of certain sections of our country than any alien we have ever had. He has done more to destroy the merchant marine of this sovereign Government of ours than the Confederate States did during the war between the States; yet there are those who would like to keep him in the United States. I cannot understand the spirit or psychology motivating those who want to keep him here. It is ridiculous to assert that the United States does not have the power to protect itself by deporting undesirable aliens.

It may be true that Dean Leavitt is a learned lawyer. It may be true that his students have a great regard for him, but I venture the assertion here and now there is not a Member of this House who thought Dean Leavitt would hold other than he did in the Bridges case in order to take the best off of somebody else. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] is to be commended for his untiring efforts to give us protection from undesirable aliens. He has been a leader in the fight for selective and restrictive immigration. In his fight to preserve America for decent, law-abiding, and God-fearing people he is deserving of our praise and support. [Applause.]

Mr. LESTINEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LASKY].

Mr. LASKY. Mr. Chairman, I voted in the affirmative on this bill. I intended to vote in the negative on the passage of the bill, but it remains in the condition it now is. If it is amended in the manner in which it is now amended, I am in a conundrum. I don't really want it in my humble judgment. I am not going to find fault with any of my colleagues who differ with me in their conclusions, and I want to say that it would be the easier way for me in the congressional district that I represent, being far removed from the coast and having virtually no C. I. O. labor in it, to vote as the great majority evidently will vote from the expressions we have heard; but I cannot in good conscience, consistent with my oath as a Member of this House, likewise as a member of the bar of the State of Washington, of the Supreme Court of the United States, and also as a judge of a court of general jurisdiction for 10 years before coming here, bring myself to the belief that this legislation is constitutional, much as I might feel that Mr. Bridges should not be here, feeling as this way, it is my plain duty to vote against it if it remains as it is now written.

It is unconstitutional, in my judgment, upon two grounds: First, it is a bill of attainder, which Congress is prohibited from enacting.

I shall cite the same authority cited by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DREWES], to wit, Cummings against Stanton: "A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment upon a particular individual without a judicial trial, and without the opportunity of being heard in his own defense. It is a bill of attainder in which all nations are more liable, as well the rights and liberties of citizens." These bills are generally directed against individuals by name, but they may be directed against a whole class. (Cummings v. Missouri, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 339, 12 U. S. 401, 408.)

It is well at this very moment, when freedom and justice run so high, to ever be mindful of the rich and wholesome restraining judgments of our Constitution. Even the wisest, noblest human being must not be denied the rights secured by that sacred document, which has guided us through our entire national existence and is now the beacon light of hope to every individual, and to every nation.







The CHAIRMAN. A substitute for the pending amendment would be in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. If the Committee will include the Chair, the Chair will state that the Chair has a list of eight Members who were on their feet at the time the gentleman from Montana offered his substitute amendment. Without objection the Chair will recognize these gentlemen in the order in which they appear on this list.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Anderson] is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Anderson of Missouri to the amendment: After the word "except" in line 4, strike out the remainder of the line and insert "and the Government of the United States."

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment meets for itself and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (Yeas 61, Nays 81).

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand a teller.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed Mr. Anderson of Missouri and Mr. Lusk to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 76, nays 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Gerry] for one-half minute.

Mr. GERRY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. GERRY of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. Leavell M. Ford] very often, and again I do not agree with him. I want to read a telegram which shows that not all the people on the Pacific coast feel just exactly as my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. Leavell M. Ford].

This telegram reads as follows:

San Francisco, Calif., June 5, 1916.

Understand House Immigration Committee has just sought to know H. E. 9762 to floor of House. Also understand Congressman Sawyer stated 7,000,000 people in California suffering from the effects of the depression. Congress of California has 200,000 members of Labor's Nonpartisan League of California only disagree with him. Opposition to Bridges comes from an honest group only. Millions of California workers have benefited from the passage of the Immigration Act of 1914. The law is not a law of exclusion, but a law of regulation. The depression is not a law of exclusion, but a law of regulation. The law is not a law of exclusion, but a law of regulation. The law is not a law of exclusion, but a law of regulation.

State Secretary, Labor's Nonpartisan League of California.

Mr. Chairman, oh, patriotism, what crimes are committed in my name.

I cannot say that I know Harry Bridges personally as I have met him only casually on two occasions.

I do know this, that several thousand members of his union living in my district have implicit faith in him. They attribute to him the fact that working conditions and wages they receive are much better than before he took the leadership of their organization.

To this fact add that even now this union is negotiating a new contract and you will have the real reason why some deem him to be undesirable. Boiled down to the last analysis we do not hesitate to state that this is the old battle between the union and the employers. Is this Congress going to take sides in this controversy? Are we going to fail to face the issue squarely? Or will we, under the cloak of Americanism, violate those very principles of democracy that we claim to espouse?

I maintain that this body should be the last in the world to succumb to hysteria and establish such a precedent as this just because it is good politics in an election year.

I did not think things would come to such a pass that I should ever hear a member of the Rules Committee so flout the principles of democracy as to make such a statement as I heard in that committee the other day when this bill was being considered. The gentleman from New York [Mr. First] stated, "The Congress needs no reason for deporting a man. It is enough if we do not like the color of his eyes."

This coming from a high-ranking minority member of that powerful committee. It is an indication of the shifting ether of keeping the Congress in session during these critical days than I say the sooner we do have the better legislation he needs. He has been proved by a 1914 States I thought not to be fully as energetic. And then after the process of having the Immigration Bill methods. Can we protect democracy by destroying it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Cooney].

Mr. Cooney of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. Cooney of Washington addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] for one-half minute.

Mr. Voorhis of California addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

Mr. Voorhis of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case].

Mr. Case of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this bill becoming a precedent. Let it be a precedent and let those who should, take warning.

Today happens to be the day when, I understand, the Bureau of Immigration goes over to the Department of Justice. Let it also be the day when America takes charge of her own destiny and says that we have the right to combat the "Irish column" according to the means that we find necessary in order to preserve the integrity and the life of the United States. [Applause.]

We have been told by the chairman of the Dies committee that the "Irish column," so-called, presents a new problem in the life of nations; that Norway was unable to meet it successfully; that other nations have found it difficult to meet.

I do not maintain that the passage of a bill that singles out one solitary individual for deportation is the answer to the problem—far from it, yet it is the only opportunity that has been given this body to speak what America thinks of this thing—the Immigration Commission of one hundred men who have come here as guests; they should not pull down the pillars of the house.

There is only one reason that legislation of this kind is here before us today. It is that the American people have the overwhelming conviction that someone whose job it was to administer certain immigration and naturalization laws has fallen down on the job in the face of a threatening situation.

It is a similar conviction that finally reached the head of the present administration that resulted in the reorganization order that transferred the Bureau of Immigration from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice, which is effective today. Four-sevenths of the personnel of the Labor Department will be transferred under that order. I am told

It is a shocking thing, that such a step is taken, as it is to correct that situation.

This is a shocking thing—the passage of a bill, which is an alien act, that represents the determination of America to do something about a situation that do not appear to be the property of other workers. They are tired of alien jobs that come here to reap what they can, but who have not the responsibility of citizenship. We have had here today that this man Bridges four times took on the job that had to many times no further.

That bill had to many times no further. The lawyers here divided on that question; the balance of us can only read the heart and mind of America on the broad question.

Can an alien come to this country, engage in a V. V. activities when the country is at war as Bridges did in 1915, the false statements regarding his marital relationship, as Bridges did; work himself into contact of destructive radical labor groups and lead them into sit-down strikes, taking possession of the property of other persons, violating the rights and desires of other workmen to work, disrupting the country's ability to produce and to carry its produce even in a time of national emergency—can a man, an alien, do these things and retain the welcome of the country where he is a guest?

Cannot the Congress which passes laws, both general and individual, that permit an alien's entry also pass a law to deport the alien who offends the hospitality he accepts?

That, as far as the American public is concerned, is the principle involved. And in this time when America is looking to her defense, there is only one answer. We have been told that the passage of this bill would be a blot on our history. The blot in history will be of those democracies that fail to assert the inherent rights in sovereignty of keeping out or kicking out those aliens who are or who become enemies of the United States. Let this be known as the day when America takes charge of her own destiny. [Applause.]

Mr. McGowan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case].

Mr. Case of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this bill becoming a precedent. Let it be a precedent and let those who should, take warning.

Today happens to be the day when, I understand, the Bureau of Immigration goes over to the Department of Justice. Let it also be the day when America takes charge of her own destiny and says that we have the right to combat the "Irish column" according to the means that we find necessary in order to preserve the integrity and the life of the United States. [Applause.]

We have been told by the chairman of the Dies committee that the "Irish column," so-called, presents a new problem in the life of nations; that Norway was unable to meet it successfully; that other nations have found it difficult to meet.

I do not maintain that the passage of a bill that singles out one solitary individual for deportation is the answer to the problem—far from it, yet it is the only opportunity that has been given this body to speak what America thinks of this thing—the Immigration Commission of one hundred men who have come here as guests; they should not pull down the pillars of the house.

There is only one reason that legislation of this kind is here before us today. It is that the American people have the overwhelming conviction that someone whose job it was to administer certain immigration and naturalization laws has fallen down on the job in the face of a threatening situation.

It is a similar conviction that finally reached the head of the present administration that resulted in the reorganization order that transferred the Bureau of Immigration from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice, which is effective today. Four-sevenths of the personnel of the Labor Department will be transferred under that order. I am told

It is a shocking thing, that such a step is taken, as it is to correct that situation.

This is a shocking thing—the passage of a bill, which is an alien act, that represents the determination of America to do something about a situation that do not appear to be the property of other workers. They are tired of alien jobs that come here to reap what they can, but who have not the responsibility of citizenship. We have had here today that this man Bridges four times took on the job that had to many times no further.

That bill had to many times no further. The lawyers here divided on that question; the balance of us can only read the heart and mind of America on the broad question.

Can an alien come to this country, engage in a V. V. activities when the country is at war as Bridges did in 1915, the false statements regarding his marital relationship, as Bridges did; work himself into contact of destructive radical labor groups and lead them into sit-down strikes, taking possession of the property of other persons, violating the rights and desires of other workmen to work, disrupting the country's ability to produce and to carry its produce even in a time of national emergency—can a man, an alien, do these things and retain the welcome of the country where he is a guest?

Cannot the Congress which passes laws, both general and individual, that permit an alien's entry also pass a law to deport the alien who offends the hospitality he accepts?

That, as far as the American public is concerned, is the principle involved. And in this time when America is looking to her defense, there is only one answer. We have been told that the passage of this bill would be a blot on our history. The blot in history will be of those democracies that fail to assert the inherent rights in sovereignty of keeping out or kicking out those aliens who are or who become enemies of the United States. Let this be known as the day when America takes charge of her own destiny. [Applause.]

Mr. McGowan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Case].

Mr. Case of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this bill becoming a precedent. Let it be a precedent and let those who should, take warning.

Today happens to be the day when, I understand, the Bureau of Immigration goes over to the Department of Justice. Let it also be the day when America takes charge of her own destiny and says that we have the right to combat the "Irish column" according to the means that we find necessary in order to preserve the integrity and the life of the United States. [Applause.]

We have been told by the chairman of the Dies committee that the "Irish column," so-called, presents a new problem in the life of nations; that Norway was unable to meet it successfully; that other nations have found it difficult to meet.

I do not maintain that the passage of a bill that singles out one solitary individual for deportation is the answer to the problem—far from it, yet it is the only opportunity that has been given this body to speak what America thinks of this thing—the Immigration Commission of one hundred men who have come here as guests; they should not pull down the pillars of the house.

There is only one reason that legislation of this kind is here before us today. It is that the American people have the overwhelming conviction that someone whose job it was to administer certain immigration and naturalization laws has fallen down on the job in the face of a threatening situation.

It is a similar conviction that finally reached the head of the present administration that resulted in the reorganization order that transferred the Bureau of Immigration from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice, which is effective today. Four-sevenths of the personnel of the Labor Department will be transferred under that order. I am told

It is a shocking thing, that such a step is taken, as it is to correct that situation.



The Chair sustains the point of order.

All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'Connor] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Van Zandt].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported so the Members may know what it provides.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the O'Connor amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Van Zandt].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the Van Zandt amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parallel motion.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know who has the privilege of offering a motion to recommit. If a gentleman on the minority side is ready to offer a motion to recommit, is he not entitled to recognition for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. The rule is that a minority Member who qualifies as being opposed to the bill is entitled to recognition if that point is raised. Does the gentleman raise that question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes; I certainly do.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Connecticut opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARTIN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 9766 to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. This question is on the passage of the bill.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Barton of North Carolina (for) with Mr. Magnuson (against).

Unfil further notice:

Mr. Foy with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Cullin.

Mr. Coffey with Mr. Clegg of New York.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Yelton.

Mr. Smith of Illinois with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Stock with Mr. Denny.

Mr. Donnell with Mr. Lamb.

Mr. Satterthwaite with Mr. Keenan.

Mr. Walker with Mr. Egan.

Mr. Wood of New York with Mr. Trubman.

Mr. Wood with Mr. Keenan.

Mr. Cramer with Mr. Keenan.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Keenan.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. Spruce with Mr. Keane.

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, it be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 300, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of domestic personal liberty and property rights, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, and that after general debate, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the majority and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the part of the minority, the question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without amendments.

RESERVED BY THE VERTUALLY ACT OF 1938

Mr. CLARK from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed: