

APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and Mr. SCOTT rose.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Two gentlemen arise: For what purpose did the gentleman from Kansas arise?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rose for the purpose of moving that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas arises for the purpose of submitting a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill. For what purpose did the gentleman from Indiana arise?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I arose, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of moving that the House do now resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill apportioning Representatives among the several States under the Thirteenth Decennial Census.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana rose for the purpose of submitting a motion to the House that it do resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill referred to—the apportionment bill—reported from the Committee on the Census. It seems to the Chair the gentleman calls up a matter which heretofore has been held, with one exception, uniformly to be a question of constitutional privilege, and the Chair will recognize the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Did not this House once overrule the Speaker and hold this was not a motion of the highest privilege?

The SPEAKER. Oh, well, the Chair thinks it did, but the Chair, without regard to such action, recognizes the gentleman, and it is in the power of the House to consider this bill; or, if they refuse to consider this bill, to consider some other privileged bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Would it be in order for me to move, as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, that the House proceed to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Agricultural bill?

The SPEAKER. Those motions under the rule in the practice of the House have not been considered as amendable, since

they refuse to consider this bill, to consider some other privileged bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Would it be in order for me to move, as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, that the House proceed to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Agricultural bill?

The SPEAKER. Those motions under the rule in the practice of the House have not been considered as amendable, since no time would be saved and no purpose would be effected.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 30566) providing for the apportionment of Representatives among the several States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House do resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 30566) for the apportionment of Representatives among the several States.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And, Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to two hours, one hour on a side, one hour of which is to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] and the other half by myself, and that the debate shall be confined to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the request. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that all general debate be limited to two hours on this bill, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana and the other half by the gentleman from Virginia, and that the general debate shall be confined to the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he thinks it would be fair to have general debate controlled by two gentlemen who have both reported in favor of the same bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Well, I do not know that there is anybody in the House who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. MANN. A good many people are opposed to the bill which is reported and which the gentleman calls up.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I know that an amendment will be offered to the first section limiting the membership, or reducing the membership from 433, as proposed by the bill, to 391.

Mr. KENDALL. That will be done by the committee.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And when that question comes up there will be a liberal amount of debate upon the bill.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] spoke to me about time that, I understand, he wants to use in opposing the size of the representation provided in the bill reported by the committee. I think arrangement can be made between the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] and myself to give him 30 minutes of the time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who wants time in opposition to the bill reported by the Committee on the Census.

The SPEAKER. One moment. The Chair will suggest that there may be some member of the Committee on the Census that is opposed to the bill as reported, on the matter of ratio, for instance, or for any other reason. If so, it seems that the gentleman had better modify his request in order to let him control the time; and if there is no such man on the committee then that the request ought to go to some gentleman on the Democratic side; and if there be no one there opposed to the bill, then to any gentleman on the Republican side who is opposed to it. The Chair merely makes that by way of suggestion.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] is opposed to the bill.

Mr. HAY. I would like to suggest that it is entirely proper that a gentleman who is opposed to the committee bill control the time on this side. Now, I understood the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has introduced a bill carrying out the views of certain Members of the House for 391 Members instead of 433, as reported by the committee, and I suggest that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] control the time as opposed to the committee bill, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] control the time in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] modify his request as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I did not understand what his suggestion was.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] suggests the following modification, namely, that general debate be concluded in two hours, and be confined to the bill, and that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] control one hour of that time and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] the other hour.

Mr. MANN. A question for information before they decide that, Mr. Speaker. Does the bill go to the Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule after general debate?

The SPEAKER. It can only be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union except by unanimous consent, and under the five-minute rule, of course.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. The situation is a little peculiar here

Mr. CRU
the time f
and that i
The SP
modifies L
hours and
the bill. I
none.

The mo
Accordi
Whole Ho
the bill (C
tives in (C
teenth Dec
The CH
Whole Ho
H. R. 305
the bill.

The Cle
A bill (I
Congress a
Census.

Mr. CR
sent that
The CH
There w
The CH
for one ho
Mr. CR
committee
Represent
Decennial
peratively
under eac
taken last
certified t
is ready n
gard it as
There ;
should be
The legisl
sion, and
after the
selves wh
into cong
population
practicabl

