1142. By Mr. TURNER: Petitions from (1) Dickson, (10) Giles, (5) Hickman, (3) Wayne, (1) Maury, (5) Lawrence, (2) Williamson Counties, Tenn., requesting the passage of House bill 2856, old-age-pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1143. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging an amendment to the reconstruction finance law in behalf of loans to small fishing industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1144. Also, petition of employees of Greenfield Tap & Die Corporation, Greenfield, Mass., protesting against the Connery-Black 30-hour bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1145. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Societa M. S. Nord Italia di East Liberty, Pittsburgh, Pa., by their secretary, Dan Calalerese, demanding immediate enactment of the workers' bill (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

1146. Also, petition of the Tony Wroblewski Post, No. 18, of the American Legion, Toledo, by their adjutant, James J. Tusynski, asking only to be treated on a par with the railroads, munitions concerns, and other industrial organizations, and urging the payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1147. Also, petition of the Akron Board of Business Representatives, Akron, Ohio, by their recording secretary, Daniel C. Stokes, favoring the Wagner bill and urging Members of Congress to give it their full support; to the Committee on Labor.

1148. Also, petition of German-American Federation of the Ohio Valley, by their secretary, Theodor Meyer, Shadyside, Ohio, endorsing the Lundeen bill (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

1149. Also, petition of German Beneficial Union of Pittsburgh, District No. 474, of Mansfield, Ohio, by their secretary, Jacob B. Walery, urging that their Congressmen actively support to the fullest extent House bill 2827; to the Committee on Labor.

1150. By Mr. WALLGREN: Petition of Washington State Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1151. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 1789, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to remove unwarranted obstacles to wine distribution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1152. Also, Joint Resolution No. 1 of the California State Senate, memorializing Congress to provide compensation, in lieu of taxes, for certain lands of the United States within the borders of the several States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1153. By Mr. WERNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota urging enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill, or its equivalent, and Government regulation of marking on basis of cost of production for that part of farm crops domestically consumed, and providing for storage of surplus on the farm or disposal in the world market; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1154. By Mr. WHITE: Petition of the Idaho State Legislature, being senate joint memorial no. 3, with reference to discriminatory freight rates on livestock and agricultural products produced in Idaho and other Western States similarly situated, urging the Congress to examine into the conditions set forth in connection with the proposed legislation for the purpose of creating and designating marketing termini within the several producing States; also urging that a processing or consumer's tax be levied by Congress on the commodity in commerce which shall be sufficient in amount to create a fund out of which all freight charges shall be paid from the designated terminal to the point of destination; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1155. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of George Ricker, of Owendale, Mich., and 39 others of Huron County, Mich., urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1156. By Mr. ZIMMERMAN: Petition of House of Representatives of Missouri, urging Congress to pass legislation providing for immediate payment of balance due on adjusted-service certificates, commonly referred to as "soldiers' bonus"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1157. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Dunklin County, Mo., and of Ripley County, Mo., asking Congress to enact an old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1158. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Sioux Falls Chamber of Commerce, regarding the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1935

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

Dear Lord and Father of us all, who knowest the weariness of every heart that comes to Thee for rest: refresh us with the streams of love which flow from Thee forever like a never-ebbing sea, as at Thy gracious word we come before Thee, laying at Thy feet our fretting cares. Grant that Thy children everywhere may own Thy sway, and hear the call of Him by whom we test our lives, that as He walks again amid life's throng and press all sin-sick souls may touch the seamless garment of His love and be made whole again. We ask it in His name and for His sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 12, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I note the absence of a quorum, and ask for a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Coolidge	Keyes	Pope
Ashurst	Costigan	King	Radcliffe
Austin	Couzens	La Follette	Reynolds
Bachman	Cutting	Lewis	Robinson
Bailey	Davis	Logan	Russell
Bankhead	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schall
Barbour	Dieterich	Long	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Donahey	McAdoo	Sheppard
Bilbo	Duffy	McCarran	Shipstead
Black	Fletcher	McGill	Smith
Bone	Frazier	McKellar	Steiwer
Borah	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gibson	Metcalf	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Minton	Trammell
Burke	Gore	Moore	Truman
Byrd	Guffey	Murphy	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Murray	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Neely	Van Nuys
Caraway	Hastings	Norbeck	Wagner
Carey	Hatch	Nye	Walsh
Clark	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Connally	Johnson	Pittman	White

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] is detained by illness in his family and that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 932) authorizing the Postmaster General to extend certain air mail contracts for a further period not exceeding 6 months, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 3465. An act permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4996. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Chester C. Groff; and

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution authorizing the use of public parks, reservations, and other public spaces in the District of Columbia; and the use of tents, cots, hospital appliances, flags, and other decorations, property of the United States, by Washington, D. C., 1935 Shrine Committee, Inc., and for other purposes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIETERICH. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. It is very seldom that I address the Senate on a matter of this kind, but for fear that some of my colleagues may think I have suddenly gone insane, I think it might be well for me to explain an article which was published in the Washington Post, Wednesday, February 13, pertaining to an address delivered by me before the Dames of the Loyal Legion assembled at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., in commemoration of the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, a President who came from my State.

In that address I stated that Lincoln in his time met with a treachery that was not unlike that with which the present administration was meeting. I did not think anyone could misunderstand that statement nor draw any deduction such as has been drawn. I am reported as saying that "Lincoln met with a little more treachery than we are meeting now." Even if that was the language I used, the newspaper could not construct the headline in which it is said by innuendo that I said the new deal was "like the treachery Lincoln met", and could not characterize my address as vicious assault upon the policies of the administration and the new deal.

I believe that anyone within the sound of my voice who has watched my action on the floor of the Senate in supporting those measures would say, if that was my attitude, I had suddenly suffered an illucid interval.

I did comment upon the unusual conditions we were meeting and the unusual legislative program necessary to meet those conditions, but I made no criticism of that program. Everyone within the sound of my voice knows that I have always felt, and so expressed myself, that it was a consistent program directed toward a definite objective which had for its purpose the cure and recovery from the depressed condition which has confronted the Nation. I think all others, like myself, have hoped that the time for these unusual measures would eventually expire and we would finally get to the place where we could pursue a normal course of legislation.

I merely wish to say that the article does not do me justice. Evidently whoever listened to my talk misunderstood me. Unfortunately I did not talk from manuscript. I think that is a serious mistake I made and I shall try not to make that mistake again.

I make this statement merely to inform those Senators who may have read the article that I am still with the new deal, still with the policies of the administration, and still expect to lend my support in the fight for recovery. I have never made any public or private expression to the contrary.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for taking its time on this matter, because it is very distasteful to me to have to bring up such a personal matter.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, I should like to add my complete endorsement of the statement just made by my eminent colleague as to his ceaseless and constant support of the administration. Particularly, I may note this fact, when it is recalled that my eminent colleague, who for 20 years with me has been urging a cause and aiding in a fight in our great State of Illinois, parted from me upon the vote on the World Court upon construction by him of the national platform of 1932 on which he was elected, where I departed from the administration based upon the terms of the Illinois 1930 platform on which I was elected. I voted against the Court.

I merely call attention now that a more consistent, honorable, and devoted course of support to any President could not be carried on by any Senator in excess of that which has been represented by word and conduct everywhere by my honorable colleague.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
TWELFTH LEGISLATURE, SENATE,
REGULAR SESSION.

Senate Memorial 1

A memorial to the Congress of the United States praying for an adequate appropriation for the United States Bureau of Mines

Whereas the mining industry in the United States is the Nation's second largest industry, providing a large proportion of the Nation's wealth, and giving employment to a large proportion of our population; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Mines is the only governmental agency devoting entire effort to the development of the mining industry, the safety of those employed by the industry, and the compilation of authoritative information for guidance of the industry; and

Whereas the appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the United States Bureau of Mines by the Seventy-third Congress was severely curtailed, necessitating economies which seriously interfere with the efficient operation of the Bureau, greatly limiting research work, and seriously interfering with the work of the Bureau in safety and mine-rescue operations, thus endangering the lives and health of our citizenship engaged in the business of mining; and

Whereas the mining industry is entitled to and should receive a portion of the benefits accruing from governmental functions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, petitioned to provide sufficient funds for the efficient operation of the United States Bureau of Mines, and particularly that portion of the work assigned to the Bureau covering research, statistical, and safety work; and be it further

Resolved, That suitably engrossed copies of this memorial, signed by the president of the senate, be transmitted to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, the Director of the Budget, the President of the United States, and to each of the Arizona Members of the Congress of the United States at Washington.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

Unanimously adopted by the senate, February 8, 1935.

M. C. HALDMAN,
President of the Senate.
W. J. GRAHAM,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

Concurrent Resolution A

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue Federal aid to school districts in financial distress

Whereas the Federal Government during the year of 1934 did grant to the teachers employed by distressed school districts financial assistance by paying salaries to teachers, thus enabling many school children in the drought area to secure schooling who would otherwise have been denied it; and

Whereas such aid now being furnished will expire January 31, 1935, or within 21 days; and

Whereas while recognizing the State's responsibility to provide assistance to such distressed school districts we must acknowledge that in the ordinary course of legislative action any financial plan devised will be too late to be of assistance during the present term; and

Whereas the financial crisis of the entire public-school system is bound to grow more serious and will, unless aid is forthcoming, result in the loss of school privileges to at least 25 percent of the school children living on farms and in small towns, villages, etc.: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house concurring) respectfully and urgently memorialize the Congress of the United States to direct that the Federal Emergency Relief Administration continue the relief aid now being furnished to distressed school districts for the balance of this school term or until such time as may be necessary to secure special State revenue for such purposes.

WALTER WELFORD,
President of the Senate.
F. E. TUNELL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA.

Senate Concurrent Resolution H

Requesting Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the immediate payment of World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; canceling interest; refunding interest paid

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring)—

Whereas a general economic depression, producing a depreciation in the value of all commodities, a stagnation of business, an aggravated condition of unemployment, and serious individual suffering, now exists in the State of North Dakota and throughout the whole Nation; and

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States certain measures, the purpose of which is to alleviate in some degree the existing distressing conditions by providing for the immediate conversion into cash of World War veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; and

Whereas the passage of such legislation would bring immediate relief to thousands of veterans and their dependents who are now in need, create new markets, instill new life into American business, and be a well-deserved demonstration of the gratitude of the Nation to those who carried its arms in 1917 and 1918; and

Whereas the American Legion in convention duly assembled have requested the immediate cash payment of all adjusted-compensation certificates; and

Whereas it is our sincere and honest belief that the immediate cash payment of all adjusted-compensation certificates will be of untold value in hastening recovery from present economic crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring) most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the early enactment of legislation providing for the cancelation of all accrued interest, the refund of all interest paid, and the immediate payment, upon application, of the full face value of such adjusted-compensation certificates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of North Dakota be, and is hereby, instructed to forward a duly authenticated copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each representative of the State of North Dakota in the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

WALTER WELFORD,
President of the Senate.
F. E. TUNNEL,
Secretary of the Senate.
WILLIAM M. CROCKETT,
Speaker of the House.
WALTER S. MARTIN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1934, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Indiana in session assembled—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to acquire the Daniel Freeman farm in Gage County, Nebr., for the purpose of establishing it as a national monument to mark the filing of homestead no. 1, of the United States, and to commemorate the development of the agricultural empire of the West

Whereas the homestead law of 1862 marked an era in our Government's effort to solve the problems of humanity by making available free homesteads for its citizens; and

Whereas Daniel Freeman, a resident of Gage County, Nebr., a soldier in the Union Army, on January 1, 1863, filed on a certain tract of land on Cub Creek, in Gage County, Nebr.; and

Whereas the filing by Daniel Freeman on January 1, 1863, stands of record as filing no. 1, of more than 1,000,000 homestead filings; and

Whereas the homestead filing of Daniel Freeman also marked and was situated upon the old freight road from the Missouri River to the mountains, which was an important line of communication and marked the development of the West; and

Whereas today humanity is at the crossroads, and history of the development of the great agricultural empire of the West, made possible by the homestead law of 1862, is an inspiring story: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nebraska, fiftieth session assembled—

SECTION 1. That the National Congress be memorialized to acquire the Daniel Freeman homestead, which is homestead no. 1 of the records of the Land Office of the United States; and

SEC. 2. To establish the Daniel Freeman homestead as a national monument in commemoration of the beneficent purposes of the homestead law of 1862, made possible by the great humanitarian, President Abraham Lincoln; and

SEC. 3. The Daniel Freeman homestead as a national monument to also commemorate and be a permanent monument to the development of the agreat agricultural empire of the West; and

SEC. 4. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Vice President as the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Members of the United States Senate from Nebraska, and to the Members of the House of Representatives from Nebraska, and to all patriotic, historical, and civic societies with the request that they lend their support to the establishment as a national monument of homestead no. 1 of the United States, known as the "Daniel Freeman homestead", located in Gage County, Nebr.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

House Joint Memorial 9

To His Excellency the President of the United States and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas during the past decade the production of narcissus bulbs within the State of Oregon has increased to a point where it now assumes the status of an important horticultural industry, representing an investment of approximately $3,000,000; and

Whereas the amazing development and success of this industry has been influenced by several important factors, namely, favorable climatic conditions, scientific cultural methods, rigid standards of grading, the success of an organized pest-control program, the close cooperation between the bulb growers, the State department of agriculture, and particularly the protection from foreign pests and diseases afforded by the United States Department of Agriculture quarantine no. 37; and

Whereas an announcement by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace on January 14, 1935, that the regulations governing the importation of narcissus bulbs from foreign countries will be removed and unlimited importation permitted places our tremendous stocks of high-quality, clean, domestic-grown narcissus bulbs in jeopardy from the influx of infested foreign material which will follow; and

Whereas we realize that the United States Department of Agriculture takes all reasonable precaution to prevent the introduction of foreign pests which may be detrimental to agriculture, nevertheless, it is the consensus of opinion of scientific authorities that the presence of the serious pest known as the "bulb nematode" (Anguillulina dipsaci) in narcissus bulbs cannot usually be detected in the ordinary process of inspection as practiced at the various ports of entry; and

Whereas in view of the large expenditures in money and effort by the narcissus growers of the State in maintaining high cultural standards and in successfully fulfilling the requirements of

a pest-control program which has been encouraged by the United States Department of Agriculture; and

Whereas in view of the judgment of practical bulb growers that all of this money and effort will be lost and a valuable, growing industry would be destroyed by this order: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to reestablish narcissus bulbs in United States Department of Agriculture quarantine no. 37 to the status occupied prior to the above announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, and we further request that all imported stocks of narcissus be subjected to the latest improved treatment of hot-water sterilization at ports of entry as a protection to our domestic stocks of narcissus bulbs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Member of the Oregon delegation in Congress, and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter from Louis A. Nucera, of Buffalo, N. Y., enclosing data and his views concerning a national new deal, having reference to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by money institutes held at Corunna and Owosso, Mich., under the auspices of the American Science Foundation, favoring the prompt enactment of legislation taking from banks organized for private profit the privilege of issuing money, and the issuance instead of all money directly by the Government to citizens for services rendered and materials purchased, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by members of Goodyear Local, No. 18282, United Rubber Workers Federal Labor Union, of Akron, Ohio, favoring the enactment of the so-called "Wagner Labor Disputes Act"; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by Ensign Eric Lingard Post, No. 1624, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Gloucester, Mass., favoring the imposition of an adequate tariff duty upon foreign fish entering the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram from members of the Ladies' Auxiliary of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fort Concho Post, No. 1815, of San Angelo, Tex., favoring the passage of legislation providing for immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from the committee on legislation, Kit Carson County Bureau Federation, Burlington, Colo., praying for adoption of the so-called "Wagner Labor Disputes Act", which were Act", lowering the farm-mortgage interest rate to 3½ percent, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from Louis Weiss, secretary, etc., New York City, N. Y., on behalf of 15,000 bricklayers in New York City and Long Island, praying for the insertion of the so-called "McCarran amendment" relative to the prevailing rate of wages clause in the pending work-relief program joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117), which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, favoring the passage of legislation repealing the Federal tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 12th instant, p. 1821, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. ASHURST presented petitions signed by 436 citizens of the State of Arizona, praying for the adoption of Senate Resolution 70, submitted by Mr. BORAH, protesting against religious persecutions by the Government of Mexico and authorizing an investigation thereof by the Committee on Foreign Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, on request of Mr. ASHURST, the body of one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, resident in the county of Maricopa, State of Arizona, having read the Borah resolution on Mexico, do heartily concur in the sentiments of that resolution, and we hereby respectfully but urgently call upon our Senators, the Honorable HENRY F. ASHURST and the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, as well as upon our Representative, the Honorable ISABELLA GREENWAY, to lend their support to this and any corresponding resolution in the Senate and the House, respectively.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

House Concurrent Resolution 10

Whereas the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates to the veterans of the World War will increase tremendously the purchasing power of millions of the consuming public distributed uniformly throughout the Nation; and will provide relief for the holders thereof, who are in dire need and distress because of the present unfortunate economic conditions; and will lighten the burden which towns, cities, counties, and States are required to carry for relief; and

Whereas the payment of said certificates will not create any additional debt but will discharge and retire an acknowledged interest obligation to the National Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Delaware in general assembly met—

1. That since the Government of the United States is now definitely committed to the policy of spending additional sums of money for the purpose of hastening recovery from the present economic crisis, the General Assembly of the State of Delaware recommends the immediate cash payment at face value of the adjusted-service certificates, with cancelation of interest accrued and refund of interest paid, as a most effective means to that end.

2. That the secretary of the senate and the chief clerk of the house of representatives are hereby directed to forward copies of the concurrent resolution to the congressional delegates of the State of Delaware: Hon. DANIEL O. HASTINGS, Hon. JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Jr., and Hon. J. GEORGE STEWART.

Mr. RUSSELL presented the following resolution of the Senate of the State of Georgia, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States what is commonly known as the "bonus bill"; and

Whereas the Government of the United States through various agencies is extending relief throughout the United States and is making loans for the purpose of restoring employment; and

Whereas ex-soldiers who would be benefited by the payment of the bonus at this time are in every walk of life, and live in every section of the United States; and

Whereas many of these ex-soldiers have procured loans against their bonus certificates which are bearing interest which is accumulating so that at the maturity of the bonus certificates there will be little or nothing left; and

Whereas the service for which the bonus certificate is granted was performed at a wage of $30 per month for the great majority and at the most productive age of the soldiers and at a time when other citizens were gainfully employed at much higher wages: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of Georgia, That we urge upon our Representatives in Congress the immediate passage of the "bonus bill" regarding the distribution of the payments thereunder as being fair, equitable, and just.

Mr. RUSSELL also presented the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Whereas the veterans of the World War have heroically and valiantly fought and suffered to protect and safeguard the ideals of America; and

Whereas a great number of them surrendered their business and suffered much loss when they volunteered their services to their country; and

Whereas our great country issued to them an adjusted compensation as a medium of their appreciation for what they have done when duty called: Be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States now in session pay these men in cash their adjusted compensation just as soon as they, in their judgment, feel that our national finances will permit; be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, now in session, go on record favoring the payment of the adjusted compensation.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY PROJECT

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the Division No.

22, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Camden, N. J., against ratification of the St. Lawrence Waterways Treaty. I may add in passing that I voted against the ratification of this treaty when it came up before the Senate last session.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Senators WARREN BARBOUR, A. HARRY MOORE, and Honorable Congressman CHARLES WOLVERTON:

Resolution

Whereas the opening of the St. Lawrence Waterways would cause irreparable damage to railroads operating between Atlantic coast and Chicago tidewater; and

Whereas the movement of freight by foreign ships manned by cheap foreign labor would cause heavy loss of employment by American railroad employees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Division No. 22, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Camden, N. J., goes on record as opposed to the opening of the aforesaid St. Lawrence Waterways and requests their representatives, the Honorable Senators WARREN BARBOUR and A. HARRY MOORE and Honorable Congressman CHARLES WOLVERTON to use their influence and vote against the furtherance of this project.

JOSEPH H. SYPHERD,
Chief Engineer.

[SEAL] RALPH ELBERTSON,
Secretary.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back favorably, with amendments, House Joint Resolution 117, making appropriations for relief purposes; and I submit a report (No. 109) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be immediately considered and made the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from Virginia desires to have the Senate enter upon the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GLASS. I made that request.

Mr. McNARY. Has the report on the joint resolution been filed?

Mr. GLASS. I am filing the report now.

Mr. McNARY. In view of that situation, Mr. President, since the immediate consideration of the measure is objectionable to the rule and the practice of the Senate, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 1425) to amend section 80 of chapter 9 of an act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, reported it without amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1094. A bill for the relief of Claude C. Martin (Rept. No. 110); and

S. 1427. A bill for the relief of Lyman I. Collins (Rept. No. 111).

Mr. DICKINSON also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1347) for the relief of Robert J. Smith, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 112) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1390) for the relief of Harry L. Reaves, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 113) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 1821) for the relief of Frank White and others; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1822) authorizing the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska to bring suit in the United States Court of Claims, and conferring jurisdiction upon said court to hear, examine, adjudicate, and enter judgment upon any and all claims which said Indians may have, or claim to have, against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 1823) to correct the naval record of Willard A. Freeman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 1824) for the relief of Abraham Green (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1825) to amend the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GIBSON:

A bill (S. 1826) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service to include employees in the legislative branch; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 1827) for the relief of Lucille McClure;

A bill (S. 1828) for the relief of Mrs. Frank G. Sanford; and

A bill (S. 1829) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims arising from the use by the Postal Service of the United States of a combined postmarking and stamp-canceling device, generally known and referred to as the Norton device or stamp, and more particularly described in United States letters patents issued to Marcus P. Norton, nos. 25036, 37175, and 38175; and to award compensation therefor; to the Committee on Claims.

(By request.) A bill (S. 1830) for the relief of Naomi L. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HATCH:

(By request.) A bill (S. 1831) transferring certain national-forest lands to the Zuni Indian Reservation, N. Mex.; and

A bill (S. 1832) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide by agreement with Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, a subdivision of the State of New Mexico, for maintenance and operation on newly reclaimed Pueblo Indian lands in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., reclaimed under previous act of Congress, and authorizing an annual appropriation to pay the cost thereof for a period of not to exceed 5 years; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 1833) for the relief of W. L. Horn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 1834) authorizing loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to publicly and privately controlled colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher learning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A bill (S. 1835) for the relief of the legal representatives of John T. Brickwood, deceased, Edward Gaynor, Theodore Gebler, Lee W. Mix, Arthur L. Peck, Thomas D. Casanega, Joseph de Lusignan, and Joseph H. Berger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 1836) for the relief of Emma S. Fletcher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

A bill (S. 1837) for the relief of W. W. Cook; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 1838) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 1839) amending section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916, and section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 1841) to provide medical services after retirement on annuity to former employees of the United States disabled by injuries sustained in the performance of their duties; and

A bill (S. 1842) to amend section 863, title 48, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America relating to the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 1843) to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Service Cross to George J. Frank; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 1844) granting a pension to Howard E. Tolson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MALONEY:

A bill (S. 1845) granting an increase of pension to George B. Sheldon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL:

A bill (S. 1846) for the relief of the estate of Anton W. Fischer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 1847) to amend Public Law No. 169, 73d Congress, commonly known as the "Bankhead Act", to permit farmers producing 3 bales of cotton or less to sell same tax free, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAREY:

A bill (S. 1848) for the relief of Joseph E. Myers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1849) to amend the act of June 27, 1934, known as the "National Housing Act"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 1850) to amend an act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever", approved February 28, 1929, as amended, by including Roger P. Ames among those honored by said act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 1851) to amend an act entitled "The United States Grain Standards Act", approved August 11, 1916, and acts amendatory thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1852) to provide for the carrying out of the award of the National War Labor Board of April 11, 1919, and the decision of the Secretary of War of November 30, 1920, in favor of certain employees of the Minneapolis Steel & Machinery Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; of the St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; of the American Hoist & Derrick Co., St. Paul, Minn.; and of the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co., Stillwater, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BULKLEY:

A bill (S. 1853) to amend the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) for the relief of Lillian Morden; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59) providing for the celebration on September 17, 1937, of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Convention; establishing a commission to be known as the "Sesquicentennial Constitution Commission"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEDAL OF HONOR TO MAJOR GENERAL GREELY

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, on the 4th of February the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN], Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the body at the other end of the Capitol, introduced a bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus W. Greely. At the request of Mr. McSWAIN, I introduce a similar bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate.

The bill (S. 1840) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION IN WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to House Joint Resolution 117, relating to highway construction. I ask that the amendment lie on the table, be printed, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, immediately following it, a brief statement relative to the meaning of the amendment.

I offer this amendment at this time in order that the Senate may have ample time to study it. In connection therewith I should also like to have printed in the RECORD certain data relative to the ratio of apportionment of Federal road-construction funds, the work that could be performed in the several States, and a comparison of the total expenditures for highways with the collection of Federal taxes from those who use the roads.

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

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. HAYDEN is as follows:

On page 3, line 4, before the period insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, (1) That from the appropriation made herein not less than the several sums authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, by the act approved June 18, 1934, entitled 'An act to increase employment by authorizing an appropriation to provide for emergency construction of public highways and related projects, and to amend the Federal Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes, including the unappropriated balance of the amount authorized by section 1 of such act of June 18, 1934, shall be expended in the manner and for the purposes specified in said act; and, (2) except as hereinafter provided, all additional sums allocated from the appropriation made herein for the construction of public highways and other related projects (except within or adjacent to national forests, national parks, or other Federal reservations) shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture in the manner provided by section 204 (b) of the National Industrial Recovery Act for expenditure by the State highway departments under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, and subject to the provisions of section 1 of such act of June 18, 1934: *Provided further*, That any amounts, in addition to the amounts specified in the preceding proviso, allocated from the appropriation made herein for the elimination of existing hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, including the separation of grades at crossings, the reconstruction of existing railroad grade crossing structures, and the relocation of highways to eliminate grade crossings, shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States (including the Territory of Hawaii and the District of Columbia), one-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States as shown by the latest decennial census, one-fourth in the ratio which the mileage of the Federal-aid highway system in each State bears to the total mileage of the Federal-aid highway system in all the States, as of January 1, 1935, and one-fourth in the ratio which the railroad mileage in each State bears to the total railroad mileage in all the States, as determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission, to be expended by the State highway departments under the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended and supplemented, and subject to the provisions of section 1 of such act of June 18, 1934; but no part of the funds apportioned to any State need be matched by the State: *And provided further*, That the President may also allot funds made available by this joint resolution for the construction, repair, and improvement of public highways in Alaska, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands: *Provided, however*, That in the expenditure of funds from the appropriation made herein for the construction of public highways and other related projects preference in the employment of labor shall be given (except in executive, administrative, supervisory, and highly skilled positions) to persons receiving relief, where they are qualified, and the President is hereby authorized to predetermine the hours of work and the rates of wages to be paid to skilled, intermediate, and unskilled labor engaged in such construction in the several States."

The statement and data ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HAYDEN

The amendment consists of five substantive propositions:

1. The actual appropriation of $249,000,000 authorized to be appropriated by the Road Act of June 18, 1934, for expenditure as provided in that act. This appropriation is made, not because of a desire to earmark money for roads in the joint resolution, but primarily to secure uniformity in the expenditure of road funds with respect to wages and hours of labor. If earmarking had been the object, the sum for roads and grade-crossing elimination would

have been much larger. Administrator Ickes reports that 18 percent of the $3,300,000,000 appropriated for public works has been allocated to highways, and it is, therefore, reasonable to assume, that substantial sums above the minimum of $249,000,000 will be so used out of the appropriation of $4,000,000,000.

2. Direction that any additional sums allotted to road construction from the $4,000,000,000 shall likewise be expended in accordance with the Federal Highway Act of 1921, and section 1 of the act of June 18, 1934. This provision means that all money for primary and secondary roads, and within municipalities, will be apportioned among the States in the customary way and all new highway construction will be supervised by the State highway departments and carried on in the manner now provided by law.

3. Recognizing that the established rule of apportionment based on population, area, and mileage of roads does not fit the grade-crossing situation, the amendment adopts a new method suggested by the American Association of State Highway Officials. The factor of area is eliminated and railway mileage substituted therefor. The factor of population is increased to one-half. Careful comparison with the work capable of being accomplished shows that this change in the basis of apportionment will fairly and equitably distribute the Federal funds to be used in grade-crossing elimination.

4. Since Federal aid is not regularly apportioned to Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or the Virgin Islands, it is necessary to specifically authorize highway construction therein.

5. In his message to Congress, the President proposed that persons who are on relief be employed at less than the ordinary rate of wages. The monthly rate is to be more than twice the average relief payment, which is $24 per month, or an average of about $50 per month for continuous employment. This can readily be accomplished on road construction by authorizing the President to adjust the scales of wages which have been predetermined by the several State highway departments. The last provision gives this authority to the President and provides for preference to those on relief. The hours and wages fixed by the President will apply to all State highway work paid for with Federal funds, and thus avoid different rates of pay for the same kind of work done within the same State.

Sample apportionments of $100,000,000

State	Basis of apportionment	
	½ population, ¼ mile Federal-aid highway system, ¼ mile railroad	Sec. 204, N. I. R. A., ⅓ Federal aid, ⅓ population
Alabama	$2,073,000	$2,129,000
Arizona	652,000	1,318,000
Arkansas	1,831,000	1,719,000
California	3,794,000	3,973,000
Colorado	1,332,000	1,742,000
Connecticut	874,000	728,000
Delaware	221,000	462,000
Florida	1,450,000	1,332,000
Georgia	2,522,000	2,559,000
Idaho	870,000	1,140,000
Illinois	5,260,000	4,458,000
Indiana	2,624,000	2,534,000
Iowa	2,865,000	2,560,000
Kansas	2,644,000	2,561,000
Kentucky	1,894,000	1,911,000
Louisiana	1,650,000	1,482,000
Maine	734,000	860,000
Maryland	1,070,000	898,000
Massachusetts	2,110,000	1,673,000
Michigan	3,382,000	3,232,000
Minnesota	2,760,000	2,706,000
Mississippi	1,675,000	1,773,000
Missouri	3,164,000	3,083,000
Montana	1,428,000	1,885,000
Nebraska	1,852,000	1,985,000
Nevada	457,000	1,150,000
New Hampshire	424,000	485,000
New Jersey	2,038,000	1,604,000
New Mexico	914,000	1,473,000
New York	6,930,000	5,665,000
North Carolina	2,490,000	2,421,000
North Dakota	1,702,000	1,470,000
Ohio	4,280,000	3,934,000
Oklahoma	2,383,000	2,349,000
Oregon	1,211,000	1,558,000
Pennsylvania	5,901,000	4,793,000
Rhode Island	359,000	507,000
South Carolina	1,510,000	1,386,000
South Dakota	1,464,000	1,526,000
Tennessee	1,943,000	2,150,000
Texas	5,591,000	6,148,000
Utah	641,000	1,061,000
Vermont	376,000	474,000
Virginia	1,939,000	1,873,000
Washington	1,569,000	1,552,000
West Virginia	1,375,000	1,144,000
Wisconsin	2,578,000	2,474,000
Wyoming	726,000	1,138,000
District of Columbia	201,000	487,000
Hawaii	237,000	475,000
Total	100,000,000	100,000,000

CONSTRUCTION DATA COMPILED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

President Roosevelt said in his message to the Congress, January 4, 1935: "This new program of emergency public employment should be governed by a number of practical principles (a) all work undertaken should be useful * * * affords permanent improvement. (b) Projects should be undertaken on which a large percentage of direct labor can be used. (c) The projects undertaken should be selected and planned so as to compete as little as possible with private enterprise * * *.

"This work will cover a wide field including * * * improving existing road systems and in constructing national highways designed to handle modern traffic and in the elimination of grade crossings * * *."

State highway departments report building roads meet the policies of Public Works expenditures demanded by the President, for they are:

1. Useful—affording permanent improvement.
2. Over 80 percent of the outlay goes to wages.
3. The projects are planned and fit into a definite system of highways.
4. Do not compete with private enterprise.
5. Form a permanent improvement which adds to the stability and wealth of the Nation.

The State highway departments herewith list hundreds of definite projects that can be immediately undertaken to meet this situation.

Railroad grade-crossing eliminations and reconstruction of same

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Alabama	48	$1,800,000	36	$2,500,000	84	$4,300,000
Arizona	6	730,000	9	1,305,000	15	2,035,000
Arkansas	40	2,500,000	20	1,800,000	60	4,300,000
California	150	24,678,000	577	72,000,000	727	96,678,000
Colorado	17	2,305,000	27	4,173,000	44	6,478,000
Connecticut	19	2,025,000	9	2,061,000	28	4,086,000
Delaware	5	730,000	5	1,000,000	10	1,730,000
Florida	32	3,750,000			32	3,750,000
Georgia	60	2,500,000	50	2,500,000	110	5,000,000
Idaho	11	800,000	21	1,720,000	32	2,520,000
Illinois	75	8,000,000	75	10,000,000	150	18,000,000
Indiana	2	350,000	36	1,954,000	38	2,304,000
Iowa	50	4,000,000	50	4,000,000	100	8,000,000
Kansas	50	3,500,000	50	3,500,000	100	7,000,000
Kentucky	8	520,000	43	2,050,000	51	2,570,000
Louisiana	16	2,200,000	11	1,520,000	33	3,720,000
Maine	22	1,939,500	41	3,300,000	63	5,239,500
Maryland	22	3,570,000	25	4,000,000	47	7,570,000
Massachusetts	54	6,230,000	36	10,575,000	90	16,805,000
Michigan	23	5,025,000	41	8,960,000	64	13,985,000
Minnesota	40	3,000,000	60	4,500,000	100	7,500,000
Mississippi	33	2,500,000	69	4,500,000	102	7,000,000
Missouri	40	3,309,500	31	4,227,500	71	7,537,000
Montana	18	1,725,000	26	1,500,000	44	3,225,000
Nebraska	16	620,000	18	725,000	34	1,345,000
Nevada	9	710,000	3	250,000	12	960,000
New Hampshire	17	745,000	13	960,000	30	1,705,000
New Jersey	43	11,367,000	77	18,860,000	120	30,227,000
New Mexico	9	485,000	10	745,000	19	1,230,000
New York	129	16,000,000	113	8,400,000	242	24,400,000
North Carolina	28	1,268,000	30	1,312,000	58	2,580,000
North Dakota	15	600,000	20	650,000	35	1,250,000
Ohio	150	25,000,000	150	40,000,000	300	65,000,000
Oklahoma	34	1,995,000	37	2,215,000	71	4,210,000
Oregon	20	2,500,000	10	2,000,000	30	4,500,000
Pennsylvania	73	8,000,000	67	16,000,000	140	24,000,000
Rhode Island	5	415,000	4	500,000	9	915,000
South Carolina	30	700,000	40	1,500,000	70	2,200,000
South Dakota	31	790,000	26	750,000	57	1,540,000
Tennessee	17	840,000	56	3,900,000	73	4,740,000
Texas	25	1,700,000	50	3,100,000	75	4,800,000
Utah	28	2,635,000	22	1,685,000	50	4,320,000
Vermont	32	2,125,000	55	4,535,000	87	6,660,000
Virginia	43	1,845,000	27	2,400,000	70	4,245,000
Washington	44	3,627,000	30	2,500,000	74	6,127,000
West Virginia	24	2,935,000	24	2,935,000	48	5,870,000
Wisconsin	87	9,225,000	60	7,500,000	147	16,725,000
Wyoming	6	500,000	6	500,000	12	1,000,000
Total	1,756	184,314,000	2,302	277,567,500	4,058	461,881,500

Elimination of congested and dangerous highway intersections

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Alabama			2	$600,000	2	$600,000
California	4	$1,100,000	4	1,100,000	8	2,200,000
Colorado			9	3,800,000	9	3,800,000
Connecticut	9	1,600,000	10	1,500,000	19	3,100,000
Delaware			1	100,000	1	100,000
Georgia	1	100,000	2	500,000	3	600,000
Illinois	9	900,000	12	1,250,000	21	2,150,000
Iowa	10	4,000,000	6	3,000,000	16	7,000,000
Kansas	2	250,000	4	500,000	6	750,000

Elimination of congested and dangerous highway intersections—Continued

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Louisiana	2	$150,000	3	$275,000	5	$425,000
Massachusetts	7	1,060,000	3	450,000	10	1,510,000
Michigan	1	250,000	1	500,000	2	750,000
Minnesota	4	400,000	8	800,000	12	1,200,000
Missouri	7	535,000	5	1,250,000	12	1,785,000
Nebraska			1	40,000	1	40,000
New Jersey	16	2,400,000	12	1,800,000	28	4,200,000
New York	36	4,000,000	30	2,400,000	66	6,400,000
North Carolina	1	50,000	1	50,000	2	100,000
Oklahoma			1	100,000	1	100,000
Oregon	1	250,000	2	1,000,000	3	1,250,000
Pennsylvania	2	550,000	11	2,557,500	13	3,107,500
Rhode Island	3	425,000	1	290,000	4	715,000
South Carolina	4	300,000	7	500,000	11	800,000
South Dakota	5	175,000	5	175,000	10	350,000
Tennessee	1	40,000			1	40,000
Texas	6	450,000	20	1,400,000	26	1,850,000
Utah	1	80,000			1	80,000
Virginia	5	200,000	12	500,000	17	700,000
Washington	1	75,000			1	75,000
West Virginia	20	250,000	6	300,000	26	550,000
Wisconsin	3	650,000	3	575,000	6	1,225,000
Total	161	20,240,000	182	27,312,500	343	47,552,500

Construction and reconstruction of highways—Federal aid, State, secondary

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Alabama	39	$11,200,000	34	$12,300,000	73	$23,500,000
Arizona	44	7,661,000	52	10,280,000	96	17,941,000
Arkansas	40	7,500,000	85	8,250,000	125	15,750,000
California	115	6,000,000	105	20,000,000	220	26,000,000
Colorado	327	10,000,000	135	10,000,000	462	20,000,000
Connecticut	7	1,629,000	3	1,871,000	10	3,500,000
Delaware	6	500,000	6	500,000	12	1,000,000
Florida	41	3,000,000	41	3,000,000	82	6,000,000
Georgia	52	3,000,000	112	7,000,000	164	10,000,000
Idaho	38	2,177,000	17	1,185,000	55	3,362,000
Illinois	166	7,500,000	200	5,000,000	366	12,500,000
Indiana	65	6,429,310	117	10,595,580	182	17,024,890
Iowa	50	5,000,000	100	10,000,000	150	15,000,000
Kansas	25	5,000,000	25	5,000,000	50	10,000,000
Kentucky	35	5,000,000	60	8,000,000	95	13,000,000
Louisiana	60	4,000,000	80	6,000,000	140	10,000,000
Maine	104	3,200,000	104	3,200,000	208	6,400,000
Maryland	43	1,500,000	43	1,500,000	86	3,000,000
Massachusetts	90	8,000,000	110	10,000,000	200	18,000,000
Michigan	107	6,495,000	177	13,695,000	284	20,190,000
Minnesota	90	13,000,000	50	4,000,000	140	17,000,000
Mississippi	50	8,000,000	30	4,500,000	80	12,500,000
Missouri	308	8,517,000	340	9,556,000	48	18,073,000
Montana	60	5,000,000	60	5,000,000	120	10,000,000
Nebraska	170	6,300,000	61	5,100,000	231	11,400,000
Nevada	277	1,100,000	277	1,100,000	554	2,200,000
New Hampshire	19	1,185,000	9	585,000	28	1,770,000
New Jersey	6	4,000,000	7	6,000,000	13	10,000,000
New Mexico	30	2,500,000	30	2,500,000	60	5,000,000
New York	120	20,000,000	180	30,000,000	300	50,000,000
North Carolina	100	4,000,000	125	6,000,000	225	10,000,000
North Dakota	40	2,000,000	40	2,000,000	80	4,000,000
Ohio	343	10,700,000	1,000	38,000,000	1,343	48,700,000
Oklahoma	24	4,255,000	67	9,849,000	91	14,104,000
Oregon	10	4,000,000	20	10,000,000	30	14,000,000
Pennsylvania	530	36,300,000	1,050	72,700,000	1,580	109,000,000
Rhode Island	30	2,000,000	20	1,500,000	50	3,500,000
South Carolina	75	10,000,000	75	15,000,000	150	25,000,000
South Dakota	150	3,600,000	120	5,000,000	270	8,600,000
Tennessee	149	25,700,000	5	1,000,000	154	26,700,000
Texas	200	12,000,000	450	22,000,000	650	34,000,000
Utah	75	2,260,000	66	2,560,000	141	4,820,000
Vermont	30	1,745,000	52	2,525,000	82	4,270,000
Virginia	65	6,000,000	130	12,000,000	195	18,000,000
Washington	65	6,200,000	67	6,662,000	132	12,862,000
West Virginia	50	5,000,000	30	3,000,000	80	8,000,000
Wisconsin	100	20,000,000	100	20,000,000	200	40,000,000
Wyoming	25	2,000,000	20	2,000,000	45	4,000,000
Total	4,645	332,153,310	6,087	447,513,580	10,732	789,666,890

Construction and reconstruction of trunk-line routes through cities and city bypasses

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Alabama	16	$1,000,000	11	$1,400,000	27	$2,400,000
Arizona	7	258,500	2	165,000	9	423,500
Arkansas	10	1,000,000	25	3,500,000	35	4,500,000
California	11	2,000,000	17	3,000,000	28	5,000,000

Construction and reconstruction of trunk-line routes through cities and city bypasses—Continued

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Colorado	20	$700,000	16	$600,000	36	$1,300,000
Connecticut	7	1,550,000	5	2,975,000	12	4,525,000
Delaware			2	500,000	2	500,000
Florida	4	500,000	4	500,000	8	1,000,000
Georgia	4	700,000	6	1,000,000	10	1,700,000
Idaho	1	50,000	2	205,000	3	255,000
Illinois	40	5,600,000	100	8,000,000	140	13,600,000
Indiana	16	341,500	44	2,867,800	60	3,209,300
Iowa	10	500,000	20	1,000,000	30	1,500,000
Kansas			5	1,500,000	5	1,500,000
Kentucky	10	500,000	13	600,000	23	1,100,000
Louisiana	1	300,000	3	900,000	4	1,200,000
Maine	1	115,000	1	105,000	2	220,000
Maryland	13	6,000,000	31	14,000,000	44	20,000,000
Michigan	9	870,000	26	3,290,000	35	4,160,000
Minnesota	15	3,000,000	20	4,500,000	35	7,500,000
Mississippi			18	2,000,000	18	2,000,000
Missouri	10	750,000	16	1,500,000	26	2,250,000
Montana			3	300,000	3	300,000
Nebraska			1	250,000	1	250,000
New Hampshire	2	400,000			2	400,000
New Jersey	6	4,000,000	7	6,000,000	13	10,000,000
New Mexico	2	250,000	2	250,000	4	500,000
New York	30	6,000,000	70	14,000,000	100	20,000,000
North Carolina	60	1,000,000	85	1,400,000	145	2,400,000
North Dakota	20	600,000	20	600,000	40	1,200,000
Ohio	18	3,700,000	30	7,500,000	48	11,200,000
Oklahoma			10	1,000,000	10	1,000,000
Oregon	7	1,500,000	8	2,000,000	15	3,500,000
Pennsylvania	100	10,000,000	200	20,000,000	300	30,000,000
Rhode Island			5	500,000	5	500,000
South Carolina	20	5,000,000	30	5,000,000	50	10,000,000
South Dakota	8	200,000	8	350,000	16	550,000
Tennessee	1	500,000			1	500,000
Texas	50	1,500,000	150	4,500,000	200	6,000,000
Utah	1	120,000	2	150,000	3	270,000
Vermont	2	175,000	2	70,000	4	245,000
Virginia	4	500,000	6	1,500,000	10	2,000,000
Washington	30	1,100,000	32	1,225,000	62	2,325,000
West Virginia	5	250,000	10	500,000	15	750,000
Wisconsin	50	10,000,000	50	10,000,000	100	20,000,000
Total	621	72,530,000	1,118	131,202,800	1,739	203,732,800

Weak and narrow bridges

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Alabama	40	$4,000,000	45	$5,300,000	85	$9,300,000
Arizona	9	416,000	8	1,170,000	17	1,586,000
Arkansas	60	1,500,000	90	3,600,000	150	5,100,000
California	130	2,600,000	130	2,600,000	260	5,200,000
Colorado	16	825,000	13	840,000	29	1,665,000
Connecticut	17	4,485,000	16	5,097,000	33	9,582,000
Delaware	3	100,000	3	180,000	6	280,000
Florida	16	3,820,000	58	2,800,000	74	6,620,000
Georgia	10	2,000,000	15	2,000,000	25	4,000,000
Idaho	12	550,000	12	675,000	24	1,225,000
Illinois	30	2,000,000	40	3,250,000	70	5,250,000
Indiana	100	1,059,000	177	3,543,200	277	4,593,200
Iowa	75	3,000,000	100	4,000,000	175	7,000,000
Kansas	25	1,500,000	25	1,500,000	50	3,000,000
Kentucky	8	640,000	56	4,095,000	64	4,735,000
Louisiana	12	970,000	14	1,820,000	26	2,790,000
Maine	40	1,225,000	50	1,300,000	90	2,525,000
Maryland	23	1,650,000	25	1,800,000	48	3,450,000
Massachusetts [1]						
Michigan	15	688,000	28	988,000	43	1,686,000
Minnesota	160	2,000,000	215	4,000,000	375	6,000,000
Mississippi	22	1,500,000	25	3,000,000	47	4,500,000
Missouri	60	600,000	75	750,000	135	1,350,000
Montana	4	500,000	4	500,000	8	1,000,000
Nebraska	30	450,000	58	656,500	88	1,106,500
Nevada	5	132,500	5	132,500	10	265,000
New Hampshire	17	1,082,000	11	450,000	28	1,532,000
New Jersey	2	500,000	22	2,000,000	24	2,500,000
New Mexico	26	500,000	127	1,580,000	153	2,080,000
New York	138	5,700,000	121	3,000,000	259	8,700,000
North Carolina	47	2,366,000	95	1,213,000	142	3,579,000
North Dakota	20	250,000	40	500,000	60	750,000
Ohio	175	6,000,000	175	14,000,000	350	20,000,000
Oklahoma	39	5,664,000	98	5,073,500	137	10,737,500
Oregon	20	750,000	25	1,000,000	45	1,750,000
Pennsylvania	303	6,500,000	187	13,100,000	490	19,600,000
Rhode Island	3	115,000	3	105,000	6	220,000
South Carolina	100	1,000,000	400	4,000,000	500	5,000,000
South Dakota	176	1,875,000	159	1,600,000	335	3,475,000
Tennessee	87	1,950,000	90	2,000,000	177	3,950,000
Texas	9	960,000	15	3,110,000	24	4,070,000
Utah	16	640,000	16	740,000	32	1,380,000
Vermont	35	1,489,000	38	1,164,500	73	2,653,500
Virginia	41	1,683,000	27	6,100,000	68	7,783,000
Washington	20	1,400,000	30	3,600,000	50	5,000,000
West Virginia	23	2,807,500	23	2,807,500	46	5,615,000
Wisconsin	58	4,715,000	42	6,000,000	100	10,715,000
Wyoming	8	300,000	10	400,000	18	700,000
Total	2,285	86,457,000	3,041	129,131,700	5,326	215,588,700

[1] In roads.

Grand total

State	Early projects		1-year projects		Total projects	
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost
Alabama	143	$18,000,000	128	$22,100,000	271	$40,100,000
Arizona	66	9,965,500	71	12,920,000	137	21,985,500
Arkansas	150	12,500,000	220	17,150,000	370	29,650,000
California	410	36,378,000	833	98,700,000	1,243	135,078,000
Colorado	380	13,830,000	200	19,413,000	580	33,243,000
Connecticut	59	11,289,000	43	13,504,080	102	24,793,000
Delaware	14	1,330,000	17	2,280,000	31	3,610,000
Florida	93	11,070,000	103	6,300,000	196	17,370,000
Georgia	127	8,300,000	185	13,000,000	312	21,300,000
Idaho	62	3,577,000	52	3,785,000	114	7,362,000
Illinois	319	24,000,000	437	27,500,000	756	51,500,000
Indiana	183	8,179,810	374	18,960,580	557	27,140,390
Iowa	195	12,900,000	276	19,300,000	471	32,200,000
Kansas	102	10,250,000	105	12,000,000	207	22,250,000
Kentucky	61	6,600,000	172	14,745,000	233	21,345,000
Louisiana	91	7,620,000	111	10,515,000	202	18,135,000
Maine	167	6,479,500	196	7,905,000	363	14,384,500
Maryland	101	12,720,000	124	21,300,000	225	34,020,000
Massachusetts	151	15,290,000	149	21,025,000	300	36,315,000
Michigan	155	13,328,000	273	27,383,000	428	40,711,000
Minnesota	309	21,400,000	353	17,800,000	662	39,200,000
Mississippi	105	12,000,000	142	14,000,000	247	26,000,000
Missouri	425	13,711,500	467	17,283,500	892	30,995,000
Montana	82	7,225,000	93	7,300,000	175	14,525,000
Nebraska	216	7,379,000	139	6,771,500	355	14,141,500
Nevada	291	1,942,500	285	1,482,500	576	3,425,000
New Hampshire	55	3,412,000	33	1,995,000	88	5,407,000
New Jersey	73	21,767,000	125	32,160,000	198	53,927,000
New Mexico	67	3,735,000	169	5,075,000	236	8,810,000
New York	453	51,700,000	514	57,800,000	967	109,500,000
North Carolina	236	8,684,000	336	9,975,000	572	18,659,000
North Dakota	95	3,450,000	120	3,750,000	215	7,200,000
Ohio	686	45,400,000	2,355	99,500,000	3,041	144,900,000
Oklahoma	97	11,914,000	213	18,237,500	310	30,151,500
Oregon	58	9,000,000	60	16,000,000	118	25,000,000
Pennsylvania	1,008	61,350,000	1,515	124,357,500	2,523	185,707,500
Rhode Island	41	2,955,000	33	2,895,000	74	5,850,000
South Carolina	229	17,000,000	552	26,000,000	781	43,000,000
South Dakota	370	6,640,000	318	7,875,000	688	14,515,000
Tennessee	255	29,030,000	151	6,900,000	406	35,930,000
Texas	290	16,610,000	685	34,110,000	975	50,720,000
Utah	121	5,735,000	106	5,135,000	227	10,870,000
Vermont	99	5,534,000	147	8,294,500	246	13,828,500
Virginia	158	10,228,000	202	22,500,000	360	32,728,000
Washington	160	12,402,000	159	13,987,000	319	26,389,000
West Virginia	122	11,242,500	93	9,542,500	215	20,758,000
Wisconsin	298	44,590,000	255	44,075,000	553	88,665,000
Wyoming	39	2,800,000	36	2,900,000	75	5,700,000
Grand total	9,467	691,534,310	13,725	1,007,487,080	23,192	1,699,021,390

Comparison of Federal-aid highway expenditures and Federal tax income from motor vehicles, gasoline, etc.

[Cumulative figures for expenditures and receipts]

Date	Total Federal-aid highway expenditures to date shown			Motor-vehicle Federal tax receipts to date shown	Amount income greater than expenditure
	Regular Federal aid	Emergency and public works	Total		
June 30, 1917	$34,338		$34,338		—$34,338
June 30, 1918	609,154		609,154	$23,981,268	+23,372,114
June 30, 1919	3,524,437		3,524,437	72,815,540	+69,291,103
June 30, 1920	23,865,211		23,865,211	216,738,332	+192,873,121
June 30, 1921	81,327,979		81,327,979	332,284,581	+250,956,602
June 30, 1922	171,274,583		171,274,583	436,718,344	+265,443,761
June 30, 1923	242,879,292		242,879,292	581,008,834	+338,129,542
June 30, 1924	323,327,115		323,327,115	739,023,544	+415,696,429
June 30, 1925	420,799,622		420,799,622	863,710,289	+442,910,667
June 30, 1926	510,161,732		510,161,732	1,001,865,484	+491,703,752
June 30, 1927	593,139,298		593,139,298	1,068,303,365	+475,164,067
June 30, 1928	675,653,132		675,653,132	1,119,931,631	+444,278,499
June 30, 1929	759,659,751		759,659,751	1,119,931,631	+360,271,880
June 30, 1930	837,551,943		837,551,943	1,119,931,631	+282,379,688
June 30, 1931	973,143,316	$20,296,266	993,439,582	1,119,931,631	+126,492,049
June 30, 1932	1,102,948,504	79,208,699	1,182,157,203	1,119,931,631	−62,225,572
June 30, 1933	1,206,689,629	141,335,680	1,348,025,309	1,293,899,291	−54,126,018
June 30, 1934	1,250,159,050	322,355,073	1,572,514,123	1,592,630,358	+20,116,235
June 31, 1934	1,259,222,497	499,321,158	1,758,543,655	1,723,780,555	−34,763,100

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On pages 7 and 8, to strike out all of section 6 and in lieu insert the following:

"SEC. 6. The President is authorized to subscribe, and shall give full publicity to, rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purpose of this joint resolution: *Provided, however,*

"(a) That such rules and regulations shall stipulate that all work done under this joint resolution, whether by contract or otherwise, involving the expenditures of any money appropriated by this joint resolution, shall contain a provision to the effect that all laborers and mechanics employed by the contractor or any subcontractor, or the public officer in charge for the United States and the District of Columbia, shall be paid rates of wages not less than the prevailing rates of wages paid for work of a similar nature in the city, town, village, or other civil division of the State in which the work is located or in the District of Columbia.

"(b) Rules and regulations prescribed under this section shall not abrogate any existing law."

AMENDMENT TO STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $500,000, of which $250,000 shall be immediately available, to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States (in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 4018, 74th Cong., 1st sess), intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON PUBLIC-WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STEIWER obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana presents a resolution, which will be read.

Mr. LONG. I ask to have it read, and, if there shall be no objection, I shall ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana presents a resolution and asks for its immediate consideration.

Mr. LONG. I ask to have it reported first.

Mr. ROBINSON. I shall, of course, have to object to immediate consideration.

Mr. LONG. I want the Senator to hear it before he objects.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to the resolution being reported.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the proposed resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 78) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the United States Senate as soon as possible all reports, checks of reports, daily and temporary reports, work sheets, and any and all other material and data in the possession of the Department of the Interior which was assembled by or under the direction of or in association with Louis Glavis or any other person in the employ of said Department of the Interior in connection with any investigation, inspection, review into the Public Works building program, or the building program commonly known and referred to as the "P. W. A.";

Resolved further, That there particularly be transmitted to the United States Senate by the Secretary of the Interior any and all reports, data assembled, or work sheets (including daily, temporary, or final reports, work sheets, and material collected) affecting any building project investigated or inquired into which affects the contracts let to or done by the firm of James Stewart Co., and particularly as may have affected the supplies furnished thereon by the General Builders' Supply Corporation; and

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Interior further transmit to the United States Senate any and all information, data, reports, investigations, or inspections that have been assembled or conducted by the said Louis Glavis, or those working under or in association with him, or by any other person or persons, which affect, mention, or report on James A. Farley, or any concern with which said Farley has been or is now identified.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, all I am asking in this proposed resolution is for the Department of the Interior to transmit to the Senate such reports and data as it has collected. I, of course, would say that this is in the usual form, and that copies of the reports would be acceptable as a compliance with the resolution. I only ask that the Department of the Interior transmit to the Senate reports, that is all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over.

Mr. STEIWER obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I want to ask immediate consideration, with the explanation I have given, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let the resolution go over under the rule.

Mr. LONG. Very well; let it lie over for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I do not wish to offend the Senator from Oregon, but I had intended to read a statement, covering a couple of pages, which I had prepared in connection with the matter I submitted to the Senate this morning.

Mr. STEIWER. I prefer that the Senator defer doing so, because I think it may lead to considerable discussion. If it is not of importance at the moment, I hope the Senator will defer it.

Mr. LONG. I do not believe it will lead to any considerable discussion. I did not think I was losing the floor when the Senator rose. I thought he was rising to ask me a question, but the President pro tempore recognized the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. STEIWER. I shall conclude as promptly as I can.

ADMINISTRATION OF CODES UNDER THE N. R. A.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and submit a resolution which is being offered by myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] jointly. Reference to the Committee on Commerce is requested. There are a number of whereases preceding the resolution, and, if the reading of the whereases can be dispensed with, I ask that the resolution itself be read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the reading of the resolution from the desk? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

(S. Res. 79, without the preamble thereto)

Resolved, That the subject matter of this resolution be referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce and that said committee be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate and report upon the subject matter of this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Congress until the final report is submitted, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. 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, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota what the subject matter of the resolution is. It did not appear from the reading.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I have explained that the whereases within the resolution were very extended. They relate the many allegations which are being offered concerning hardship under N. R. A. and operation under the codes. The subject matters are the charges of inability on the part of business to operate under the codes, and the resolution is a call for an investigation by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate of these charges. I am asking that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from North Dakota whether the N. R. A. Act was not reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance? I was wondering whether the Senator had chosen the committee with jurisdiction of the subject matter of his resolution. The Finance Committee reported the National Recovery Act. I suggest to the Senator that the proposed resolution lie on the table until he ascertains what the fact is about that.

Mr. NYE. I have no objection to the resolution going over a day, but I should be rather insistent that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the resolution will lie over 1 day.

The resolution (S. Res. 79) was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Whereas the National Industrial Recovery Act, as a temporary measure, has been in operation for nearly 2 years and will expire by limitation of time on June 16, 1935; and

Whereas proposals will soon be pending before the Congress for an extension of the act or for the enactment of new legislation in lieu of it; and

Whereas the Congress should be guided in its deliberations by the practical experience of the last 2 years; and

Whereas numerous charges have been made of injustice, oppression, and favoritism in the administration of the codes of the several industries; and

Whereas the charges include, among others, the following:

1. That small enterprises are oppressed and their continued existence jeopardized;

2. That wage scales and the rights of the workers are being ignored or subordinated in the competitive battle of the strong to seize the markets of the weak;

3. That in some industries the code authorities are dominated by certain elements of the industry, and are using their powers for the oppression of other elements;

4. That they are energetically using their usurped powers to accomplish the centralization of industry and to prevent its decentralization;

5. That hordes of paid investigators and inquisitors travel over the country practicing unlawful searches and seizures;

6. That in certain cases the administrators themselves have not hesitated openly to suspend or revoke the law for the benefit of favored individuals;

7. That even among the nonfavored elements of industry there is discrimination in this respect; that the strong are able to resist aggression while the weak must submit;

8. That, possessing vast and extralegal powers, code authorities have made trivial demands which cannot be ignored, under pain of economic death and have compelled the accused to travel vast distances with their witnesses and records to remote places to vindicate themselves;

9. That under the pretense of enforcing wage provisions the code authorities and the administrators have declared and are putting into effect a policy of regulating production costs without reference to wage scales;

10. That by means of the usurped power of fixing production costs they are indirectly fixing prices to the consumer;

11. That code authorities have usurped the legislative function and have issued floods of new legislation under the guise of rules, regulations, and interpretations;

12. That such rules, regulations, and interpretations are deliberately designed to affect adversely the unfavored elements and to leave unaffected the favored elements of industry;

13. That the torrent of rules, regulations, and interpretations has been deliberately designed to be vague, indefinite, and uncertain in order that the codes may mean anything or nothing in the unlimited discretion and untrammeled will of the code authorities;

14. That many of these vague rules, regulations, and interpretations have been retroactive in character; that industry has been compelled to guess at its peril; and individuals have been charged with serious offenses for violation of supposed laws which were not and could not have been anticipated;

15. That a wealth of statistical information is obtained from members of industry for the use and guidance of code authorities; that this information is available to the dominant elements and is withheld from those who would resist their domination;

16. That protected by code provisions for the confidential nature of information thus obtained, the operations of the code authorities are shrouded in mystery which the unfavored elements are unable to penetrate;

17. That in certain instances important amendments to codes have been obtained and approved of which the industry at large was in total ignorance for many months;

18. That when just complaints have been made to the administration the administrators have investigated the conduct of themselves and of their collaborating code authorities; that such investigations have been secretly conducted, and the complaining elements never called upon to produce evidence or informed that the investigation was in progress;

19. That section 4 (b) of the National Industrial Recovery Act (now expired by limitation) provided the conditions under which the President may require that no person shall engage in any trade or industry without first obtaining a license; that in defiance of the clear intent of the act certain industrial codes provide that all commodities produced shall bear an N. R. A. label; that the privilege of using such label shall be granted upon application to the code authority; that the privilege of using such label may be withdrawn in respect of any manufacturer whose operations, after hearing by the code authority and review by the Administrator, shall be found to be in substantial violation of the code; that this in effect constitutes the code authority and the Administrator a

licensing authority; that some retail codes contain an absolute prohibition of the sale by any merchant of any commodity the code of whose industry requires a label unless the label of such industry be thereto affixed; that this system of legalized boycott places the manufacturer at the absolute mercy of the code authority and the Administrator; that a standardized practice has evolved under which a person aggrieved by a ruling of the code authority may appeal to the Administrator for redress, but that as a condition of obtaining a hearing of his grievances he must agree in advance to be bound by the decision of the Administrator and waive his right to resort to the judicial process;

20. That, notwithstanding the provision of the Constitution of the United States that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, code authorities have assumed and are exercising the power to levy taxes on industries and are enforcing collection thereof by duress;

21. That code authority administration in many cases has lost all semblance of a rule of law and has become a rule of men, bent upon the oppression of their weaker competitors; and

Whereas if the conditions charged obtain to any considerable extent the Congress should have full knowledge of them to guide it in the formulation of new legislation; and

Whereas all friends of labor and all well-wishers for the success of the industrial-recovery program recognize that the correction of abuses is a necessary condition to the success of the program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the subject matter of this resolution be referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce and that said committee be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate and report upon the subject matter of this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Congress until the final report is submitted; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. 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, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

PIPE LINES ACROSS NEW YORK AVENUE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a day or two ago the Senate passed Senate bill 1519, a measure permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia. A similar measure, indeed, one identical in terms, has passed the House of Representatives and has been messaged to the Senate. I ask that the House measure now be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3465) permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill just read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3465) permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] intended this morning to deliver an address honoring the memory of a distinguished American, Susan B. Anthony. He was suddenly called away because of illness in his family, and has asked me to request the Senate to accord him the privilege of having the clerk read the address, a transcript of which I have in my hand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the address.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SUSAN B. ANTHONY—BORN FEBRUARY 15, 1820; DIED MARCH 13, 1906

By ROYAL S. COPELAND

In our generation woman suffrage is accepted as a natural and normal procedure. It is difficult to understand why such bitter opposition prevailed against it in this country and abroad.

When the cry was raised, "Votes for women", England was shocked, and the music halls of London made nightly use of the theme. A familiar ditty was the following:

"Put me upon an island where the girls are few,
Put me among the most ferocious lions in the zoo,
Put me upon a treadmill and I'll never fret,
But for heaven's sake don't put me near a suffragette!"

During my campaign last year my itinerary took me to Seneca Falls, N. Y. The editor of the local paper invited me to visit the church where the first American Equal Rights Association was formed. As I recall, there were present at that meeting Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Frederick Douglass, and other friends of the cause of equal suffrage. My editor friend said that his grandmother, then a girl of 18, was present at this gathering, and went home enthusiastic for suffrage. Her father was so shocked that he proceeded at once to horsewhip his daughter as a warning to her and others that such a heresy could not be endured.

It is impossible for us to imagine how there could be such intense feeling over this matter, yet there are women alive in the United States who can testify to the violent opposition to the idea of women voting.

We cannot speak about equal rights for women without thinking of Susan B. Anthony. Tomorrow is her birthday. This remarkable woman was one of eight children. She first saw the light of day on February 15, 1820, born at the foot of "Old Greylock", a spur of the Green Mountains, a mile east of the village of Adams, Mass.

Miss Anthony sprang from rugged Yankee stock. Her father was Daniel Anthony, a strict Quaker. Her mother was Lucy Reed, a Baptist. Both parents were descendants of a long line of distinguished pioneers. They were of liberal religious tendencies, remarkably broad in their views. Their teachings are traceable in the life of Susan B. Anthony, strengthened by education and environment.

In her youth Miss Anthony belonged to the Quakers. The even tenor of her career was disturbed by a mild sensation. Her father was expelled from the Quaker affiliation because his worldliness could no longer be endured. He received a public reprimand for wearing a comfortable cloak with a long cape. This act was regarded as altogether too human.

Susan B. Anthony earned her first dollar by working in her father's large cotton mill. She took the place of one of the mill hands who had fallen ill. Although a man of wealth, the father believed in self-support for his sons and daughters. In consequence, the founder of woman suffrage grew up in an atmosphere of self-reliance and independence of thought.

Before attending a boarding school in Philadelphia, Miss Anthony, at the age of 17 years, was teaching school in a Quaker family. For this she received less than a security wage. Her salary was $1 a week and board.

The wisdom of Mr. Anthony's training for his children, teaching them self-support, was proved when the financial panic of 1837 caused his own financial failure. His offspring were not only able to support themselves, but they materially assisted their father to retrieve his fortune.

The tireless energy, cheerful disposition, and rare sense of humor which were hers all through a long life helped to make Miss Anthony a successful teacher. What she learned in the classroom assisted in her efforts at education of the public in the interest of equal rights for her sex. I am glad to note that her professional qualities were recognized, and that soon she was paid $8 a month. But, even then, men teachers received from $24 to $40 a month for the same work, probably not so well performed.

This discrimination taught Miss Anthony the first lesson in women's inequalities. During the following 15 years she devoted to teaching she made many eloquent pleas of protest at the conventions of the New York State Teachers' Association. She pled eloquently for the principle of equal rights for women, which, with all the accompanying honors and responsibilities, should include the higher wages.

In 1845 Miss Anthony removed her family to Rochester, N. Y., where she continued teaching school. The following year found her in the Canajoharie Academy. There she joined the Daughters of Temperance and was made secretary. After making her first platform address for this organization, the villagers said, "Miss Anthony is the smartest woman who ever has been in Canajoharie!"

Miss Anthony's public life really began in 1852, when she attended as a delegate the State meeting of the Sons of Temperance at Albany. During the meeting there was a discussion among the men. She rose to speak, but was not permitted to do so. Her very desire to do something so unconventional caused consternation among the men and horror and indignation on the part of the women present. The latter referred to her as a "bold thing." The presiding officer said that women were not to speak in meeting, a rebuke which acted as a firebrand to one of Miss Anthony's temperament. She and a dozen others marched out of the hall. The following evening a meeting headed by Miss Anthony was held in a church in Albany. Out of this came the formation of the first Woman's State Temperance Society.

During the years she engaged in the temperance movement, Miss Anthony's determination to work for greater freedom for women became the motive of her ever active life. She became convinced that to secure this objective women should be enfranchised, so she allied herself with the suffrage movement.

About this time Miss Anthony met Elizabeth Cady Stanton. A warm friendship was formed, and this lasted during their entire lives. For many years they cooperated in all movements for the advancement of women.

At the behest of Miss Anthony, the first Woman's Rights Convention, which illness prevented her attending, was held in Seneca Falls, N. Y., in July 1848. To this I have referred. The next gathering was held in Syracuse in September 1852. In this she was the leading spirit. The advanced position taken by that con-

vention gave rise to discussions and controversies in the press and pulpit for many months thereafter.

Horace Greeley, the great editor of the New York Tribune, became a convert to the cause. I observe that along about this time he wrote as follows:

"I still keep at work with the President in various ways and believe you will yet hear him proclaim universal freedom. Keep this letter and judge me by the event."

During the State teachers' convention in Rochester in 1853 Miss Anthony, true to her traditions, claimed the privilege of speaking. After lengthy debate, she was allowed to speak on a subject assigned her. It was, "Why is the profession of teaching not as respected as that of lawyers, doctors, and ministers?" She said: "It seems to me you fail to comprehend the cause of disrespect of which you complain. Do you not see that so long as society says a woman has not brains enough to be a doctor, lawyer, or minister, but has plenty to be a teacher, every man of you who condescends to teach tacitly admits that he has no more brains than a woman?"

She certainly turned the tables on her critics.

The winter of 1854–55 was a stormy one for Miss Anthony. She succeeded in gathering 10,000 signatures, which she accumulated for the cause of equal rights at 54 conventions held throughout the State. She never faltered because of insults, slammed doors, and all sorts of abuse, even from the clergy.

From January 1868 to May 1870 Miss Anthony backed a weekly paper called "Revolution." Some of the brightest minds of that period were contributors. Financially it was not a success, so the publication went out of business owing $10,000. Within 6 years, from the earnings of her lectures, Miss Anthony paid this indebtedness in full, with interest.

One of the exciting episodes of Miss Anthony's life occurred in November 1872, when she and 14 other women were arrested, and each was held in $500 bail. These daring women had sworn in their votes after registering, claiming it was their right under the fourteenth amendment to exercise suffrage. Miss Anthony refused bail and applied for a writ of habeas corpus. Her bail was then raised to $1,000. She objected, but was overruled by her counsel, who thought it would be a disgrace for so fine a woman to go to jail. Though in the eyes of the law a prisoner, Miss Anthony was left free to attend to many engagements.

Her trial opened on the 18th of January 1873. It was a lengthy proceeding and Judge Hunt, who sat on the bench, charged the jury to bring in a verdict of guilty. She was sentenced to pay a fine of $100 and costs of prosecution. In response to this, Miss Anthony said to the court:

"May it please Your Honor, I will never pay a dollar of your unjust penalty. All the stock in trade and possession I have is a debt of $10,000 incurred in the publication of a paper known as "The Revolution." The sole object of this publication was to educate all women to do precisely what I have done, rebel against your unjust mandates and unconstitutional assumption of power to tax, fine, imprison, and hang women while denying them the right of representation in government. I will work on with might and main to pay every dollar of my honest debt, but not one penny will go to meet the unjust claim made by the court; and I shall earnestly and persistently continue to urge all women to the practical recognition of the old revolutionary maxim, 'Resistance to tyranny is obedience to God.'"

The fine was never paid.

To celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Woman's Rights Convention held at Seneca Falls in 1885, Miss Anthony originated the holding of the International Council for Women at Washington. How successfully this plan was carried out is a matter of history. In all parts of the United States women formed organizations for woman suffrage. Miss Anthony and her followers spoke in many parts of the country. The movement spread to most of the civilized countries of the world.

At the Thirteenth Annual Convention of the Woman's Suffrage Association, held in Washington in 1900, Miss Anthony, then 80 years old, resigned as president. She was succeeded by Carrie Chapman Catt. It was with the utmost regret that the resignation was accepted, but her followers felt it was not right to insist upon Miss Anthony continuing to endure the stress and strain of the work.

On her eightieth birthday a magnificent reception was held in her honor in the Corcoran Art Gallery in Washington. Thousands of congratulatory telegrams and letters were received from all parts of the world. White and black, high and low, as well as the President himself, did her honor. Through it all she remained what she had always been—a simple, gracious, affable, ingenuous woman.

On the eve of her eighty-sixth-birthday celebration in Washington the late President Theodore Roosevelt sent a letter of congratulation. Many prominent officials brought tributes of esteem. During the reception Miss Anthony said:

"Why do not all these men, who have power, do something for the cause, instead of lavishing praise upon me?"

After the celebration Miss Anthony's condition was such that she could not attend a private dinner in her honor in New York. She went directly home from Washington, and on March 13 quietly slipped away from this life. She was buried in Mount Hope Cemetery, Rochester. Just before turning away from the grave the Reverend Anna H. Shaw, a long-time associate, said: "Dear friend, thou hast tarried with us long; thou hast now gone to thy well-earned rest. We beseech the Infinite Spirit, who has upheld thee, to make us worthy to follow thy steps and carry on thy work. Farewell!"

T. V. A. AUTHORITY—NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted in the RECORD two letters. Some days since I made a statement here with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority. In reply to that statement the editor of the Journal of the National Educational Association wrote a letter and asked that it be inserted in the RECORD. I ask that his request be complied with and that my reply to his letter be also included, and that both be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1935.

Hon. L. J. DICKINSON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DICKINSON: I believe you would wish me to call your attention to the fact that there are three serious errors in your statement about the article on the T. V. A., which appeared in the Journal of the National Education Association for December.

First, your assertion "that this article was prepared by Mr. Myer at the instance and request of those in the authority." The idea of publishing that article was entirely our own and grew out of the demand for it. The selection of Mr. Myer to write the article was entirely on our own motion.

Second, your implication of secrecy as to the cooperation between the T. V. A. and the Journal. The fact of that cooperation is clearly stated in the article itself. My letter to you which you publish certainly does not suggest that we have anything to conceal.

Third, your implication that the article is fraudulent propaganda. Every page in that article is a statement of fact prepared by one of America's leading scholars, and there is not a sentence in it whose accuracy any fair-minded scholar would question.

The facts about the efforts of the Power Trust to misinform the schools are well documented in the investigations conducted by the Federal Power Commission. May I inquire if you ever raised your voice to denounce the spokesmen of the Power Trust when they were spending a million dollars of the people's money to fill the schools with subversive teaching? You assert in your statement that your record is clear on the power issue. Is your record really clear when you fail to denounce the efforts of the Power Trust to misinform the people and on the other hand lend your voice to destroy freedom of teaching by attacking an honest presentation of the facts by disinterested parties?

Your own misleading statements appear on page 800 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 23. In the name of fair play I ask that you have this letter also inserted in the RECORD. I am sending copies to Senator NORRIS, to whom you refer; to Mr. Walter E. Myer; and to the T. V. A.

Very cordially yours,

JOY ELMER MORGAN, *Editor.*

FEBRUARY 14, 1935.

Dr. JOY ELMER MORGAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. MORGAN: Thank you for yours of the 25th, which I have studied with care, in view of the nature of its contents. In the light of that study, I am forced to reiterate the charges which I made on the floor of the Senate on January 23, and now I must add to those charges your own implied admission of them.

From your letter I must conclude either that you are unaware of ordinary ethical obligations that have been placed upon you as editor of a great schoolroom journal to maintain a fair and impartial position on public questions, without recourse to subterfuge and frauds upon your readers, or that you have deliberately evaded and avoided the essential charge involved and have sought to becloud the vital issue with trivial and impertinent side issues.

Your denial does not deny, and by implication affirms the charges.

The essence of those charges was contained on page 800 of the RECORD, as follows:

"Thus is revealed an agency of the Federal Government engaging in a propaganda trick that amounts to a public fraud—a deception as black as any charged against its public-utility opponents. T. V. A. has employed a writer of reputation to prepare an article purely for propaganda purposes, pleasingly painting its arguments, and has paid this man to place the article within the covers of the journal of the National Education Association as a bona fide, unbiased study of a great Federal experiment. The deception lies in the fact that the readers of this article—and it has been reprinted for classroom use, large quantities having been purchased for free distribution by T. V. A.—are forced to assume that the writer has written freely from his own observations."

You have not answered that charge—you have not even referred to it.

The fraud involved, of course, is the fact that your readers were forced to assume, naturally, in view of the high character of your journal, that Walter Myer was in your employ, not in that of the interest he lauds so eloquently.

The same point would be involved if you had permitted a Power Trust writer to expound power propaganda as a study unit arranged, as you euphemistically put it, "in cooperation", with, for example, the Edison Institute. Or do you contend that there is a difference in the relative blacknesses of the pot and the kettle?

You have made certain categorical statements, which, while they do not challenge the essential assertions of my speech, I shall discuss, rather than leave myself open to any charge of having ignored them.

First, what is the distinction between your initiating this propaganda deal with T. V. A., or their starting it? If it doesn't make any difference, for what reason was the point raised? In fact, you seek to make a point of virtue that you solicited T. V. A. for the opportunity to prostitute your magazine and its readers, and that T. V. A. did not. I recognize the validity of a certain ethical difference insofar as T. V. A. is concerned, but does not this very admission compound your own misfeasance? In any case, I can regard it as nothing less than a most extraordinary coincidence that, if the article was initiated and solicited by yourself, you should choose as its author one of the paid propagandists of T. V. A.

Second and third, I think I have completely answered your question on the matter of fraud involved. Certainly, as I have already pointed out, the true manner of cooperation was not stated in the article itself. The obvious implication of such cooperation meant, to any unsuspecting reader, that T. V. A. had courteously laid at the disposal of Mr. Myer all pertinent data for the preparation of his article. Or must I assume that this type of cooperation is customary in the preparation of articles for the Journal, where the writer is paid by the interest being written up?

On this point permit me to refresh your memory by referring you to specific remarks directed to the question you raised—to be found in the first column, on page 801, of the January 23 RECORD—the paragraph beginning "In a personal message", etc.

Your remarks about my record in connection with the Power Trust are a bit bewildering. In my speech I made simply reference to the fact that I have, on numerous occasions, denounced the same type of tactics, when conducted by power interests, to which you are now a party. I have a file of statements of my record which I shall be glad to permit you to examine if you have any doubts on that score. However, that same paragraph brings out an unusual attitude from you. You ask why I have "lent my voice to destroy freedom of teaching by attacking an honest presentation of the facts by disinterested parties?" In view of the admitted facts, do you still consider Dr. Myer, who was secretly in the pay of the T. V. A., a disinterested party? Indeed, I would seek to destroy freedom to teach biased and dishonest facts. You will find me always a champion for the freedom of, to use your own words, "teaching honest presentation of facts by disinterested parties." That is exactly the point at issue.

I shall be delighted to request the insertion of your letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my reply.

Yours very truly,

L. J. DICKINSON.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN—LETTER TO COURIER-JOURNAL

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Lincoln, which appeared on February 12 in the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky. It is in the form of a letter to the editor, signed "A Jeffersonian Democrat, Frankfort, Ky."

The tribute which this letter pays to Lincoln is well worthy of record; and the fact that the writer signs himself "A Jeffersonian Democrat" shows that he is such a rare specimen that that fact alone justifies the inclusion of the letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Feb. 12, 1935]

LINCOLN

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COURIER-JOURNAL:

Kentucky soil gave birth to one of the greatest characters the world has ever known—Abraham Lincoln. His environments were humble. His hardships were many. But these hardships were the making of the man. Denied the opportunity of attending school because of poverty, he applied his energies and educated himself. To those who criticized his zeal for knowledge, he said: "I will prepare myself and the opportunity will come."

The opportunity did come. He struggled along as a young lawyer until his constituents sent him to the lower house of the Illinois Legislature, where he distinguished himself as a brilliant debater. Later he went to Congress, where he challenged the slavery evil. A few years more and he was debating with Douglas, these discussions winning him admirers. "* * * 'A house divided against itself cannot stand. * * *' I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect that it will cease to be divided." Having won the Presidency in 1860, he took over the reins of government at the most critical period in the Nation's history.

Addressing the Southern people in his first inaugural: "In your hands, my dissatisfied countrymen, and not in mine rests the momentous issues of civil war * * *."

In his Gettysburg address: "* * * Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

In his second inaugural address: "With malice toward none, with charity for all * * *."

He triumphed. But he paid with his life for the destruction of slavery and the preservation of the Union. No President had a greater or more noble character than the martyred Lincoln. No man had greater faith in the intelligence and capacities of the common people. For from these he sprang and to these he gave, in truth "The last full measure of devotion." Truly, this great champion of popular government and human rights deserves to, and doubtless does "belong to the ages."

A JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRAT.

FRANKFORT, KY.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE PLUMLEY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on February 12 Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Representative from Vermont, delivered an address at a Lincoln Birthday dinner in Beaver Falls, Pa., given under the auspices of the Lincoln Republican Club of Beaver County. This club was organized in 1880 and is the oldest Republican marching club in the United States.

I ask that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

AGGRESSIVE IN ITS OPPOSITION TO ALL THE POLICIES OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION SUBVERSIVE AND DESTRUCTIVE OF OUR AMERICAN FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies, and gentlemen, we have come together tonight to observe the anniversary of the birth of the uncommon commoner—an American, great emancipator, savior of a Nation. "A type that Nature wills to plan but once in all a peoples' years."

"Some opulent force of genius, soul, and race,
Some deep life current from far centuries
Flowed to his mind and lighted his sad eyes,
And gave his name, among great names, high place.

Unschooled scholar! How did you learn
The wisdom a lifetime may not earn?
Unsainted martyr! Higher than a saint!
You were a man, with a man's constraint,
In the world, of the world was your lot;
With it and for it the fight you fought
And never 'till time is itself forgot
And the heart of man is a pulseless clot
Shall the blood flow slow, when we think the thought
Of Lincoln."

Shepherd of the people, that old name that the best rulers ever craved. He fed us with counsel when we were in doubt, with inspiration when we sometimes falter, with caution when we would be rash, with calm, clear, trustful cheerfulness through many an hour when our hearts were dark. He spread before the whole land feasts of great duty and devotion and patriotism on which the land grew strong. He fed all his people from the highest to the lowest, from the most privileged down to the most enslaved.

"So they buried Lincoln! Strange and vain.
Hast any creature thought of Lincoln hid
In any vault 'neath coffin lid?
In all the years since that wild spring of pain?
It is false—he never in grave hath lain.
You could not bury him, although you slid
Upon his clay the Cheops pyramid,
Or heaped it with the Rocky Mountain chain.
If so, man's memories not a monument be,
None shalt thou have."

His rugged, honest, steadfast perseverence and staunch Americanism still stand as examples, as objectives which the Nation and all of us as individuals may well try to emulate. Unwavering in his loyalty to the fundamentals of American Government, his genuine respect for the Constitution and his great concern for the destiny of the Republic ended only with his death.

A redeemed and reunited Republic is his monument.

I say to you tonight, Mr. Toastmaster, that no such crisis has confronted this country since the day when Abraham Lincoln declared that this country could not permanently endure half slave and half free. It was on that declaration that the Republican Party was formed, and the Civil War was fought utterly and completely to extirpate slavery from the soil of this Republic. The war was won, that issue was determined, the Union was saved, the fundamental principles of the Republican Party and its policies and leadership were vindicated. The national character of the Union was established, and an end was put to the doctrine of secession. Now another great crisis is at hand. It is time to wake up!

I am a Republican since I believe the Republican Party was born because of a principle, and has lived and grown because of vital governmental principles and policies, for which it has stood, which it has maintained, too sound to be permanently overthrown, too deep and fundamental and underlying to be effaced!

I am a Republican because I believe this. I am a Republican because with the farmer in Vermont I also believe that our liber-

ties and our Union can be preserved only by strict adherence to the principles laid down in our Constitution.

I know that a republican form of government, with a Republican administration, has in a long period of years made greater material progress, produced higher standards of living, inspired superior love of peace, tolerance, and good will, than in any other period in any nation on earth.

I am a Republican because that party stands always for the sanctity of the home and the church; for the constitutional right of free speech; free criticism of government; for independence in thought, work and play, worship and prayer; individual license to plant and sow and harvest without dictation by "brain trust" or bureaucrat.

I am a Republican because that party stands now, and ever has stood, for sound currency, full-value money, and against any repudiation of Government pledges to the people in whatever guise such repudiation may be offered.

Many panaceas have been offered, many remedies suggested, and so many methods of resuscitation or revival of the body politic have been tried, it is a wonder the patient has survived the ordeal. We are threatened with a dose of inflation, which means repudiation or substantial reduction of debts; and deflation, which means an enforced sale of assets at a price far below what they are really worth. Inflation is an insidious method of fooling the people, the workmen and wage earners, and the farmers. The farmer is hardest hit of them all. History attests this fact, a fact so often proven as to be an axiom.

To lighten the burden of debt by depreciation of the currency is a benefit to a very small minority of the population at the expense of a large majority. By far the greater part of the population is interested as a creditor rather than as a debtor.

Recovery can only be brought about by an increased volume of business, done with the expectation of a reasonable profit, and anything that tends to obscure the hope of profit tends to retard recovery. Uncertainty as to the future character and value of money is the strongest single deterrent to business enterprise. It has always seemed to me that to stabilize the currency by reducing the gold content of the dollar to approximately its recent value can but result in further and far-reaching disturbances and disaster causing great harm and injustice to a majority of our people. It will eventually bring about a larger increase in the general price level over even that of today, of the cost of living, of the wages of organized labor, measured in the dollars of depreciated purchasing power. While wages may double, so will prices also, and the buying power of the money with which current bills are to be paid will be further depreciated.

It does not follow that it is a good thing to raise prices, for unless incomes rise at the same time as do prices the standard of living must go down. You do not have to argue this hard or long to the people of the State of Justin S. Morrill, George F. Edmunds, or Calvin Coolidge. They know that to issue fiat money—to start the printing presses or to put our currency on a silver standard, or to attempt to establish a bimetallic standard would but spell national disaster. They know these things from experience, and they know they have been found to be facts by a Monetary Commission, of which the late Honorable George F. Edmunds, Vermont's distinguished statesman, was the chairman. The facts so found exist today.

No complicated scheme of relief; no plan for Government fixing of prices; no resort to the Public Treasury will be of any permanent value in establishing agriculture or bringing back prosperity. The America which Washington founded does not mean we shall have everything done for us by the Government, but that we shall have every opportunity to do everything for ourselves. These are the announced fundamental doctrines on which the political philosophy of Calvin Coolidge was based. They are good enough for me!

The sound judgment, wisdom, and foresight of the man is well illustrated by the letter he wrote from Northampton, Mass., on June 21, 1931. He said: "The centralization of power in Washington which nearly all Members of Congress deplore in their speech and then support by their votes steadily increases." The latest report is that the Federal employment service will have a bureau in every State and the District of Columbia.

The farmer, who was the shining example of sturdy independence, has intrusted the Government with finding him a market. Now the wage earner is to look to the same source to find employment. Individual self-reliance is disappearing and local self-government is being undermined.

A revolution is taking place which will leave the people dependent upon the Government and place the Government where it must decide questions that are far better left to the people to decide for themselves. Finding markets will develop into fixing prices and finding employment will develop into fixing wages. The next step will be to furnish markets and employment or in default pay a bounty and dole. Those who look with apprehension on these tendencies do not lack humanity but are influenced by the belief that the result of such measures will be to deprive the people of character and liberty.

We do not have many multimillionaires or millionaires among us in Vermont, but we look with disapproval on all attempts to arouse class antagonism by ranting and raving about the capitalistic system. Every home owner in this land is a capitalist, so are 60,000,000 holders of insurance policies and 20,000,000 of savings depositors and all those hard-headed, thrifty investors who have purchased United States and State municipal bonds and securities. Every farmer and every wage earner in the land is a capitalist. It follows, therefore, that all of us who constitute the backbone of this Republic must suffer by the reduction of the purchasing power of the currency and the resulting increase in the cost of living. No, my friends, Vermont Republicans are for a sound currency and a solid basis for a sure recovery, which will be sound, solid, and secure only if it comes of itself.

Today we are forced to the inescapable conclusion that the administration's program of recovery measures has in most part been nullified by the administrative abandonment of the only principles which can guide a government through the stormy waters of economic distress. It is a tragic fact that every major country in the world from Australia to Denmark is nearer to permanent recovery than the United States. Canada to the north of us and Mexico to the south of us move ahead toward recovery while we struggle in a foggy mist of legislative experiments. The early restoration of trade and employment and investment is held back by the uncertainty, the bewilderment, and the fear which shadow the industry of the Nation.

Some people are pessimistic. They think they see social chaos ahead. They are mistaken. They are wrong. The deep-lying forces of economic life, anchored to the fundamental principles on which this Government was established, have already set in motion the inevitable processes of recovery. Every new day presents new evidence of the absolute futility of artificial stimulation of recovery, the unwisdom of experiments with the lives and property of the people and of the Nation.

I believe that as recovery proceeds, as it is proceeding, inevitably and in spite of the artificial stimulation undertaken to have been given to the body politic, interference with its orderly progress will be widely resented; that it will be reduced and eventually have to be abandoned. I charge you that it is the clear duty of the Republican Party, the party of opposition to the fantastic program of the administration, to keep these facts constantly and everlastingly at the front. I admit that there is the danger that the extravagant expenditures for experimentation and wasteful spending of the taxpayers' money may create so hopeless a situation that Government insolvency may be inevitable; but in my opinion before that point is reached the people of these United States, under the leadership of the Republican Party, will wake up, will read the handwriting on the wall, will be wise, and will return to the principles maligned and derided as "old economics", for which the Republican Party has so long and successfully stood.

As Republicans we still believe in the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights. We still insist, among other things, that Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech; that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; and that powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution itself are reserved to the States respectively or to the people. We believe that the Constitution still is the supreme law of the land, and that neither Congress nor the President on any plea of emergency may ever suspend its provisions in any particular at any time, at any place, or anywhere.

We are opposed, moreover, to the profligate spending of our hard-earned money. If that makes us isolated and old-fashioned and rugged individualists, we thank God for it. We are Republicans.

If, by common consent, hypnotized by the spending of money as if there never were to be a day of reckoning, we sell our birthright for a mess of pottage—if by lack of appreciation and a disinclination to advise ourselves as to what confronts us, we keep silent, suffer the Constitution to be nullified, and our rights to be taken away from us, just so certainly as the sun rises and sets the principle of liberty will surely and steadily be destroyed, despotism will crown itself with power, and it will then be too late to recover the liberty at whose loss we have connived.

The framers of our Government knew all about regimentation, planned economy, colonizations, and other features, and government schemes, and the futility and folly and failure of them all as repeatedly demonstrated in the days that have gone. They knew the story of kings and despots, and tyrants, and bureaucracy—the beginning and endings thereof—and they definitely and positively would have none of them. It is only by the subversion and the ignoring of the limitations which these men prescribed in the Constitution which they made, and the assumption and usurpation of unwarranted power and authority that it has been possible for the administration, autocratically, to tell the wage earner what he may earn, how long he may work; the farmer what and how much he may produce on his own farm; the merchant at what price he may sell his goods; the manufacturer what additions he may make to his plant, how much he may produce; to control the flow of capital and savings; to enter into business in competition with private citizens. They have obliterated State lines. The prerogatives of Congress, in whom is vested the sole power to impose taxes and regulate the value of money, have been usurped. Do you realize that the right to impose taxes, in his discretion, has been granted the Secretary of Agriculture, and the authority to fix the value of money has been transferred to the President, a power so great over the lives of men it has never been enjoyed save by complete despots? And this is America! It is time to wake up. "The liberty of a people", said Edmund Burke, "has many times been lost in a night." He who loses it, loses all. Human rights and property rights are inseparable.

The cost of it all is staggering. Money is being spent at the rate of $7,500 a minute; $45,000 an hour; $324,000,000 a month; $3,888,000,000 a year. Just think of it, you thrifty people. And this is not spending money merely as it is received, for the spending has been at the rate of $2.28 spent for every $1 received. We have been "going in the hole" at the rate of $11,000,000 every day.

The debt and deficit already incurred is stupendously staggering. From reliable sources come the statements that at the end of the next fiscal year the Federal Government will be in debt for not less than $40,000,000,000, or double the Federal debt when Roosevelt became President, and with an additional contingent debt of more than seven billions besides. It is generally estimated that at least 25 percent of the contingent debt will have to be assumed by the Federal Government. If this proves to be reasonably accurate, the total net debt is somewhere around $42,000,000,000. To this must be added the twenty billions owed by States, cities, and towns, making a total Government debt, which rests as a burden upon all properties of all of us, of whatever description, in the United States of sixty-two billions.

The interest on this huge sum alone, at 3 percent, which is less than the average paid, would be nearly $2,000,000,000 per year. To amortize this, as it has been our practice in the past, over a period of 20 years would call annually for $3,000,000,000 more; thus the annual burden for the service of the debt alone for the next generation will average between four and five billion dollars.

It runs into the billions and billions. Our great-grandchildren will not live long enough to see it paid. What a burden we are imposing on our children and on posterity. What a price they will have to pay for our orgy of spending. No wonder they are rising in revolt against such a program. What is there in it that can appeal to red-blooded, virile, young, patriotic Americans? They know that they must face the necessity of paying off the debt we have incurred. They know that the door of opportunity will be closed to them, and that under the present program they will be reduced to mere cogs in the machinery of a planned economy—regimented, colonized, Russianized, working for the state and not for themselves.

And the women of America! They are awake to what it means—not selfishly for them, but for their children. Hear the woman farmer when she says, "What of my children and my grandchildren, and my great-grandchildren." Will there be any incentive to work hard and try to get ahead when the income must be turned over in such increasingly large amounts to the Government? What will it do to the souls of the people? They find no encouragement to do their best since a premium appears to be set upon inefficiency, waste, and idleness. The blood of generations of independent farm people rises within me to hate dictation, no matter how soft the velvet may be laid over the mailed fist, or how beautiful the bribery it offers for our inalienable rights. That is what the women are thinking.

Whether we like it or not the fact is incontrovertible that we are the Santa Claus. We'll have to pay or else our children will. We will pay for every bushel of grain and bale of cotton that has been destroyed; for every pig slaughtered by bureaucracy; for every farm and home defaulted to the Government. "These grants seem to be gifts," said that grand old man, that blunt old Democrat, Senator CARTER GLASS, of Virginia, as he talked turkey to his fellow Democrats in his home town of Lynchburg. "But we will pay them all; we in Virginia will pay ours and we will help pay for 14 Western States that all together do not pay as much Federal taxes as Virginia. We will pay and through the nose—and our children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren will be paying taxes, taxes, taxes.

And so far as we are concerned more than our share, as always. Its your money that is being spent. Can we be bought and sold with our own money? And one thing above all others we should remember, namely, that real estate as always will have to bear more than its share of the tax burden. The farmers and other real-estate owners and their descendants will have to meet the bill.

The Republican Party is the party of opposition to these theories and this program that has been forced upon us. Let me tell those who resent constructive criticism of their plans and policies that whatever in this country is too delicate to discuss or to criticize is too dangerous to be tolerated. Any system, any policy, any institution which may not be debated will overthrow us if we do not overthrow it.

There are none of us who do not favor and approve of some of the measures constituting a part of the so-called "new deal": Proper control of market speculation; the regulation and limitation of private profits in the manufacture of munitions in preparation for war; the elimination of child labor and sweatshops; some rational plan for unemployment insurance and relief for debt harrassed home and farm owners. But measures looking toward satisfactory solution of the problems just enumerated were under consideration long before the days of the "brain trust" or the new deal. These propositions are not the ones that give us pause. It is the proposition to socialize the States and for national regimentation that shocks us, and to which we are opposed. Regimentation is anathema to free, independent, home-loving Americans. National regimentation violates practical economies and essential liberty, if America is to remain America. National price fixing never worked whenever or wherever it has been tried, and it never will.

The suspension of the antitrust laws and the establishment of the codes has had and can have but one result, the encouragement of monopoly. The Government should get out of business and the dangerously growing bureaucracy should be stopped. Republicans, as I have said, are opposed to the new-deal plan of delegating nondelegable powers to the President respecting money, tariffs, expenditures, and other factors which create the deadly uncertainties now defeating the very recovery they are assumed to be attempting to accomplish. I am too much a Vermonter to consent to the usurpation of these legislative and judicial powers and prerogatives by the Executive, and the taking over of the rights of the States by the Federal Government without a protest, and, as a Vermonter, representing my constituents and the best interest of all the people, as I have seen it, under my oath, I have voted against such a program.

Thrift, industry, economy are no longer regarded as essential to the well-being of our people. With millions unemployed, we are advised that factories and workshops, mines, and quarries shall be closed in order that a scarcity of their products may enhance their price. With hundreds of thousands of the poor suffering the pangs of hunger, it is made an offense against the law to plant more than a modicum of crops in order that food may not become too cheap. Not too much milk must be produced, though the pale faces of undernourished children haunt the dreams of those who come in contact with the poor. Millions—yes, billions of dollars representing wealth dug from the earth and wrested from the sea, brought to public treasuries by the taxgatherers are being wasted in an unprofitable expenditure in an attempt to create a prosperity as unreal and unsubstantial as the dreams of an opium eater.

The gigantic debts so created will bear down and burden generation after generation yet to come. It is time to stop.

It is illogical, unwarranted, and uneconomic to rave about overproduction and to favor plowing under crops and limiting the raising of livestock while starving thousands walk the streets in direst need. "Want in the midst of plenty." I am forever opposed to the wanton destruction of God's bounty by any self-constituted authority, on any political pretext, for the selfish interests of any section or group, while millions of our fellow citizens are suffering for want of the necessities so destroyed.

Taking the position that I have, I have been in very distinguished Democratic company. "Let's look at the record", said Gov. Alfred E. Smith, for whom some 45,000 Vermont Democrats voted in 1928 for President; and having looked at it, no man can be more outspoken in opposition to the policies of the present administration than he has been. And that great constitutional lawyer and ambassador and candidate for President on the Democratic ticket for whom so many Vermont Democrats voted in 1924, the Honorable John W. Davis. No man could fight more vigorously than he is fighting against bureaucracy and the other undemocratic theories in which he sees nothing but wreck and ruin for his party and for the country. Two great men were these, and they still are.

Then here comes Senator Carter Glass and Senator Byrd and Senators Gore, Tydings, and Bailey; Thomas, and former Senator James Reed and Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State in President Wilson's Cabinet; and scores of others, each and all of whom the Democrats have recognized and followed as the high counsels of their party, each and all of whom are active and outspoken in their opposition to the present program. A few days ago Senator Reed said: "The remedies now imposed and sought to be imposed will delay recovery, if, indeed, they do not make recovery impossible." I warn the farmers of this country who may be enticed by arguments or influenced by the bribe money paid. I warn the laborer who may be allured by the promise of higher wages that if we proceed further along this road of bolshevism and socialism the burden in the end will be visited upon them. A few weeks ago one of the ablest Democrats in this country, one of the greatest Secretaries of War who ever sat in any President's Cabinet, the Honorable Newton D. Baker, said: "Picture Uncle Sam bailing out a pond with a sieve and you have a birdseye view of our great national paradox."

History with all her volumes vast, so far as the Democratic Party and its accomplishments are concerned, hath but one page. To save themselves, to restore confidence, the people of these United States have in days gone by called in and on the Republican Party. History repeats itself. The call for the constructive leadership of the Republican Party grows stronger and louder day by day, as people the country over come to realize how deep in the slough of national financial debauchery and despond, how severe the civil destruction into and through which we are being so blindly led. They see Government-enforced pauperism and conflicting programs which will not lead to a substitution of the pay roll for the relief roll.

The danger of today, as has been so well said, is not the loss of liberty by use of force. It lies, rather, in the supine surrender of the rights of free men to a seductive, subversive program of paternalism which is gradually changing the form of our government from a representative democracy to a bureaucratic state, mildly despotic in action, dangerously experimental in conception—a program in which human rights and property rights cease to rest on the firm foundation of established law and come to depend upon the whims of a temporary majority.

No free government can remain virile if it ignores or attempts to forget the traditions of its history. It is not ignorance to heed the lessons that history is ever willing to teach us—it is just that to ignore them. As Woodrow Wilson so cogently said: "Every nation must constantly keep in touch with its past; it cannot run toward its ends around sharp corners."

Moreover, to those who hurl the words "reactionary" and "obstructionist" as an epithet, I say to you that no student who makes even a cursory study of history can wisely censure those who protest against State paternalism. The present administration attempts both to ignore the traditions of our Government's history and to become essentially paternalistic.

The Nation which the Civil War was fought to preserve will have ceased to be when the legislative powers are surrendered to executives who are but too willing to accept them; when the judiciary strives to find reasons for upholding laws enacted at the behest of noisy minorities; when the plain language of Federal and State

Constitutions is given new and strange meanings in order to meet assumed emergencies; when debasement of the currency is adopted as a sound financial policy; when the sovereignty of the individual States is disregarded and local self-government becomes an obsolete phase; when individual initiative is discouraged, the lessons of experience cast aside, and personal liberty, in great measure, becomes a thing of the past; when men are denied to buy and sell the products of their labor in the open market place; to fix the price of goods in which they deal by bargain with their fellows; when the farmer is forbidden to sow and reap on the land he owns, according to his own best judgment; when every detail of business life of the citizen is ordered by officials, not of his own choosing; lastly, when written agreements and contracts cease to have a binding force even upon government itself. All these things are involved in, will be the ultimate end and result, and are a part of the policy and program which candidates of the Democratic Party endorsed and pledged themselves 100 percent blindly to support, like automatons or robots. It is the clear duty of the Republican Party aggressively to resist and to oppose them.

It is a tremendous task which confronts the Republican Party, but not too great an undertaking for this party of ours, which sponsored and was responsible for the enactment of legal tender and sound-money laws, for a system of internal taxation by which a major part of the operating expenses of the Government has been met; not too great an undertaking for the party which forced the adoption of the thirteenth amendment, which abolished slavery, the fourteenth amendment, which created citizenship of the United States, the fifteenth amendment, which established equality of suffrage.

What Daniel Webster said over a hundred years ago comes down to us today as a challenge wisely prophetic and as forcefully applicable to our day and time, and the matters and things which confront us as for the day and age in which it was delivered. Hear him when he says:

"Other misfortune may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites National sovereignty with State rights, individual security and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art, for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

It has been well said: "If the Republican Party is to function effectively as an opposition party; if it is to win again the confidence of the majority of the people of America, it must be as a champion of a competitive system of economy in which every man shall have an equal chance; it must be as the foe of monopoly putting under the control of clean-cut, enforcible laws, those great combinations of capital and wealth which have exploited labor and stifled competition; it must be as the exponent of a free, independent system of banking and credit which shall be neither the pliant tool of great bankers in New York nor the suppliant instrument of political power in Washington. Our party, to deserve and win majority favor again, must not be content to preserve the profitable domestic market for American manufacturers and leave to the mercies of a world market and world price fixing the products of American farms. We must have the courage, as a party, to stand for a single gold standard as a measure of value and be prepared to maintain the stability of that gold standard at all times and under all circumstances. We must believe in, champion, and practice economy in public affairs, precisely as we are compelled to practice it in our private affairs. We must repudiate with the scorn it richly deserves the utterly insane attempt to spend ourselves back into prosperity out of the Government Treasury. While recognizing and acknowledging the obligations to protect from privation and want the victims of depression and drought, we must insist upon the speediest possible balancing of the Budget, knowing full well this to be the first, essential, and vital step toward prosperity. And, finally, we must rally America against the dangers of a constantly growing bureaucratic army that has descended upon us in the past 2 years like a swarm of locusts to eat the people's substance, interfere with their lives, and prevent their recovery."

The Republican Party has made mistakes but is big enough to admit them; subsequently to correct them. It has maintained a record for achievement and accomplishment which will not permit it to lie down or to admit that its men or its women have lost their vision or that, as a party, it is unable to cope with the present situation. It has always been the party of action, of progress, of achievement, since the day of its founding. I tell you that the call for its leadership is stronger today than ever before. The political party which has put into effect the principles and policies which saved national unity, freed a race, resumed specie payments, established the national credit, fixed the gold standard, restored prosperity—in short, which always, when it has been brought to a realizing sense of the magnitude of the crisis and the responsibility resting upon it, has responded to the call, has then proven equal to the emergency—that party will once more respond, will continue to keep the faith, will provide the solution for our current problems, and, true to its record, will lead the country out of the slough of despond into the sunshine of a complete recovery, prosperity, contentment, and peace.

Place the Republican Party in power, restore confidence! Go tell the pessimist that we have a vast domain of 3,000,000 square miles, this Nation of ours, literally bursting with latent treasure still awaiting the magic of capital and industry to be converted into the practical uses of mankind; that what natural resources we lack we have the brains to manufacture synthetically; a country rich in soil and climate, in the unharnessed energy of its mighty rivers, and in all the varied products of the field, the forest, the factory, and the farm. Tell him we have the man power and the brains; that the Republican Party, renewing its allegiance to the principles, purposes, and declaration of its founders, with its face toward the light, reaffirming its adherence to fundamental Republican doctrines, will go forward determined to perpetuate blessings already received and to make sure and secure the achievement of a greater America yet to be.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY ACCEPTING NOMINATION

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] accepting the nomination to the office of United States Senator, the address having been delivered on September 6, 1934.

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

At the time I was nominated for Congressman 2 years ago, I delivered a speech in which I gave my opinion as to how we might bring about a correction of the distress of the times. That speech was, in a large part, the expression of a conviction I had had, and had often expressed, since the very beginning of the panic which cast its shadow over the entire country during the administration of President Hoover.

I said then that the paramount question of the campaign was the attitude of candidates on the subject of employment, or unemployment. Since then I have not changed my opinion as to the way to guarantee jobs to every able-bodied man who is willing and anxious to work. Neither have I changed my opinion on one single statement that I made in my acceptance speech of 2 years ago.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR RELIEF

As a matter of necessity, the Government has been compelled to assume the responsibility of providing relief for millions of our people. If these were ordinary times this would not be my idea of a proper function of the Federal Government, for, carried to the end of its possibilities, it would mean the end of the capitalistic system. I am against that.

On the other hand, however, because of the power and influence of a reactionary element in our political and economic structure, we have been denied the opportunity to use certain prescriptions which long before now could have effected a cure.

If we stop the relief measures without providing work for people in another way, we are certain to create a chaos that will destroy the efforts of 150 years and bring about not only a complete destruction of business but misery to all of our people. Everything is based upon buying power, and when you take that away from a sufficient number of our people, you destroy not only the opportunity of business and capital but every other value.

If we stopped the Federal relief measures tomorrow, we would rob every home owner in America, and the merchants and other business men of the Nation would be compelled to join the ranks of those without anything to do. Local taxes would be raised to an impossible point in an attempt to raise money to care for the unfortunate victims of unemployment. Very few of the local taxpayers would be able to meet the bills, and it does not require any special gift of wisdom to anticipate the consequences. Men will not give up their homes and idly watch the suffering of their families without one or another kind of resistance.

MUST CARE FOR WEAK

The true test of a nation is its care of the weak, and until industry assumes the responsibility the Government must. At that point we make the diagnosis and we should prescribe the medicine aiming to bring about a cure.

I shudder when I think of the paternalism now necessarily practiced by the Federal Government. People are expecting that the Government will provide for them, and unless we exercise and accelerate the wisdom with which this country is endowed, we will drift into the chaos and decay which has overcome other great nations in the days behind us.

While the care of the weak is a governmental responsibility, I believe that we should provide that care through the enactment and enforcement of laws and not through the assumption of the responsibilities and obligations of States and municipalities. I am willing to assume the responsibility, and to brush aside that reactionary element which decries the existing situation but is not prepared to offer any other substitute than the pagan practice of the survival of the fittest. They are mistaken when they think that such a procedure would keep them secure.

For the past 4 years or more I have urged that the Government assume the responsibility of providing work, for those desiring work, by the regulation of working hours. Everyone admits that there can be no return to better times until there is a shorter

working day and week, but industry as a whole refuses to do anything about it. It is my claim that the Government should assume the necessary leadership and guidance to make the cure effective. This could be done very quickly if the people had a sufficient courage to enforce their convictions.

I will not believe that we are to revert to a standard of living through which men are to be deprived of many of the good things of life which they have enjoyed up to now, and neither do I believe that natural laws, unaided, will carry us back to that high standard of living which so recently we regarded as normal. We have ignored so many natural laws in this machine age that it is pitiful to hear men say that eventually the laws of nature will bring us the cure. How sad for those who suffer misery while we wait.

CURTAIL WORKING HOURS

The attempts at regulation up to now have been in the right direction, but too complicated and in many instances unfair. It is futile to establish a 40-hour code for any industry that has worked only 30 hours a week for 4 years. That procedure corrects the sweatshop evil, but it does not go far enough to keep up with the inventive genius that forced millions of men out of work. The proper way is a governmental regulation that will curtail working hours so that the right to earn a living will be distributed over the entire field of those who want to work. This will bring relief not only to those who labor, but also to those for whom they labor, and to every kind of business. That the wages of workmen would increase is beneficial, as I see it, for people are willing to pay prices that permit a profit if given some assurance of the necessary income. I say again America has never been prosperous when compelled to give away its produce and its products.

Many people entertain the notion that we are suffering only from the ills of a mad period of speculation. This opinion is in part true, and the mad rush for seemingly certain wealth is what brought the economic disaster upon us so suddenly and severely. Before and beyond that is the fertility of American inventive genius. This God-given wisdom expelled men from the busy industrial plants by the hundreds of thousands. Until the fruit of this genius is properly divided between capital and labor, both will suffer to a greater or less extent. Both will agree to the division, and to governmental leadership if intrusted the almost sacred responsibility of effecting the proper procedure. We stay in the wilderness until people have been given employment. Everyone knows that our opponents are anxious to see men go back to work. So far, however, they have offered no plan.

MUST FIGHT DEPRESSION

They appear to entertain the thought that we have gone through similar periods before, and that because prosperity runs in cycles, the situation will ultimately clarify itself. I am not among those following that line of thought. I believe that the past is behind us and the future is what we make it. This period has little in common with other periods, and while some people feel that we drifted out of depressions in the past, I do not think we did. To overcome the last one we saw financial experts devising ways to make credits easier for individuals as well as corporations, and the manufacturers of the country furnishing advanced necessities and luxuries that made work for the man in the factory and life easier for those in his home.

What regulation of industry we have at the moment is the creation of industry. Industry itself has written the codes, but they fall short of the mark because they neglect the welfare of those not working, and they are almost impossible of enforcement because they are so complicated and there are so many of them. They are being violated every day in thousands of places.

I propose that we write one law that will regulate the hours of labor, and that the same law apply to all industry. If it can be proven that certain fields should enjoy a certain privilege because of a peculiar problem of the business, I am for that. I would have the law administered by some such governing body as the Supreme Court of the United States, with authority to set the specific hours of labor in industry in accordance with the needs of the situation. As conditions changed the hours could be changed. The law should be flexible, but there should be but one code, with the aforementioned exception, insofar as the hours of workmen are concerned. The needs of the moment demand a lessening of the hours per week.

Industrialists and bondholders and stockholders must know that the value of their holdings can only be determined by the success of labor and the maintenance of buying power. If men do not have jobs they cannot buy for their families and they cannot pay taxes. When the buying power is too greatly impaired industrial plants become a liability and stocks and bonds are tokens of a past period of security.

SOURCE OF MONEY

Employers will ask, "Where is the money coming from with which to start this plan?" If necessary, the Government should loan the necessary money to industry with which to meet its early pay rolls. The machinery would start quickly, as it did when credit was made available in 1921, and the Government loans would be repaid. Much that is now being expended will not be returned.

This proposal means as much to the farmer as it does to the industrial leader and the stockholder and bondholder. He sells his produce to the man who labors in the field of industry, and a successful industry assures the proper market for the man who gets his living from the soil. With the buying power of labor curtailed, or destroyed, there can be no profit in a farm.

In one part of the country a proposal is made that the Government operate certain industrial plants that are idle. This is a socialistic dream. Our governmental structure is burdened with the frailties of practical politics, and where private industry fails governmental operation under the capitalistic system cannot be successful. This proposal is just as fallacious as the plea of the reactionary element in the Republican Party that wants to stop where we are and return to those days we knew just before the bold and courageous Roosevelt assumed the oath of office.

We cannot go back to the days of complete despair, when all of the banks were closed and people wondered if we had come to the end. The old order has passed. The days of stock-market manipulation and easy profits are over forever. We must decide whether we want all of the people to have a share of the world's goods, which are the gifts of God, or whether we surrender.

RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM

I am against regimentation and I am for rugged individualism. I am for a destruction of that regimentation that made puppets of the masses while the wealth was poured into the capital structure at the expense of the Nation's buying power. I am for that rugged individualism that means a job for every honest and able-bodied man who is willing and anxious to work. I am against that rugged individualism that was threatened by the blind political philosophy of the administration in power up until 1932.

If industry tries to arouse fear by telling those men who are still working that curtailed working hours will mean a loss to them, I want to say that no job is secure while half of the people are without work, and unless we correct the situation, all of us will fall before the inevitable tax burden.

The speech of acceptance I am making now is pretty much the speech I delivered when I was nominated for Congress 2 years ago. Since that time our opponents have been over all the territory. They have pulled every string on the zither and they have condemned almost every patriotic effort of a brave national leadership, and those of them who have been your agents in governmental places made little or no contribution to the war against misery and despair. If they meant well, their vision was dimmed by a reactionary school of thought, or their efforts by the party lash, wielded by those who were blinded by selfishness.

OVERPRODUCTION PROBLEM

Two years ago I said that if we permitted good times to return in the normal and natural way, which is so frequently and so easily described, we would ever be confronted with the terrifying problem of unemployment and the awful spectre of new panics. Our generation had witnessed a period of invention surpassing the imagination of those just before us. Production, accelerated by intense competition, and sometimes by greed, nearly devoured the wage earner and too often crippled the producer. Perfected production surfeited the market in every direction and left industry on the rocks.

The fallacious philosophy of natural laws, as it applies to industry and labor, is antiquated. Some of us sensed this a long time ago, and most of us fully realize it now. We realize that there will be no regeneration by dole or moratorium, or by new taxes, or by a vicious political criticism. The courage to face the facts and take the seemingly bitter medicine that promises a cure is the one way out—and the only way.

For too many years we have had inefficient representation at Washington. It was permitted because in good times the average man was usually concerned with politics only to the extent of his ordinary emotions. This year, however, he is not treating the subject very lightly, and I think he is going to make certain that the agents elected to represent the State at Washington are not the agents of only a certain few.

I have never been afraid that we would not solve our problem, because I have great faith in the intellectual capacity of the American people when they are aroused. I have had the fear that we might delay the proper action so long that a less clear thinking influence might assume control of governmental affairs and retard the progress which is available. Despite our rich natural resources, and a greatly developed material wealth, a too-long dormant or reactionary element in office will permit much of them to decay and be wasted.

JOBS, BUYING POWER

A great many otherwise careful-thinking people appear to believe that we only need to restore confidence and credit. They are absolutely right so far as they go. You cannot, however, restore confidence and credit without restoring jobs and buying power. We are not coming out of this depression by using rose-colored glasses. We can emerge from it only by a redistribution of wealth through a fair division of work.

If we were to return to so-called "normal times" tomorrow, it would still be a fact that the shoe manufacturers, the makers of silver products, and of almost everything else, could, in a period of less than 6 months, supply the needs of the country for a year. This seems to prove, by simple subtraction or division, that there must be a rearrangement of working hours. The reward of the genius that made this speeded production possible cannot successfully be controlled by a group or a class. It belongs to the manufacturer, the man who works for him, the farmer, and to every other honest and sincere person who helps to make up the national structure. In my opinion the division can only come by a supervision of working hours.

Many of the manufacturers will not see this, and I want to rescue them from themselves. They will say that it is not proper

to tell a man how long he can work. I answer that no other means has solved the puzzle, despite many legislative ventures, and it is much less serious to tell a man how long he can work than to tell him he cannot work at all.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

They will claim that foreign competition will defeat the purpose. I answer that we can meet that situation by establishing such restrictions as are necessary to compel those who compete with us to meet our labor standards. Let us sell to the rest of the world such things as they need from us, and buy from the rest of the world those products we need from them. Let us lead the rest of the world to a proper division of work. We saw our American industrialists establish industrial plants abroad in great number.

Despite the arguments made, I challenge opponents of this proposal to tell us how else we can get men back to work. I challenge them to tell how we will preserve the capitalistic system unless we do get men back to work.

Some industrialists will maintain that they are in accord with the idea but that industry should be permitted to work out the problem without governmental interference. I like the theory of their suggestion, but it will never work. Many manufacturers are sufficiently patriotic and convinced of the wisdom of the plan, but just enough of them would take advantage of the situation to destroy the attempt of others in competitive lines. While we wait for the natural processes to correct the evil, the coupon-cutting income, together with the power for good of normal labor conditions, becomes less potent and there is a corresponding loss of confidence and faith.

At one time a road was built by hundreds of men with the aid of wheelbarrows. Gigantic equipment now replaces that small army of another day. Factory work and office work is now done to a great extent by machines. And millions of college graduates are among the masses unable to gain employment.

I cannot see failure if we pursue this course. I claim that those who doubt it should be willing to experiment. Without bold and experimental steps there would have been no Revolution and no Republic. Without experimentation, no electricity, no radio, no medicine. Shame on those who fear to experiment in this advanced age, while people are drinking the most bitter dregs of distress.

CONCERN FOR INDUSTRY

We should be as much concerned over the welfare of the manufacturer as we are of the wage earner and the small taxpayer, because if he falls by the wayside we all fall with him. I call attention to the fact that, if the idea of regulated working hours was national and compulsory, no manufacturer would have an advantage over another, and proper wage scales would be maintained. With proper wage scales there need be no continuous slashing of prices that only results in disaster. Times are good only when men get good wages and manufacturers substantial prices.

Industry can now produce as much in 30 hours as it did in 45 or 50 hours in 1927 and 1928. I only suggest that the men produce as much now as they did then and for the same production receive the same wages they then received. Buying power would be the same now as it was then. Merchants and manufacturers and farmers, as well as professional men, could charge the same prices as they did in those years and enjoy the same profit. If they would keep that profit where it belonged in their own business, the brighter day would be secure. Once more there would be money for advertising and for every service field—and for honest investment.

We cannot return to the honest but floundering philosophy of the administration of Mr. Hoover. He believed—and his very close friends here in Connecticut seem to still believe—that the proper procedure is to take care of those on top, with the hope that a sufficient amount will trickle through to the farmers and factory workers and small merchants underneath.

My prescription is to start at the bottom, in accordance with the laws of nature, and construct the foundation properly. This foundation is the millions of plain people who make up most of our national life.

My concern for industry and business is no less than that of our opponents, because I fully understand that there can be no return to good times unless these are successful, but I cannot overlook the truth of the other side of the question—that industry and business, or capital, if you will, cannot do more than dream of success until the real buying power of the 90 percent is returned.

This is my speech of acceptance. I have not a sufficient gift of words to tell you how grateful I am for the great honor you have conferred upon me. I am mindful of the responsibility and I accept it. I pray for God's help in the days ahead and I ask the support of every honest man and woman who believes that I will fearlessly and fairly represent this great Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States.

PRAISE FOR ROOSEVELT

I have refrained from a detailed recital of the accomplishments of our great President because I think the people are more concerned with the days ahead than those behind us. I have made no attempt to appeal to passion, nor will I make such an attempt in this campaign. I do reserve the right to point to the record of my opponent, if he has a public record, and I shall welcome his criticism of mine.

It would have been proper here to have said that President Roosevelt found the country and its banking, agricultural, industrial, and mercantile institutions disorganized and in a wilderness and that on the first day he raised the hope of every man and started the Nation on the road to recovery.

I might herein have recited that I helped lead the fight in Congress for the passage of the stock exchange bill, designed to protect small investors of America; that I fought for the repeal of the recapture clause to help strengthen the railroads and insurance companies and banks of the country, and in turn the bondholders, stockholders, small-policy holders, and bank depositors.

It might have been proper for me to have dwelt upon the part I played in attacking the municipal bankruptcy bill. I was in the well of the House in those fights, and it is part of the printed record that I spoke in behalf of old-age pensions and regulated working hours. I will save the details for the campaign, and then we will examine the records. My opponent may have a chance to explain what part, if any, he played.

CHALLENGES OPPONENT

If my good health continues, I hope to visit most of the cities and towns of Connecticut during the next several weeks. Issues will be available when our opponents are selected. I welcome the campaign, because I have complete faith in our party, our leadership, and our purposes. I now invite my opponent, whoever he may be, to discuss the issues with me on such platforms as he may select.

I have always lived in Connecticut. My record is readily available. I pray that I may reflect credit upon your judgment and that I may bring some glory to Connecticut and help to bring happiness to the people of our country.

SUPPRESSION OF RADICALS

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Daily News, entitled "The Methodists Speak."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE METHODISTS SPEAK

A timely warning is issued by the Methodist Federation for Social Service against proposed measures to suppress radicals.

Speaking for the federation, Dr. Harry F. Ward said:

"If American citizens let these laws pass, they will wake up and find they have lost all the freedom guaranteed them by the Constitution. If the Communists are denied their constitutional rights, we shall soon see the order of events that was followed in Europe. First the Communists are repressed; then the Socialists, then the labor unions, then the others.

"If this legislation is passed big business will have the legal machinery to put out of business any organization that opposes capitalism or war or that conducts a strike. It will not be necessary to subsidize Fascist storm troops. They will kill democracy in the name of democracy, and they will trample upon every sacred principle of Christianity."

To appreciate the logic of Dr. Ward's statement, Americans have only to recall the tyranny of the Federal spy system under Attorneys General Palmer and Daugherty.

OFFICIAL RECORD OF HON. FRANK R. M'NINCH

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, headed "Official Record of Hon. Frank R. McNinch, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, December 22, 1930, to February 1935."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Clearly to understand the significance of the official acts of Hon. Frank R. McNinch as member and Chairman of the Federal Power Commission one must know the history of the conflict between the American people and the private power interests for the past 30 years.

The purpose of the Federal Water Power Act of 1920 was to stop the practice of giving away the Nation's power sites in fee simple to private monopoly; to prevent security inflation; to secure reasonable rates and make certain the recapture of these sites at the end of lease period. Unreasonable profits by private lessees to be prohibited.

The power interests, through political control of the Power Commission, had made a farce of the administration of the act for the first 10 years. President Hoover attempted the further wreck of the act, administration of which under Chairman Ray Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, created a scandal. Congress in May 1930 passed the Couzens bill, setting up an independent full-time commission of five members. Mr. McNinch was appointed on this new Commission and thus came upon the Federal power scene. Two things must be noted at the start:

1. He did not seek the office; it came to him as a complete surprise.

2. No commitments were asked or given, his only promise being that in the oath of office to faithfully administer the law.

Doubtless it was a political appointment, President Hoover's reward to North Carolina and other Southern Democrats for opposing Alfred E. Smith in the campaign of 1928, with the hope of holding them in the Republican column. It is true that Mr. McNinch had

no expert knowledge of the Nation's power problem, but neither did the other members, excepting the chairman, Dr. George Otis Smith, for 20 years head of the Geological Survey, who had considerable general knowledge.

It was assumed that Chairman Smith would dominate the Commission, and it was believed that he would execute Hoover's policies. Doubtless Mr. Hoover thought Mr. McNinch would go along with the administration whatever it might do. Events quickly proved that he did not know his McNinch any more than President Coolidge knew his Robert E. Healy when he permitted that faithful public servant to be appointed chief counsel of the Federal Trade Commission.

Progressive members of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, which investigated Mr. Hoover's appointees before confirmation, freely stated that McNinch was too new to the power question to have fixed opinions, but that they considered him honest, intelligent, and a man of marked courage and independence who would do what he considered right, this at a time when there was general scepticism over any power appointment Mr. Hoover might make in any department of the Government, so notorious was his championship of the private power position. It soon developed that Chairman Smith's policy would be favorable to the power companies not only by positive acts but by marking time and leaving unenforced the most important provisions of the Power Act, which the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover regime had ignored for 10 years. That put Commissioner McNinch in a trying position.

THE NEW RIVER CASE

The first "show down" came on the New River case, inherited from the old Commission. The Appalachian Electric Power Co., controlled in New York, had applied in 1930 for the right to construct a 185,000-horsepower plant on the New River in Virginia under a minor part license. A standard license, imposing full regulation over security issues, rates, etc., was clearly required, but a minor part license carried on regulation. A former Commission had found the river nonnavigable at the dam site, but if this Commission admitted, as the company claimed, that the entire river was nonnavigable, although it had been held navigable through 100 years of State and Federal legislation, it would set a precedent for like rivers and destroy the Government's jurisdiction over 80 percent of the Nation's running waters.

It was the most insidious and dangerous attack on the Power Act yet devised, and in some form it was certain to go to the United States Supreme Court. By virtual direction of President Hoover, Attorney General Mitchell gave an opinion that the Commission could issue a minor part license if it found the river nonnavigable, but Chairman Smith refused to touch the question of navigability.

Commissioner McNinch studied the case, decided the river legally navigable, and, as a lawyer, saw that the Government's case would be gravely prejudiced unless the Commission, as a fact-finding body of the first instance, would do its duty and declare the river navigable.

Mr. McNinch had then to make his first decision as to whether he would follow President Hoover or serve the American people and uphold the law. On April 3, 1931, a little over 3 months after he took office, he sought, with the sole backing of Commissioner Draper, to have the Commission declare the river navigable, and met defeat at the hands of Smith, Garsaud, and Williamson. (See 1931 Annual Report, p. 124.)

That is, Commissioner McNinch, shortly after his appointment, finding Hoover and Mitchell undermining the Power Act to serve the Power Trust, fought them to the limit and there ended his chances for reappointment in 1934 should Hoover be reelected. That took nerve, and it was 1 year before Governor Roosevelt became a Presidential candidate.

On the same day (Apr. 3) the Commission refused the minor part license on the grounds that the project would affect interstate commerce, but it left the dangerous question of navigability untouched, against the protest of McNinch and Draper. On June 8, with Newton D. Baker as chief counsel, the power company sought a Federal injunction forbidding the Commission to interfere with the company on New River, and later amended its plea to deny the jurisdiction of the Commission and the Federal Government over water power in the rivers of the United States, navigable or nonnavigable.

Chairman Smith delayed the appointment of counsel to defend the Government's case for 6 months. It was through the efforts of Mr. McNinch that the Honorable Huston Thompson, progressive Democrat, who had shown his true metal as a public servant when Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, was selected. The appointment became effective only a few days before the case was set for hearing and with the Power Trust battery of lawyers fully prepared. McNinch kept insisting, and on October 12, 1932, his resolution, seconded by Draper, officially declaring New River navigable, was adopted. (For text, see 1932 Annual Report, p. 226.) It was Smith who began veering with the political winds. Mr. Thompson won the case and has publicly stated that in all the cases in which he has been Government counsel he has never had the courageous, active support he received from Commissioner McNinch. Mr. Thompson was formerly Assistant Attorney General of the United States and has had a long experience in defending the public interest.

Since this initial case illustrates Commissioner McNinch's independent attitude and his intelligence, courage, and fighting capacity throughout, it has been given here in more detail than is possible in this survey in dealing with his other official acts.

INFLATED SECURITIES

On July 15, 1932, the Commission made public its decision in the Mitchell Dam (Alabama) case which refused to allow approximately $4,500,000 in the claimed valuation of that project by the Alabama Power Co. It is known that McNinch, then vice chairman, powerfully influenced the decision and showed his position on one of the greatest economic issues before the Nation—watered stocks.

The Power Act provides that the investment of a power company in development of a lease on a public site shall consist only of the actual cash legitimately invested in plant equipment, with no padding or inflations allowed. Old Commissions had never enforced this provision. Company reports on construction costs were padded by millions of dollars. Previous Commissions had accepted company statements on leases made over the Nation but had made no final decision as to their correctness. Hence, the significance of the Mitchel Dam case. But McNinch went further and filed a minority opinion, proposing to throw out an organization expense item of $152,000 which should not have been put into capital expense and here first laid down principles supporting Federal jurisdiction in such matters. The company appealed, and the case is still in the courts. (For Mr. McNinch's opinion, see the 12th Annual Report, 1932, p. 18.)

REGULATION OF SECURITIES

The Power Act provides that the Commission shall regulate rates and security issues of companies under lease from the Commission where State governments provide no such regulation. Here, again, the old Commission had never exercised authority, and it was not until Mr. McNinch took the initiative that it was ever attempted. On November 12, 1932, he introduced and had passed regulation no. 21, requiring companies under lease to observe the law in this respect. The move was important. At that time 22 States had no machinery for the regulation of such securities. (See 1933 Annual Report, p. 81.)

HOLDING-COMPANY PRACTICES

One of the most flagrant methods by which the extortionate profits in the power business are covered up and by which holding companies secure income to sustain their inflated securities is to charge the underlying companies management fees, etc., for alleged supervision. These holding and management corporations were then, and are still, wholly without regulation. Even President Hoover finally had to admit the necessity of such regulation, but did nothing. It is one of the chief objectives of the Roosevelt administration, and a bill is pending in Congress as this is written.

On October 31, 1933, in the Louisville Hydroelectric Co. case, Chairman McNinch wrote one of the most advanced opinions on this question yet made. He held that these practices constitute "a grave economic and social peril." He described the Byllesby Corporation, which controls the Louisville Co., as "a holding-company dynasty, not exceptional but typical, with absentee ownership and management and sovereignty over far-flung dominions in many States, but subject to the jurisdiction of none, its authority centralized in a few strong hands, its 'fee' taxation without representation of the operating companies." He said, "The crux of the problem is in the present inadequacy of the law." Around $800,000 of this company's investment claim was disallowed. (See 1933 Annual Report, p. 307, et seq.)

THE E. E. I. AND N. R. A. ELECTRIC CODE

In January 1934, when codes were being set up, the Edison Electric Institute, trade organization of that power industry, proposed a code which, in effect, would have brought under its supervision not only private but municipally owned power plants of the Nation, including the T. V. A. and like undertakings. The N. R. A. officials yielded to the institute's proposals. The liberals of the Nation fought the move to bring public plants under Power Trust domination. The situation was critical, and Chairman McNinch, in an able and forceful speech at the public hearing, fought the proposition and was an important factor in its defeat. It is observed here that his independence led him to oppose one of the agencies of the Roosevelt administration which he did not believe was acting in the public interest. There is no evidence that President Roosevelt had approved the N. R. A. proposals.

The summation is that since Frank R. McNinch became its chairman, the Federal Power Commission has been functioning in the public interest and in the fashion intended by the progressive Republicans and Democrats who fought 15 long years for its creation. Furthermore, the rank and file of the American people, not merely official Washington, are rapidly becoming aware that such an agency exists. They knew, therefore, that when President Roosevelt, in August 1933, ordered a national power survey and placed it under the direction of the Federal Power Commission they would learn what they wanted to know. The survey was welcomed by Chairman McNinch and placed under the immediate direction of Vice Chairman Basil Manly, as was also the electric-rate survey, directed by an act of Congress under Joint Resolution No. 74, introduced by Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, of Nebraska, and Representative JOHN A. RANKIN, of Mississippi.

I cannot remember a single speech by a chairman or member of the Federal Power Commission prior to 1930 which struck fire and showed that Commission alive. Since Mr. McNinch became chairman the Commission has had a voice; and, although he does not make many public addresses, when he does speak it is always in the public interest, while at the same time he is eminently fair to private power companies who are not trying to evade the law and exploit the people. But with McNinch it is deeds first and words afterward.

MONETARY PROBLEMS OF RECOVERY—ADDRESS BY MARRINER S. ECCLES

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, on the 12th of February Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, delivered before the annual midwinter meeting of the Ohio Bankers Association, at Columbus, Ohio, a very interesting address bearing directly upon pending legislation. I ask to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

I am grateful for this opportunity to address the members of the State Bankers Association of Ohio and their friends who have joined them on this occasion.

In taking up my duties in Washington, first with the Treasury and then with the Federal Reserve Board, I was, of course, under the necessity of resigning my own banking connections. Nevertheless I have every reason to feel entirely at home in an assembly of bankers, and I am genuinely glad to be here. This is, in fact, the first opportunity I have had to address a large number of bankers since I became Governor of the Federal Reserve Board.

When I accepted the invitation I received from your president in December, I was somewhat at a loss to decide what subject to discuss with you. Since then the banking bill of 1935 has been introduced and I feel sure that there is no subject in which bankers will be more interested than the provisions of that bill. I am especially glad to be able to present to you my conception of the objectives of this measure, because I believe that all who are of the banking fraternity, no less than those of us who are identified with the administration in Washington, have every reason of common interest and common purpose to desire the solution of the monetary problems of recovery in the manner in which the banking bill of 1935 seeks to solve them.

But it is not my intention this afternoon to go into a detailed discussion of each provision of the bill. There will be ample opportunity for that on other occasions. I propose this afternoon, rather, to discuss the general philosophy underlying the bill as a whole. I have chosen this method of approach because I believe that it will enable you to appreciate more fully the significance that we attach to its various provisions, and the result that we hope to accomplish through their practical operation.

Broadly speaking, there are four main objects which we seek to accomplish. In the first place, we wish to make the banking system a more efficient instrument for the promotion of stable business conditions in the future; secondly, various proposals in the bill are designed to bring our banking system into closer conformity with modern conditions and, more immediately, to aid in business recovery; thirdly, we seek to make certain rather fundamental changes in the law relating to deposit insurance in order to make the system sounder and more equitable; and, finally, we seek to correct various inequalities, ambiguities, and abuses that have developed in the banking system in the course of time. In the limited time at my disposal I shall have to confine myself to a discussion of the broad principles behind the proposals which are designed to secure the first two objectives mentioned, stability and recovery.

How may our banking system be so regulated and adapted that it may become a more efficient instrument for the promotion of business stability and the mitigation of industrial fluctuations? A complete answer to this question demands much fuller treatment than I can possibly give it here. Book after book has been written on this subject. Because of the need for brevity I fear the statement of my views may appear to be dogmatic. I shall, however, have to run this risk, as I feel that in no other way can I indicate to you the significance I attach to the various proposals.

The fundamental premise underlying the bill and underlying my discussion this afternoon is that business stability is a desirable objective. I feel sure that no one will disagree with this premise, and to my way of thinking agreement on this one vital point alone will lead you to lend your whole-hearted support to the banking bill of 1935.

The second fundamental premise upon which I proceed is that business stability cannot be achieved without real thought, real effort, and real courage. To establish this point it is not necessary to accept and defend any one single explanation of the business cycle. It is merely necessary to call to mind that in the heyday of laissez faire, before any attempts at conscious control were undertaken, business fluctuations on a disastrous scale occurred with distressing regularity. If we had a perfectly flexible cost-and-price structure—which would have to include, I may remind you, an equally flexible wage-and-interest structure—our economy could probably adjust itself to rapid expansions and contractions with little resultant unemployment. Without such flexibility, however, expansion and contraction, instead of calling into play forces that adjust and correct such movements, tend to feed upon themselves and for a considerable period to generate further expansions and contractions.

It is not realistic, however, to say that all that is necessary is to introduce more flexibility into our system. Numerous rigidities and inflexibilities have developed in our economy, and the trend in the recent past plainly points to more rather than less rigidity in the future. If there is one thing that to me seems clear, it is that, unless conscious effort is made to prevent them, booms and collapses will continue to recur in capitalistic democracies. It also seems evident to me that neither capitalism nor democracy can survive another depression of the magnitude of the one from which we are just emerging.

Proceeding, then, on the assumption that business stability is a desirable, nay, a necessary objective which cannot be achieved without conscious effort, I wish to develop the thesis that the banking system can and should be one of our chief instruments for the promotion of stability.

The first elementary principle which it is essential to grasp and which it is not necessary for me to expand upon is that the bulk of our money supply today is composed of deposits subject to check. Out of a total volume of $24,000,000,000 of money, or units of purchasing power, nearly $19,000,000,000 is composed of checking accounts in commercial banks.

The second general principle in the theory of monetary control is that variations in the community's supply of money have an effect on the state of business activity. There is no general agreement as to the extent or nature of the effect such variations have on business conditions. If I presume, as a layman, to enter this controversial field, it is because I feel that the question "What effect have variations in the supply of money on business conditions?" cannot be answered in general terms or in a dogmatic manner. The effect depends on a large number of circumstances. Thus, at certain times an increase or decrease of 5 percent in the money supply may modify substantially the course of business. At other times the effect of a variation of 20 percent may be barely discernible. One point on which I think there is general agreement, and the only point which it is necessary for me to make here, is that increases in the money supply tend to stimulate business activity while decreases in the money supply tend to restrict activity.

The third principle in my general thesis of monetary control is that the operation of the banking system left to itself with no conscious effort of control tends to intensify rather than to counteract business fluctuations. The sequence of events may be briefly outlined. When business activity is increasing, there is an increased demand for bank loans and a growing disposition among banks to loan liberally. When banks lend more, thus increasing their assets, they also increase their deposits. Consequently, at the very time when the community is increasing its expenditures, there is a tendency for the supply of money to increase. Similarly, when expenditures are decreasing, the demand for bank loans falls off, bankers become more cautious, maturing loans are repaid, and deposits are extinguished. Our banking system, therefore, not only fails to act as a compensatory agent, but actually intensifies fluctuations. For example, in the period from 1929 to 1933, when expenditures were falling rapidly and the national income was being cut in half, the supply of deposit money decreased by approximately one-third. Part of the decrease can be attributed to bank failures, accentuated by withdrawals of cash for hoarding, and part to the contraction of loans and investments by surviving banks. No one person or body is responsible for this decline. The responsibility must be shared by the entire system.

The fact is that laissez faire in banking and the attainment of business stability are incompatible. If variations in the supply of money are to be compensatory and corrective rather than inflammatory and intensifying, there must be conscious and deliberate control.

The difficult and controversial question is, Who should do the controlling. I should gladly follow the course of the worthy divine who looked a difficulty boldly in the face and passed it by, but that is not the kind of boldness that will lead us out of the wilderness. I shall state, therefore, as my fourth principle that the controlling or regulatory body must be one which represents the interests not of any particular class or group of people but of the Nation as a whole.

There is no political or economic power more charged with the general or social interest than the power to increase or decrease the supply of money. If the sovereign authority delegates this power to a particular group or class in the community, as it has done in large part in this country, it divests itself of a part of its effective sovereignty. The purposes of the Nation, as expressed in its national administration, can be completely nullified by those who control the money supply.

The theory of a democratic state presupposes that the will of the majority shall prevail. If minorities feel that the acts of the majority make life unbearable, they may try to change the views of enough voters to change the complexion of the majority, or they may revolt and try to establish a rule of the minority. If they succeed in the latter course, the state ceases to be democratic. Majorities may, and sometimes do, abuse their power. It is necessary to remind ourselves, however, that so long as we remain a democracy the will of the majority is expected to prevail in monetary policy as well as in other matters of national concern.

It is my personal conviction that our system of broad political representation, faulty as it may be, constitutes a better guaranty that the general interest will be served than would control by a group of individuals chosen, let us say, entirely by bankers or business leaders.

The power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof has always been an attribute of a sovereign power. It was one of the first powers given to the Federal Government by the Constitutional Convention. The development of deposit banking, however, introduced into the economy numerous private agencies which have the power to create and destroy money without being aware of it themselves and without being recognized as creators or destroyers of money by the Government or the people. The

trend since 1913 represents a gradual recognition of this condition and a reassertion by the state of a power which it always possessed.

The President stated the underlying principles controlling the relation of the Government and the banks last October in his speech before the American Bankers Association. He then remarked that "the old fallacious notion of the bankers on the one side and the Government on the other as more or less equal and independent units has passed away. Government by the necessity of things must be the leader, must be the judge of the conflicting interests of all groups in the community, including bankers. The Government is the outward expression of the common life of all citizens." That, I think, expresses the matter very effectively.

I am here merely stating the broad principles involved. I should not like to be understood as arguing for a highly centralized control of all banking activities. Local versus national control is not a subject on which one should take sides irrespective of the question at hand. The administration of certain interests can obviously be handled more efficiently locally. Similarly, there are other things which can be handled more efficiently on a national scale. We should consider each case on its merits and provide for local control or national control, whichever is in the public interest. Let us now apply this principle to banking.

Banks in this country perform two main services. They act as middlemen for the investment of a substantial portion of the community's savings, and, through the provision of checking facilities, they supply the bulk of the community's means of payment. So far as the investment of savings is concerned, a large degree of local autonomy should be left with the individual bankers. The State should lay down minimum standards to be observed in the interests of protecting savings of individuals, but these standards can only be a minimum, and chief reliance for the safe investment of the community's savings must rest on the judgment and knowledge of the individual banker.

When we come to the second function of banks—namely, that of providing the community's money supply—a different range of factors must be taken into consideration. The effect of variations in the supply of money is Nation-wide, and cannot be localized. The Reserve administration may make conditions favorable for the creation of new deposits, but it cannot insure that the new money will be used in any particular section of the country, or spent on any particular kind of goods. Since, therefore, the effect of monetary policy is Nation-wide, the formulation of monetary policy should be by a body which represents the Nation, and which is activated by national considerations. It is inconceivable that variations in the community's money supply should be left to the individual decisions of some 15 thousand local bankers. It is scarcely more logical that the variations should reflect uncoordinated decisions of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

It may be helpful if I here summarize the various steps in my argument to this point.

My fundamental premise is that business stability is a desirable objective which it is worth making every effort to achieve. Variation in the supply of money, which in this country is furnished largely by our commercial banks in the form of checking accounts, influence business activity to an unknown degree but in a known direction. The banking system, left to itself, behaves in an intensifying rather than a compensatory fashion. If it is to be made to behave in a compensatory fashion, there must be conscious and deliberate control, and this control must be exercised by a body which represents the Nation.

Let us now examine the Federal Reserve System in the light of the preceding discussion. I propose, first, to discuss the development of open-market policy.

In 1913 the framers of the Federal Reserve Act had certain definite purposes in mind which did not include, as the bill was enacted, any reference to national monetary policy. They wished to prevent the periodic suspension of payments which occurred under the old national-banking system, and to provide an agency where banks could rediscount commercial loans in order to supply temporary, seasonal, and emergency needs of their customers for credit and currency. Broadly speaking, I think it is true to say that the Reserve banks were looked upon as emergency lending institutions. From this viewpoint it was proper that the regional Reserve banks should have almost complete autonomy, and that the Federal Reserve Board should have only a limited amount of supervisory and coordinating power.

In the post-war period our concept of the functions of the Reserve administration gradually changed. It became evident that through the control of the reserves of member banks the Reserve administration could influence the volume of deposits, and hence the volume of loanable funds of commercial banks. The trend away from autonomous regional action to a more coordinated and centralized control was evidenced by a significant development in 1922 and 1923. In 1922 certain of the Reserve banks began to buy securities, mainly for the purpose of increasing their earning assets. The purchase of these securities, however, took place in New York and gave deposits and reserves to New York commercial banks. These banks utilized these increased reserves to reduce their borrowings from the New York Federal Reserve Bank. It appeared, therefore, that the attempt of other Reserve banks to increase their earning assets resulted in a decrease in the earning assets of the New York Reserve Bank. It also became evident that increased or decreased purchases of securities by the Reserve banks affected member banks' reserves, and in this way member banks' deposits and loans and investments. A small committee of governors was thereupon set up to coordinate purchases and sales. In 1923 this committee became the open-market committee, composed of the Governors of the Federal Reserve banks of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Cleveland. Its stated duty was to formulate open-market policy, subject to the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, with primary regard to the accommodation of commerce and business, and to the effect of such purchases or sales on the general credit situation. This marked a step toward the theory of conscious and continuous control. From this date onward the volume of money in the United States was influenced greatly by actions of the open-market committee and the Federal Reserve Board.

It appears, therefore, that the System itself by virtue of necessity has developed a large measure of coordinated activity in regard to open-market operations, the single most important instrument of Reserve control. This coordination, while it represented a great advance over the situation which prevailed up to 1923, nevertheless leaves much to be desired. The body which is charged with the formulation of open-market policy is the Federal open-market committee, which is composed of the governors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. These governors are independent of the Federal Reserve Board. After the open-market committee has formulated its policy, its recommendations may be adopted or rejected by the Federal Reserve Board. Even after the policy has been formulated by the committee and approved by the Board, any Federal Reserve bank, through its board of directors, is free to decline to participate in the policy. Since you are all administrators, I do not think that I need spend much time in pointing out to you how bad this set-up is from an administrative point of view. The body which is ultimately responsible for policy—the Federal Reserve Board—legally can take no part in the formulation of the policy. The body which formulates policy, on the other hand, legally has no power to bring the policy into operation. The boards of directors of the individual Reserve banks, who take no part in the formulation of policy, have the power to obstruct its operation. It is a well-known fact that the more people there are who share a responsibility for policy the less keenly does any one of those people feel his own personal responsibility.

The theory, therefore, back of the open-market provision in the recent banking bill becomes clear. The bill provides for a small, responsive body which is charged with the duty of acting in the national interest in formulating open-market policy and in accepting responsibility for its consummation and results.

You will observe next that we propose to leave the essentially regional organization of the Federal Reserve System virtually unchanged. I feel that in a country the size of ours the regional system of Federal Reserve banks must always play an important and necessary role in our banking system. They afford, for one thing, an essential link between the thousands of individual member banks, on the one hand, and the Federal Reserve Board, on the other. Besides keeping in close touch with member banks, the Reserve banks examine member banks, admit banks to membership, provide check-clearing facilities, make loans to individual member banks, carry the reserves of member banks, and supply the currency needs of their localities.

There is but one change in the internal organization of the Reserve banks which, in the interests of economy, efficiency, and coordination, I think it is necessary at this time to effect. Officially the Federal Reserve Board has no relations with the governors of the Reserve banks. In their dealings with the Reserve banks the Board is supposed to work through the chairmen, who are not the chief executive officers of the banks. It is proposed to end the dual administration of the Reserve banks under the chairman of the board, who is appointed by the Federal Reserve Board, and the governor, who is appointed by the local board of directors, to give the governors a legal status and to combine their position with that of chairmen of their boards of directors. Inasmuch as the Federal Reserve Board is surrendering the appointment of the chairman, it is obviously desirable in the interests of coordination and harmony that the appointment of governors by the local boards be subject to the approval of the Federal Reserve Board.

In laying down a guiding principle for the President in his selection of future members of the Board, it seemed desirable to substitute for the somewhat meaningless phrases in the law the unequivocal requirement that the members should be persons qualified by education and experience to take part in the formulation of national economic and monetary policies. This is a recognition in the law of the principal function of the Federal Reserve Board.

In view of the enormous difficulty of the task of the Federal Reserve Board, the bill attempts to make a position on that Board as attractive as possible for the purpose of securing and retaining the services of the best talent in the country. The attractiveness of a position on the Board will be increased by the added powers granted to it and by providing that its members shall be relieved as far as possible from financial worries. A position on the Board is one of the most important posts in the Nation, and recognition of this fact is accorded in the bill.

I turn now to proposed changes in the operation of the Federal Reserve banks.

Two of the proposed changes now in the bill have been widely commented upon and have been as widely misunderstood. I refer to the provision that the type of paper eligible for rediscounting at Federal Reserve banks shall not be defined in the law, but shall be subject to the regulation of the Federal Reserve

Board; and to the provision that segregation of collateral for Federal Reserve notes shall be repealed.

In order to understand our reasons for wishing to modify the present requirements in the law relating to eligibility, it is necessary to recount briefly certain developments that have occurred in the history of the Federal Reserve System. Apparently it was the theory of the framers of the Federal Reserve Act that borrowings on commercial paper from the Reserve banks and the issue of Federal Reserve notes would be closely connected. It was provided, therefore, that Federal Reserve notes issued by Federal Reserve agents should be secured by 100-percent collateral in gold or eligible paper and that Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation shall have a 40-percent reserve in gold. It was apparently believed that the demand for notes arose from commercial borrowers, that the collateral requirements would restrict the issue of notes to such borrowers, and that this would afford elasticity and prevent the danger of overissue.

This line of reasoning did not take cognizance of a profound change in our monetary habits. In a deposit-using country, such as the United States, currency is seldom borrowed from a bank. Borrowers normally receive deposit credits and pay their bills with checks. The demand for currency arises chiefly from individuals and businesses who for the sake of convenience desire to convert a portion of their checking accounts into currency. The volume of money in circulation fluctuates with changes in the volume of those activities which employ the largest amount of cash, namely, retail trade and factory pay rolls. A consequence of this development is that the Reserve banks play a passive role in supplying Federal Reserve notes for circulation. If they issued Federal Reserve notes in payment for securities purchased, the sellers of the securities would immediately deposit the notes in the member banks and the member banks would send them in to the Reserve banks. If they sold securities for Federal Reserve notes, the buyers of the securities would get the notes from their member banks and these banks in turn would get them from the Reserve banks.

Thus, it will be seen that the framers of the Federal Reserve Act were mistaken in two of their expectations regarding note issue. Notes are not associated in any direct or immediate way with the needs of business for commercial loans. Neither is there any need to place restrictions on the issue of Federal Reserve notes since, as we have just seen, the volume outstanding is not susceptible to control in a predominantly deposit-using country.

Although the requirements that Federal Reserve notes be secured by eligible paper or gold does not serve as a restriction on the issue of Federal Reserve notes, it may in the future, as it has in the past, severely restrict the ability of the Reserve administration to increase the volume of deposits through open-market operations. Thus, in 1931 there occurred simultaneously a demand for gold for export and for notes to hoard. Owing to the shortage of eligible paper held by the Reserve banks, more than a billion dollars in gold in excess of the 40-percent gold requirement had to be earmarked for the account of Federal Reserve notes. Had the Reserve banks bought securities in order to build up member banks, reserves, the rediscounts would have decreased and more gold would have had to be pledged against Federal Reserve notes. The Reserve administration felt at that time that its hands were tied and that it could take no action to stem the course of deflation so long as the note-issue provisions remained in the law. The Glass-Steagall Act of 1932, by making Government securities bought in the open market eligible as collateral for Federal Reserve notes, permitted the Reserve administration to buy securities, get member banks out of debt, and thus stem the process of deflation. This act expires this year unless extended by the President for a maximum of 2 more years.

It is realistic and desirable at this time to do away with the collateral requirements altogether. They add nothing to the safety of the Federal Reserve notes since these notes are an obligation of the United States Government and have a prior lien on the assets of the Federal Reserve banks. This does not mean that notes will be issued without adequate backing. Any increase in the note issue must be counterbalanced by a corresponding increase in Federal Reserve bank assets. It makes no change in the requirement for a 40-percent reserve in gold certificates or lawful money. It is merely a proposal to get rid of an antiquated feature in the Federal Reserve Act which has never served a useful purpose and has in the past at times prevented the timely launching of an essential monetary policy.

The restriction of the rediscounting privilege to a particular and narrowly restricted type of bank loan is in accordance with a theory of reserve banking which I think we have now outgrown. The major task of the Reserve administration is not to encourage the extension of a particular type of loan. The restriction of the borrowing privilege to commercial loans has no connection with regulation of the volume of bank credit or of the access to the Reserve banks. The aggregate amount of paper eligible for rediscounting has been at all times greatly in excess of the volume of rediscounts. Moreover, banks have been permitted to rediscount their own notes secured by Government obligations. To control the amount of borrowing from Reserve banks, the Reserve administration relies upon the rediscount rate and the general policy, amounting to unwritten law, that borrowing should not be continuous and should be for emergency and seasonal purposes only.

Hence, the elimination of technical restrictions on eligibility does not involve any danger of excessive use of Reserve-bank facilities. But it does enable the Reserve banks to come to the assistance of banks who may have sound assets but may be devoid of eligible paper. For the emergency such a provision was made by the Glass-Steagall Act, but not until great harm had resulted from the inability of the member banks to receive help from the Reserve banks in the emergency.

The bill provides for admission of nonmember banks into the Federal Reserve System prior to 1937 without regard to the size of their capital. This will enable small banks, which would otherwise be confronted with the dilemma of either foregoing the protection of deposit insurance or promptly raising additional capital, to join the Federal Reserve System with their present capital, and thus to become eligible for admission to the insurance system. The resultant unification of banking under the Federal Reserve System and the provision in the bill giving the Federal Reserve Board power to change member bank reserve requirements will contribute to the Board's ability to exercise effective monetary control.

Let us now consider the proposals in the bill that are designed more specifically to aid in business recovery. I shall confine my discussion chiefly to the one proposal which I regard as the most important in this respect and at the same time the one most susceptible to misunderstanding. I refer to the provision permitting banks to make loans on improved real estate up to 75 percent of its appraised value and on an amortization basis for a 20-year period and in an aggregate amount up to 60 percent of their time deposits.

It has been asserted that this is an invitation to banks to make loans of a character that does not conform to sound banking principles or standards. The collapse of real estate values is cited as an illustration of the dangers associated with such loans. It is constantly stated that the troubles of our banking system were due entirely to the acquisition of long-term assets by the banks. It is suggested that banks in the future should confine themselves to short-dated commercial loans and investments. But I need not tell you that, if this suggestion were acted upon, the result would be fatal to the banks.

In October 1934 the eligible paper of member banks, within the meaning of the Federal Reserve Act, amounted to only slightly more than $2,000,000,000. No doubt, based upon your past experience, you would find that a much smaller amount would be acceptable if it were offered to the Reserve banks. Even in 1929 this paper amounted to only 4½ billion dollars. Banks cannot live on the interest of such a small volume of loans and an attempt to confine themselves to these loans would greatly curtail the scope of banking. The more business the banks refuse the more will be handled by other agencies, including the Government, and the less room will remain for the operations of the private banking system.

I am fully aware of the fear with which bankers view the extension of other lending agencies and the uneasiness they feel at having to rely more and more on holdings of Government obligations to keep up their income. I might point out, however, that these developments are a consequence of the failure of the banking system to perform its functions adequately. If the banking system would utilize in real-estate loans and other long-term investments the savings and excess funds that it now possesses, business activity would be greatly stimulated, and the Government would then be able to withdraw rapidly from the lending field.

The bankers also feel a deep concern about the constant growth of the Government's deficit and of the public debt, and yet a considerable part of this debt is incurred in refinancing mortgages and in undertaking other functions which the banks have failed to perform. Release of banking funds in these fields would enable the Government to diminish its expenditures and to reduce the rate of growth of the public debt.

I am, you will carefully note, criticizing the banking system and not the bankers as individuals. I do not see how you as individual bankers, having to secure liquidity alone and unaided, could safely have followed a different lending policy than you did.

This, then, is the dilemma that faces the banks. If they go into the longer-term lending business, they run the risk of depreciation and of inability to realize quickly upon their assets in case of need. If they do not go into this business, they cannot find an outlet for their funds. Their earnings will suffer and the justification for their existence diminishes. How can this dilemma be solved? It is proposed in the bill to solve it by removing the problem of liquidity as such from the concern of the banks, by bestowing liquidity on all sound assets through making them eligible as a basis of borrowing at the Reserve banks in case of need. This will enable the banks to concentrate their effort on keeping their assets sound and to pay less attention to their form and maturity.

Reliance on the form of paper as a guide to soundness and eligibility has not protected the banking system from disaster. We wish to divert bankers' attention from the semblance of paper to its substance; to emphasize soundness, rather than liquidity. To require that a real-estate loan shall be repaid in 5 years, as the present law requires, does not even improve liquidity but rather, through the excessive strain it places on the borrower, acts to promote foreclosures and insolvency.

What we are proposing is that the problem of liquidity shall cease to be an individual concern and shall become the collective concern of the banking system. A single bank which adopts a policy calculated to pay off all of its deposits at a moment's notice, even though the national income is cut in two, cannot adequately perform its duty of serving its community. Since good local loans go bad when a depression sets in, the bank's portfolio would have to consist of superliquid open-market paper. What we want to accomplish is to make it possible for banks, without abandoning prudence or care, to meet local needs both for short- and for long-time funds. We want to make all sound assets liquid by making them rediscountable at the Reserve

banks, and then to use the powers of monetary control in an attempt to prevent the recurrence of national conditions which result in radical declines of national income, in the freezing of all bank assets whether they are technically in liquid form or not, and in general unemployment and destitution. If we can bring this about, then the banks, as well as all other enterprises, will be safer than they can ever be under a policy of each for himself and the devil take the hindmost.

In conclusion, let me make myself clear that I do not expect the passage of the banking bill of 1935 to solve the problem of the business cycle. What I do expect is that its passage will make conditions more favorable for its eventual solution. My own view is that, while through the compensatory action of the banking system much can be done to moderate fluctuations, it will be necessary for the Government also to help in offsetting and counteracting rapid expansion and contraction of expenditures on the part of the community at large. It can do this by varying its expenditures and by the use of the taxing power in securing a better distribution of income so as to insure employment, thus maintaining the necessary distribution of wealth production as currently produced.

One thing is certain: We will not obtain stability unless we work for it. A policy of laissez faire presupposes an economy possessing a flexibility which I think it is hopeless for us to expect to achieve. Therefore it is absolutely essential to develop agencies which by conscious and deliberate compensatory action will obviate the necessity of drastic downward or upward adjustments of costs and prices, wages, and capital structures. If we do not develop such agencies, our present economy, and, perhaps, our present form of government cannot long survive.

For this reason it behooves all of us, who are charged with the responsibility of managing our money and credit mechanism, to devote our best thought and greatest effort to promote an intelligent understanding of the monetary and economic problems confronting the Nation. By supporting the proposed legislation which I have outlined to you, and, what is even more important, by cooperating with the policies for the promotion of which the changes in our banking structure are proposed, the bankers of the country will be working not only in their own best interests but also in the interests of recovery and the establishment, within our economic and political framework, of a more stable and equitable national economy.

WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 117, reported to the Senate by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, contains legislative evils which are almost beyond description. Certain amendments are recommended by the committee, and, in my judgment, the adoption of those amendments would render the joint resolution somewhat less objectionable. Yet I still regard it as being subject to very grave objection, and to very severe and serious criticism.

As passed by the House of Representatives it was the most radical perversion of the American concept of Government which I have seen in my brief service in the Senate. The resolution is entitled "A joint resolution making appropriations for relief purposes." As it comes to the Senate it ought to have been entitled "A joint resolution making appropriations for all purposes." As I proceed I shall endeavor to indicate that if the House joint resolution is enacted the appropriation may be expended in every way which fancy may conceive, and that the fancy may not be that of the President, but may be that of some person unknown, who, under the House joint resolution, would act as the spending agency; that that unknown person may use this money, not spend it, but use it by spending it, by gift, or by loan, in his unrestrained discretion, subject only to the very vague and general objectives which the joint resolution recites, and to those I shall refer further as I proceed.

If the Supreme Court does not hold this resolution invalid and unconstitutional, the whole character of our Government, so far as the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 is concerned, will be determined by some unidentified person under a plan or scheme which has not been revealed by the sponsors of this resolution, except in a meager way, and which has not been outlined even by the messages of the President except in very general terms.

Whether the unidentified spending agency will limit the expenditure of the $5,000,000,000 to direct relief and to work relief is a matter of pure conjecture, and will be unknown to the Congress until after the spending has been partly accomplished.

I want no one to mistake my position. I would not have it thought on account of the characterization which I have made, and which I propose to make of this resolution, that I am opposed to direct relief for those who suffer, nor am I opposed to indirect or work relief. The record will disclose that I have voted for every relief proposal that has come out of the Congress in this administration and in the preceding administration. I was one of those who joined in reporting from the Committee on Appropriations last Congress the $950,000,000 relief bill under which the Federal Emergency Relief Administration was set up. I did not suggest limitations upon the use of the money. I did not suggest decrease in the amount. I voted, moreover, for the La Follette-Costigan bill in the preceding administration. Senators will remember that at the time it was offered that bill was the most far-reaching measure of its kind for work relief that had been brought before a Congress of the United States. I stand ready today to vote for such appropriation as may be reasonably necessary for direct relief for those in distress. I want to aid those who suffer privation and want.

I am assured by my colleague, the minority leader, and by other influential Republicans that there is no disposition on this side of the aisle to stand in the way of any appropriate resolution for relief. I believe that a distinct resolution providing relief for those in want could be passed without reference to a committee, without a hearing, without a report, and so far as I am advised, it could be passed here now and at this hour by unanimous consent. I make this statement, Mr. President, and I hope that it will be understood, for the reason that there should be an assurance to the Senate and to the country that there is no one here objecting to any proper method for the relief of those in distress. I want to make this fact plain, and I desire to have it remain plain so that no pettifogger in Congress or out of Congress will assert the baseless claim that anybody in this Chamber is opposed to relief for suffering humanity. They need not suffer, Mr. President, because adequate and prompt aid may be had at any time that the administration leaders may ask for it.

In view of the unusual character of the resolution it seems in order that some attention be given to its meaning and to the interpretations that may be placed upon it by the spending agencies. I realize that this sort of discussion may be tiresome to those who listen, but I ask the indulgence of Senators that I may proceed upon this score in order that those who have not had opportunity to examine the resolution as it has been examined by members of the Appropriations Committee may gain some idea of what it is that is proposed.

Mr. President, the resolution in its terms is a resolution of appropriation for the accomplishment of certain objectives, which are set out in the resolution. But it is far more than that, for the appropriation is to be used, and I now quote:

> In the discretion and under the direction of the President in such manner and for such purposes—

as shall be adapted to the accomplishment of the objectives enumerated in section 1 of the resolution. Those objectives include relief from hardships attributable to unemployment and conditions resulting therefrom. That language also is substantially the literal statement of the resolution. The objective might be dealt with by providing direct relief or work relief, but it is most certain that the objective need not be attained by pursuit of either of these methods. Nothing in the discretion of the President which would provide relief from such hardship would be out of order under the resolution save only for certain very limited restraints, which I will deal with later if time permits. If the President should determine to relieve against hardships attributable to unemployment by relieving against the unequal distribution of wealth, he might in his discretion set up factories in competition with existing manufacturing institutions, and he would find nothing in the resolution passed by the House to deter him. If he should conclude that the foreign trade ought to be stimulated by loans to the soviets in order to provide unemployment, his conclusion would not be disturbed by anything in the resolution, provided the loans were made in the United States.

The elimination of clause no. 2 in section 1, as recommended in an amendment reported by the committee, removes

a part of the outward appearance of the carte blanche authority; but, in my opinion, it does not substantially change the scope and effect of the resolution; for even though the President may not spend the money to relieve against economic maladjustments, which is the clause removed, he may spend it for the same purpose in order to relieve against hardships attributable to unemployment, because that provision still remains in the resolution.

One of the enumerated objectives is the improvement of living and working conditions. How is this to be done? Would anyone deny that the general language employed in this section empowers the agency to whom the spending power is delegated to organize corporations and provide them with money in order to purchase American products, and thus provide employment for American artisans and improve their living and working conditions? The joint resolution does not deny it. Would anyone deny that if the Executive, in his discretion, should conclude to move vast numbers of our population from the so-called "submarginal areas" to the "supermarginal areas", or to the city from the country, or vice versa, that there is anything in the joint resolution to preclude the spending of $5,000,000,000, or some part of it, for this purpose? The joint resolution, Mr. President, does not preclude that possibility.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And is it not illuminating at that point to know that in a Presidential message which was submitted to the House of Representatives, that at the moment this bill was under consideration the sole and only exhibit submitted was the precise exhibit which the Senator now discusses, namely, the movement and transfer of citizens from farm to city and from city to farm?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; of course, that is illuminating, but it is also illuminating to reflect that in the existing law there is authorization of a sort, at least, to do this precise thing, and that it has been one of the objectives, either vague or specific, which has already been suggested and to some extent pursued in the efforts of the administration to deal with the depression.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield to me further?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator finds nothing in the new limiting language which has been inserted by the Senate committee which in any way would actually prevent the achievement of the objective we discuss?

Mr. STEIWER. No; I am quite sure there is nothing. I will allude to the limiting language suggested by the committee amendment at a later time in my remarks.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? If the Senator prefers not to be interrupted, I shall defer my question.

Mr. STEIWER. No; I do not mind being interrupted, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Is there no precedent for this joint resolution? Of course, there is no precedent in amount, but have we not granted lump sums to be used solely in the discretion of the President?

Mr. STEIWER. Not solely in the discretion of the President; but there is one rather outstanding precedent that comes to my mind, and that is the expenditure of the $3,300,000,000 under the National Recovery Act, which provides that the President, in his discretion, may use that money for certain projects—certain projects, however, which are defined and described in the act and subject to certain limitations in section 206, I think, of the act. Even in that very broad and enormous discretionary power conferred upon the President there is nothing comparable to the general powers which are suggested by the discretion conferred in this measure.

Mr. BORAH. I am not arguing either pro or con, but I was of the opinion that there were precedents where we had granted very large sums of money without any limitations at all upon the discretion of the President.

Mr. STEIWER. I think of that one very important precedent, but as it will presently appear—I am not arguing that today, but before this matter is settled I am sure it will be very clear to the Senator, with his ability to make distinctions, that even that precedent does not support all that is attempted to be done in the joint resolution now under discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Merely as a matter of construction I wanted to ask the Senator, because he has studied this matter, and the opportunity has not been presented to many of us to study it at all—do these qualifications 1, 2, and 3 really put any limitation upon the expenditure of the money? Would not this resolution, if it had neither qualifications 1, 2, nor 3, be substantially the same as it is with the 1, 2, and 3 limitations which are found now within that resolution?

Mr. STEIWER. In a practical sense I think the answer is in the affirmative, for the reason that clauses (1), (2), and (3) are so vague and so general that they cannot possibly operate in terms of practical limitation. I think, however, that, dealing with the matter in a legalistic way and considering only the structure of the section, the answer should be in the negative, because it is provided at the bottom of the page following the provision that money may "be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President in such manner, and for such purposes and such projects", and so forth. I am reading now from page 2, line 2—

as shall be adapted to the accomplishment of any one or more of the objectives specified in clause (1), (2), or (3).

So, in structure, the clauses are limiting in nature, but, in practical effect, there is in them no limitation at all.

Mr. JOHNSON. That was exactly why I made the query. I am not speaking as to whether it ought to be done or whether it ought not to be done; I am speaking now merely as a matter of construction. Does not the Senator conceive that, under the provisions of clauses (1), (2), and (3), which he says legalistically may be limitations, there is no limitation of any kind or character to interfere with the expenditure of the money, as a matter of fact?

Mr. STEIWER. That I think is absolutely true except there is a limitation of the date of expenditure, the appropriations being available up to a certain date named.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was speaking of purposes. Do I bother the Senator by interrupting him?

Mr. STEIWER. Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask these questions because I have not had the opportunity to study this measure at all, and now we are beginning the discussion of a most important matter; and if it does not disturb the Senator I should like, now, to get a little more light on it.

Mr. STEIWER. Not at all. I welcome the Senator's questions and his contribution.

Mr. JOHNSON. I read the three clauses. Number—

(1) providing relief from the hardships attributable to widespread unemployment and conditions resulting therefrom, (2) alleviating distress, and (3) improving living and working conditions.

I cannot conceive of any set of circumstances where money might be required that it could not be used under those limitations. Can the Senator?

Mr. STEIWER. The answer is no; none at all, as long as there is depression and distress.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Whether any particular project falls within clauses (1), (2), or (3) of the purposes here enumerated, is it not a fact that the determination of that question comes solely within the judgment and discretion of the President?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President——

Mr. STEIWER. Certainly; unless the amendment appearing at the top of page 2 and recommended by the committee shall be agreed to. That amendment I hope to discuss later. It may have the effect of giving to the Office of the Comptroller General the right to determine whether the projects employed are of the type defined in the amendment; but even that is a perfectly vague and unsatisfactory protection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STEIWER. The Senator from California has been asking some questions.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the Senator from South Carolina desires to interrupt the Senator, I am glad to yield.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I was only going to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that the Senator from California and himself would be interested in the language that the Senator from Oregon has now called his attention to, at the top of page 2, which limits the discretion to expenditures for types of projects which have been heretofore or may hereafter be authorized by Congress.

Mr. STEIWER. Not "by the Congress", if the Senator will permit me to correct him, but "by law." Therefore, if it is a non-Federal project, the authorization would be by a State legislature or city council in some remote part of the country at some date in the future, and thus the limitation on a non-Federal project goes to the bowwows before it begins to operate.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I have yielded to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah. I am merely seeking information.

Mr. KING. I am wondering whether or not existing law would not authorize expenditures along certain lines for which the Congress now, in the light of the depression and in view of the financial condition of the country, would not be willing to permit an appropriation to be made?

Mr. STEIWER. That is quite possible. Moreover, existing law, when we stop to delve down into it, authorizes so broad a range of projects, as I will presently attempt to show, that even the committee amendment constitutes in a practical sense no limitation at all. I think it is just a question of fancy or imagination, that there are so great a variety of possibilities under Federal projects, and under non-Federal projects alike, that there is nothing in the joint resolution which, in a practical sense, constitutes a restraint, or deterrent upon anybody.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. This thought just occurred to me. The amendment referred to reads:

> Of a type such as is or may be authorized by law.

That might mean any project which is not forbidden by the law of a State; so that practically money might be used on any project of any kind or character.

Mr. STEIWER. I do not so construe it; I think that is possible, but the phrase "or may be", I think, means such projects as in the future actually will be authorized. If the word "may" is merely speculative then, of course, the Senator from Montana is correct, and so in another way a great hole is kicked in the supposed limitations, and there will be no boundary at all.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator let us get this construction accurate, if he pleases? May I call the attention of my friend from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and my friend from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to what I am about to say? I do not quite follow the meaning here. There are three specific things mentioned—and when I say "specific" I use it to indicate that they are mentioned at all because they are of such general character that the use of the adjective "specific" is improper—and then the joint resolution provides:

> To be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President in such manner, and for such purposes and such projects—

What is the meaning there? It is to be used for such purposes and is to be used for such projects, Federal or non-Federal. Are there not included the purposes that are mentioned and projects that may be or have been authorized by law? So there is not any limitation, in reality, in the amendment which has been presented, I assume, by the committee, which reads:

> Of a type such as is or may be authorized by law.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, the interpretation which the Senator from California suggests as the proper interpretation of this language is the one which I first placed upon it. I learned yesterday afternoon, however, in the committee, that some of those who are most responsible for formulating the amendment at the top of page 2, place a somewhat different interpretation upon it and regard the amendment on page 2 as limiting both the projects and the purposes.

I submit, however, to the Senator, in further answer to his question, that, in a matter of this importance, Congress ought from every standpoint to employ language that means something to the average reader, and not appropriate $5,000,000,000 of the people's money with provisions so equivocal that even members of the committee sit at the table and argue over what they may mean.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it the opinion of the Senator now that by the use of the conjunctive and by the words "Federal or non-Federal of a type such as may be authorized by law", the purposes which are previously designated in the joint resolution are qualified?

Mr. STEIWER. That was not my interpretation, but that is the interpretation of some members of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is now the interpretation of the Senator after consideration?

Mr. STEIWER. It is my belief that purposes are not authorized by law; it is my belief that projects, Federal and non-Federal, may be authorized by law.

Mr. JOHNSON. Exactly.

Mr. STEIWER. And that, in the very nature of the two objectives—that is to say, purposes on the one hand and projects on the other—the limiting language at the top of page 2 must apply to projects and to projects alone and that the purposes are wholly unlimited, except that they be such purposes as shall be adapted to the accomplishment of any one or more of the objectives specified in the clauses numbered (1), (2), and (3).

Section 3 of the joint resolution provides expressly that the President in the exercise of his discretion is relieved from certain specific prohibitions or restraints of law. In addition to specific restraints which are enumerated in the section and are wiped out by it, there is a provision that the President may authorize expenditures for "such other" purposes "as he may deem necessary to the accomplishment of the objectives of this joint resolution."

I do not pretend to say why this section was included in the joint resolution. Section 1 having clothed the President with an absolute discretion within the objectives stated in that section, it is not necessary at a later point in the joint resolution to relieve him from other restraints of law; that is to say, section 1 has already accomplished his release and he therefore may use the appropriation for any and every purpose.

It was admitted before the Appropriations Committee by one of the authors of the resolution that this section is unnecessary. I claim that it is more than unnecessary; it is actually misleading, in that it suggests to the casual reader that the breaking down of the enumerated restraints, including the suspension of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, provide the only release from legal restraints contained in the joint resolution. This understanding is fallacious. The enumeration of releases from existing legal restraints set forth in section 3, if standing

alone, would imply that other restraints of existing law were still operative, and that provisions of law like the giving of preference to American-made goods in the purchase of governmental supplies, and provision against the employment of convict labor on governmental projects would not be superseded.

The author of the joint resolution or one of the gentlemen who had helped prepare it, testifying before the committee, admitted that it was the purpose of the sponsors of the resolution to permit no existing legal restraints to stand in the way of the Presidential discretion in the use of the $5,000,000,000, because, he said, such restraint would constitute "very much of a handicap on the President."

It is contended that the discretionary spending power means the money may be expended without let or hindrance within the vague objectives stated in the fore part of the section and substantially without the restraints of existing law, and that the expenditure should be limited only by the fact that it must be made toward the accomplishment of those objectives. To remove all doubt on this point I invite attention to the last sentence at the end of section 1 as the joint resolution came to the Senate from the House. That sentence provides:

> The specific powers hereinafter vested in the President shall not be construed as limiting the general powers and discretion vested in him by this section.

The attorney who drafted the joint resolution told the committee in effect that that language was incorporated in the measure so there could be no possible conflict and to remove any doubt upon the score that section 1 conferred upon the President unqualified and unrestrained discretionary power to use this money in any way he should deem proper, and to use it in accordance with the objectives named in the forepart of the section.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator just referred to "the attorney who drafted the joint resolution." Who was that attorney?

Mr. STEIWER. The Senator is getting me into a difficult subject.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator just made that statement. Can he tell me who was the attorney?

Mr. STEIWER. I can answer that the House committee failed to elicit the name of the author of the joint resolution. In the debate in the House it was stated over and over again that nobody knew where the joint resolution came from. The Senate committee made an effort to ascertain who were the authors of the joint resolution. Mr. Bell, Director of the Bureau of Budget, advised the committee that the joint resolution was drawn under his supervision. I think he did not intend by that to say he actually prepared the joint resolution. It seemed that Admiral Peoples had something to do with it and professed some knowledge of the general objects and purposes of the measure.

The committee did develop the fact that a gentleman named Hester, an attorney of the Treasury Department, serving in the Bureau of the Budget, had actually drawn some part of the joint resolution; that he had assisted in its preparation generally and that he showed a very complete familiarity with its provisions.

Mr. COUZENS. I desire to thank the Senator, because that man is the man for whom I am looking.

Mr. STEIWER. The Senator from Michigan will find Mr. Hester a very satisfactory man with whom to deal. He was frank and entirely candid with the committee. I regarded him as a very able lawyer because in his interpretation of the joint resolution he agreed with my own interpretation. [Laughter.]

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. STEIWER. Gladly.

Mr. GLASS. Does not the Senator think that he should state to the Senate that the provision which he is now discussing was stricken out in the Senate committee?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; I should make that statement; that is to say, it is one of the amendments recommended by the committee, and it will be stricken if the Senate concurs in the action of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. While I have been very much interested in what the Senator said about who drew it, yet how does that become important? Is not the important thing the language in the joint resolution?

Mr. STEIWER. Oh, yes. I was doing the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] the courtesy of answering his question. That was one importance of my answer. Aside from that, when we are dealing with a situation like this, when the Congress does not know what the money is going to be spent for, it becomes important to know who the father of this child may be in order that we may learn how the money is going to be expended; but when we fail to learn in full the authorship of the joint resolution, then we are equally in the dark as to what the money may be spent for after it shall have been appropriated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Responsibility for the joint resolution is here and not with the man who wrote it.

Mr. COUZENS. Does the Senator from Texas object to the Senator from Michigan finding out something about the measure?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no. If I had known the Senator from Michigan wanted information I should not have ventured the observation.

Mr. COUZENS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. The point with me is that I do not see the importance of who wrote the joint resolution. The important thing is who passes it. We are the ones responsible for the joint resolution as it finally passes, and not the man who wrote it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I suggest to my able friend from Texas, speaking for myself at any rate, that I am anxious to know who is the father of the thoughts embodied in the measure. I am not quite so much concerned as to who drafted the measure after the plan had been devised. I want to know whether it was Mr. A or Mr. B, in this department or that department, in this agency or that agency. Knowing the greediness of departments and bureaus to get power and authority I want to know who originated the plan. I am concerned about that. Knowing the speed with which these matters are rushed through the House and Senate, I am not so sure, speaking for the Senate, that we will give the measure the consideration which its importance deserves.

Mr. STEIWER. The President himself suggested the amount of the appropriation and is responsible for the idea of transferring 3,500,000 unemployed from the relief rolls to work-relief rolls. The President, in presenting these proposals to the Congress, has done so by two messages, one of which he delivered at the time of the convening of the Congress, and later in his Budget message; but nowhere in the President's proposal is there any explanation of the necessity for writing a blank check for $5,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money without specifying the purposes for which it shall be used. Nowhere in the President's plan has there been outlined any reason for doing the thing we are called upon to do when we abdicate our legislative functions and turn this money over under carte blanche authority to somebody else.

The desire to be relieved from legal restraint of all existing law portrays a spirit which I think is worth a one-sentence characterization. It is a spirit which is alike impa-

tient of restraint and is bent upon the attainment of utter freedom in the spending of the people's money.

The hearings disclosed that the Attorney General cooperated in creating an atmosphere of extravagance and nonrestrained expenditures by his advice to the President that the phrase "in his discretion" means an unqualified discretion. I do not quarrel particularly with that. I think there is at least one decision of the Supreme Court which justifies the Attorney General in his opinion; but the Comptroller General, who by law is the agent of Congress and who has sought to resist the viewpoint of the Attorney General, has endeavored in some respects to curb the spenders. When he seeks to do so by contending that a discretion in expenditure of money means a legal discretion and means the disbursement must be made pursuant to the specific inhibitions or prohibitions of existing law, we read in the newspapers that certain of the spenders threaten to bring about his removal from office, that they threaten to curtail his power so that he may not be able to apply restraint in behalf of lawful and careful use of public funds.

From every standpoint the joint resolution ought to be amended by providing in effect that the authority created shall be exercised with due regard to all existing law save only as to such exceptions as the Congress may find necessary and which well might be expressly enumerated in the measure.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STEIWER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator does not go quite far enough. With my present view I should not feel that this fund or any part of it might be diverted to carry out some project or proposition which has been authorized by statute perhaps enacted weeks or months or years ago. It seems to me that this huge fund ought to be so earmarked as that we might not hark back to former laws or statutes for authority conferred upon the President or individuals to carry out the provisions of the joint resolution.

Mr. STEIWER. I thank the Senator, and will advise him that some of us in the committee attempted to limit the expenditures to work relief and to direct relief, leaving the President complete discretion as to the amount which he should employ in direct relief and the amount which he should employ in work relief upon projects. We made that proposal because we thought from the President's message that that was the real objective which he sought to attain; but a majority of the committee would not take that view. They resisted an amendment to limit the expenditure to work relief and to direct relief, and left the door wide open so that the expenditures may be made for any purpose at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEIWER. In just a moment. For the moment, however, I was not dealing with the purposes for which the expenditures would be made. I was dealing with certain specific restraints which exist in law and which the joint resolution wipes out. I am talking about restraints, we will say, in paying personnel in the District of Columbia; with the requirement that supplies shall be purchased by contract and the contracts awarded to the lowest responsible bidders; that American-manufactured goods shall have a preference; that convict labor shall not be employed; and so forth. There are some 14 or 16 or 18 of these specific restraints of law. This measure not only opens the door of the expenditures so far as the use of the money is concerned, but it wipes out these restraints, so as to confer upon the President substantially a completed, unqualified, and unrestricted discretion to use the money by spending, or by gift, or in any other way that he may think necessary in order to attain the vague objectives of section 1.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President——

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming, who is my colleague on the committee. Then I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if it is not his opinion that the use of the conjunctive in line 11 between "such purposes" and "such projects" makes it clear that the amendment in lines 1 and 2, page 2, "of a type such as is or may be authorized by law" modifies "purposes" as well as "projects"?

Mr. STEIWER. Evidently my friend from Wyoming was detained from the Chamber at the time that question was raised by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] a little while ago. At that time I answered that in my own opinion the limitation on page 2 does not apply to "purposes" but applies only to "projects."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Despite the fact that the conjunctive is used?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; I think so, because I think purposes are not authorized by law. Projects are authorized by law, or may be; but purposes ordinarily are not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. STEIWER. Permit me to answer a little further. I do not want to be dogmatic about that. It may be that the Senator from Wyoming is correct; and I stated to the Senate, in answering the Senator from California, that some members of the committee had insisted upon the interpretation which the Senator from Wyoming now suggests. It may be that he is correct; but the question he asked me was whether the use of the conjunctive did not make the clause clear. I will answer that with a very hearty spirit: It certainly does not make it clear to me. It may be clear to somebody, but it is not clear to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to add that the language in lines 3 to 10 of the first section, on the first page, seemed to me to define the purposes for which this expenditure is to be made.

Mr. STEIWER. If we knew what those clauses meant, then we would know what the purposes are; but I must insist, still expressing my own opinion, that clauses so vague and so general cannot constitute a limitation. They merely suggest a target, a goal to be attained, but they cannot constitute a limitation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator, then, whether it would clear up the matter in his mind if on page 2, line 1, after the word "type", we were to insert the additional words "or types"?

Mr. STEIWER. "Or types"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. STEIWER. I do not think that would change the clause substantially. May I say to the Senator that in just a few minutes I desire to discuss the committee amendment concerning which he now makes inquiry, and which appears at the top of page 2. I think I can demonstrate to the Senate that by reason of the legislative enactments of the past, and of the construction which must inevitably be placed upon this sentence, together with the amendment, there is no substantial restraint in it.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I heard the Senator say a moment ago that he favored, in committee, a limitation of the use of the funds to direct relief or work relief only.

Mr. STEIWER. That is correct.

Mr. WAGNER. What does the Senator mean by "work relief"?

Mr. STEIWER. Jobs—jobs on projects.

Mr. WAGNER. On public projects?

Mr. STEIWER. Federal or non-Federal; we did not raise any question about that. We are not trying to limit or restrain the President so far as work relief or direct relief is concerned. I was quite content to let him go his way, and I have very great confidence that his judgment will be good. What I sought to do when I proposed an amendment to limit the expenditures to work relief and to direct relief was to get away from any sort of bizarre scheme by which somebody administering this proposed law in behalf of the President would seek to bring about a redistribution of wealth, or a redistribution of population, or some kind of

an economic accomplishment which that somebody might think had a relation to clause 1, which is to the effect—

That in order to protect and to promote the general welfare, by (1) providing relief from the hardships attributable to wide-spread unemployment and conditions resulting therefrom.

I do not see that there is any limitation in that.

Clause (2) provides for "alleviating distress." In times like these, Mr. President, when practically half the population of our country is in distress, there is no limitation upon anybody when we authorize the President to go out and alleviate distress. How could anybody suggest that that constitutes a limitation? It is language of inducement. It is language put in there to secure sympathetic consideration of the proposal, but it is not a limitation upon authority. It may enlarge it. I am not so sure, Mr. President, but that if there were any way to take this matter to a court, the court would say all three of these clauses suggest enlargements of purpose; they suggest a total lack of boundary and a complete absence of restraint.

Mr. WAGNER. I am frank to confess that the Senator has not cleared my misunderstanding as to his attitude. Beyond direct relief and expenditures upon public projects intelligently selected, what is the Senator apprehensive about?

Mr. STEIWER. I shall attempt to develop that as I proceed. I have no doubt—and I am not speaking now as to what the President may do—I have no doubt, so far as his powers under this joint resolution are concerned, that the President may take over the railroads, may take over the steamship lines, may take over the utilities, may take over every kind of public business, and many kinds of private business. I have no doubt of it at all, and I think the Senator will agree with me if he will listen just a little more to the explanation which I desire to offer.

The sponsors of the joint resolution did not favor the amendment which I suggested to the committee; and I am assuming that the forces for unrestrained expenditure will insist that the joint resolution shall be enacted in the form of a blank check, with nothing absolutely certain except the amount, and nothing else even partially certain except the probability that before a year is past the spenders will be back to Congress asking Congress to appropriate some more money for the same purposes.

Now, I desire to deal with the supposed limiting effect of the language of the amendment we have been discussing. I refer to the amendment which appears in lines 2 and 3 at the top of page 2 of the joint resolution.

The question is, What kind of projects, what types of projects have been authorized? I do not contend that that language speaks in the past tense. I do not think that means every project that was ever authorized. It might be so construed, but I think fairly it means projects that presently are authorized. In other words, it refers to a continuing or permanent authority of some kind; and I desire to ask, what type of projects are included in that definition? If they are work projects, good and well. If they are nothing else than work projects, I have no controversy with the proposal. I voted for the amendment thinking that it was better than no limitation at all; but I seek now to present to the Senate the idea that in a practical sense it constitutes no limitation.

In the first place, I desire to quote the following from section 202, title II, the public works part of the N. R. A. Act:

The Administrator * * * shall prepare a comprehensive program of public works, which shall include, among other things, the following: * * * (c) any project of the character heretofore constructed or carried on either directly by public authority or with public aid to serve the interests of the general public.

Then in the next section we find the authorization for the construction of such public projects as those defined in the language I have just read.

Section 203 (a) contains this language:

The President is authorized and empowered * * * (1) to construct, finance, or aid in the construction or financing of any Public Works project included in the program prepared pursuant to section 202.

Mr. President, I am not able to advise the Senate what the Administrator of the Public Works program did with respect to making this program of public works. Nothing, I think, has been published. If any program was ever made, we do not know what it is; nor do I know what the President did in connection with the authorization of that program. But whatever was done, and I believe I am right when I say whatever may be done, pursuant to the authorization of this act, will create a type of project which will be permissive under the amendment which the Committee on Appropriations has recommended to the Senate.

But, Mr. President, that is only the beginning. The clerks in my office find, from examination of a number of authorizations, that the authorizations of projects have covered a very wide field, indeed. We have had no opportunity during the past 2 days to make a complete or exhaustive survey of this subject; but we find that there is existing and continuing authority at this moment for the Government of the United States to build or construct or to acquire river-and-harbor projects, public buildings, subsistence homesteads, roads, reclamation projects, topographical surveys, other surveys, railroads, cemeteries, hospitals, airplanes, vessels, fuel yards, bridges, fish hatcheries, fish-rescue stations, parks, monuments, memorials, barracks, navy yards, airways, schools, flood-control projects, electric power plants, fertilization plants, military posts, fortifications, conservation enterprises—I take it that means conservation of natural resources—shipping facilities, radio and wireless facilities, warehouses, docks, stores, libraries, lighthouses, museums, agricultural experiment stations, projects for the prevention of soil erosion, game preserves, housing, insect investigation and control, grade crossings, ordnance, and many other things.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not hear the Senator read the item of the manufacture of and dealing in rum in connection with these other industries.

Mr. STEIWER. I have no doubt the Senator could supplement this incomplete list, and possibly make it twice as long and four times as inclusive.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator point out the types of projects of those he has enumerated to which he himself objects?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; if the Senator will permit me to proceed in my own way; I am proceeding to do that.

The National Recovery Act—that is, title II—authorizes the following:

1. Construction, repair, and improvement of—
a. Public highways and parkways.
b. Public buildings.
c. Any publicly owned instrumentality and facility.

Senators may draw their own conclusions concerning that language. I place no interpretation upon it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether, when it says "publicly owned", it means the facilities which are owned and operated by municipalities, by counties, and by States?

Mr. STEIWER. I have no doubt of it; and under another section of the act, to which I have already alluded, many privately owned facilities would be permitted under this measure, because such types of projects are authorized by law.

Mr. KING. That would permit the expenditure of a billion dollars, which has been requested by the mayor of New York, for New York City, the very modest sum of a billion dollars for a project the plan of which the mayor of New York has presented, and to complete which he has asked for Federal funds?

Mr. STEIWER. I think there could be no doubt about that, providing the spending agency, in its discretion, concluded that the expenditure was in order to provide relief

from hardship attributable to unemployment. That is the only thing there is to it.

Let me proceed. In title II of the National Recovery Act we find authority for conservation and development of natural resources, including—

a. Control, utilization, and purification of waters.
b. Prevention of soil or coastal erosion.
c. Development of water power.
d. Transmission of electrical energy.
e. Construction of river-and-harbor improvements.
f. Flood control.
g. Construction of any river or drainage improvement required to perform or satisfy any obligation incurred by the United States through a treaty with a foreign government heretofore ratified and to restore or develop for the use of any state or its citizens water taken from or denied to them by performance on the part of the United States of treaty obligations heretofore assumed.

We find also that there is authorization for any projects of the character heretofore constructed or carried on, either publicly or by private authority, with public aid, to serve the interests of the general public.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make an inquiry?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. Is not the Government spending some money in the State of Oregon at this time?

Mr. STEIWER. Oh, yes.

Mr. WAGNER. For the construction of a dam which is ultimately to be used for the development of water power?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. Did the Senator object to the expenditure of that money?

Mr. STEIWER. No; I favored it very heartily.

Mr. WAGNER. I thought so.

Mr. STEIWER. I favored it heartily, and that construction, incidentally, is on the Columbia River, between the States of Oregon and Washington.

Mr. WAGNER. That project is all right, although it will result——

Mr. STEIWER. A perfectly splendid project, but from the standpoint of work relief, which I shall discuss later—about 5 or 6 years will be required in the completion of that project. It was built under the authority of an act with which the Senator from New York is probably more familiar than any other man in this Chamber, which was for the purpose of bringing about the speedy reemployment of unemployed people.

On the score of compliance with the mandate of Congress, that kind of a project might be subject to very serious criticism.

I was earnestly for the project, but that is not the question; from the score of compliance there is much to be said against that project, because it not only did not bring about the speedy reemployment of a large number of people, but from its very nature its construction had to be spread over so many years that when the money was allocated to that project, the President took away from himself the power to comply with the direction of the Congress of the United States. And not only in connection with that project, but in connection with others, and in connection with the money set aside for the building of warships, some $238,000,000, the President, in defiance, I claim, of the will of Congress as expressed by the act, put the money where he could not spend it for the speedy reemployment of our people. So I claim that Congress has an obligation and a duty to itself and to the unemployed to define these projects in such a way that we will know that if we authorize the appropriation of money for a work construction program, there will be a work construction program available to the unemployed now, in this winter, and in the winter to come, and not at some time in the remote future, when, we all hope, the employment conditions in the United States will be greatly improved.

Mr. WAGNER. Then I take it the Senator's attitude is that this money, though it is being expended in his State to great advantage, should not have been spent there by the President at all, that he should have postponed the construction of that project in favor of other projects.

Mr. STEIWER. May I say most respectfully to my friend the Senator from New York that he knows better than to ask me that question. He knows I would not say that the money should not be spent there, because he knows I favored the construction of the project.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator did, and then in some respects he modified his statement.

Mr. STEIWER. No; I did not modify anything. I said that in terms of compliance with an act of Congress of the United States the President had shown open defiance, because he had put it out of his power to do the thing which Congress had directed he should do. I do not say that because I am opposed to the project; I say it because I am going to suggest before I conclude that it is the duty of Congress to write into this appropriation bill a sufficient direction to the President so that we may know whether the congressional objective is going to be attained.

Mr. WAGNER. I think I am right, then. The Senator says the money expended in his own State for this purpose was spent by the President in defiance of the mandate of the Congress.

Mr. STEIWER. The Senator is not right in his statement. He is substantially right in restating my position, but he is not right in indicating the statement he now makes is the question he asked me a moment ago.

Mr. WAGNER. Therefore that money should not have been spent upon this great project, because the Congress had ordered otherwise. Is that the Senator's attitude?

Mr. STEIWER. It is my attitude that, so far as compliance with the will of Congress was concerned, the expenditure of this money was carried on in a way that did not speedily employ idle people.

Mr. WAGNER. I should think the people of Oregon would be interested in the attitude the Senator takes upon this matter.

Mr. STEIWER. They know my position, and they know I struggled in behalf of the attainment of that project 10 years before the present incumbent in the White House was President. They know I worked for it before I was in public life, commencing shortly after the World War; they know the persistence of my efforts throughout the years, and they know how grateful I was when the President, in his wisdom, put that project where he did. However, that still begs the question as to whether or not the President has shown a faithful compliance or a spirit of defiance in dealing with the Congress in connection with the expenditure of these moneys.

Let me proceed. In the P. W. A. Act we find authority for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, or repair under public regulation or control of low-cost housing and slum-clearance projects.

We have also authorized any project, other than those included in the foregoing classes, of any character heretofore eligible for loans under subsection (a) of section 201 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended, and paragraph (3) of such subsection (a) shall for such purposes be held to include loans for the construction or completion of hospitals, the operation of which is partly financed from public funds, and of reservoirs and pumping plants and for the construction of drydocks, the construction of naval vessels, and of aircraft, the construction of heavier-than-air aircraft and technical construction for the Army Air Corps, and such Army housing projects as the President may approve and provision of original equipment for mechanization or motorization of such Army technical units as he may designate.

Subsistence homesteads are provided for as follows:

SEC. 208. To provide for aiding the redistribution of the overbalance of population in industrial centers $25,000,000 is hereby made available to the President, to be used by him through such agencies as he may establish and under such regulations as he may make, for making loans for and otherwise aiding in the purchase of subsistence homesteads. The moneys collected as repayment of said loans shall constitute a revolving fund to be administered as directed by the President for the purposes of this section.

We find that under the act the authority may acquire real estate for the construction of dams, reservoirs, transmission

lines, power houses, and other structures; rather a general authority to buy real estate. And in the measure we are now considering the power of eminent domain, one of the highest attributes of sovereignty, is conferred on the President that he may carry out this type of project by buying real estate.

We find that the authority may manufacture and sell fixed nitrogen fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients.

Under the act of March 3, 1927, there is authority for the construction of plants and the production of helium, and the lease of surplus helium to American corporations or American citizens.

I take these things rather at random, Mr. President. I do not attempt to exhaust the possibilities of authority existing, of the authority that may suggest the types which may be employed under this amendment to the pending joint resolution, but I take these things that come readily to me for illustration of what the possibilities may be.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. KING. Would not the President, under the broad authority which is conferred, have the right, if he could get the consent of Canada, to go into Canada and carry out the purposes of that treaty which we defeated?

Mr. STEIWER. There is a limitation in the act against expenditure of the money outside the United States. The President, therefore, would spend the money within the United States, but such part of it as might be employed within the United States might well be spent in doing work upon the St. Lawrence or any other river. There is no limitation, geographical or otherwise, with respect to that.

The act of March 12, 1914, which is the Alaska Railroad Act, authorizes the Government of the United States to construct and operate railroads, and that authority has never been changed. It is still an existing and continuing authority in the Government of the United States.

The Panama Canal Act has rather similar provisions.

The Shipping Act of 1916 contains some continuing and permanent authorities to construct and equip vessels, repair and alter vessels, to charter, lease, and to sell vessels.

A thing which interested me was the various bridge acts. For instance there is an authorization for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River called the Rock Island Bridge. That creates a type of authorization. So under the amendment to which the committee has agreed, any bridge across any stream apparently would fall within the type, and therefore would be permissible. So that a bridge may be built anywhere, a public bridge, private bridge, Federal bridge, State bridge, county bridge, any kind of a bridge anywhere so far as the limitation of this amendment is concerned. Navigable streams may be obstructed with approval of the War Department.

In the Merchant Marine Act of 1928 there is authority to make loans to citizens of the United States to aid them in construction in private shipyards or in navy yards of vessels in the United States. So we have there an authority that creates a type, and in accordance with the provisions of this joint resolution, as amended, the spending agents may, if they desire, make such loans as they may find expedient for the construction and repair of ships in private yards and public yards.

So, too, in the Air Commerce Act of May 1926 we find authority to do various things in connection with airways, the operations of aircraft, and other navigation facilities.

We find in the Naval Appropriation Act of 1921 authority to use, and store, and exchange, and sell oil or gas products from lands within the naval reserves. We find authority to develop the naval property. We find an indefinite authority in the act of May 7, 1928, to construct laboratories for investigatory work, and there is not a word in it to show what kind of investigation should be carried on. Any kind of investigation, therefore, answers the type required under the amendment suggested to the pending joint resolution.

We find authority to acquire land to establish an arboretum for the purpose of research. We find authority to conduct certain experimentations in connection with the soils of some of the Southern States. I was interested to learn that there is an authority existing to purchase and maintain a herd of longhorn cattle. I was interested, too, to know that in one of the appropriation acts—I do not seem to have it here—one of the Navy appropriation acts, there is authority to acquire and maintain coal yards and fuel facilities and to furnish coal and fuel to American ships, and, to such extent as deemed to be practical, other ships which may call for it. So we have a type of authority to take our Government into the coal business and into the fuel business.

I think it is unnecessary, Mr. President, to detain the Senate further with the discussion of those types. It is obvious, it would seem to all, that the authorizations of continuing character are so far-reaching, so wide in their scope, that when we limit the expenditures to a type heretofore authorized that we place substantially no limitation at all.

Let me refer to one other angle of this question. The amendment at the top of page 2, which defines the types which may be authorized by law, seems to refer to both Federal and non-Federal projects. When you are talking about Federal projects undoubtedly the authorization that is contemplated is the authorization by a law enacted by Congress. I think there cannot be any controversy about that. But what is the situation with respect to a non-Federal project? That is a project to be authorized by law. By what law, Mr. President? By the law of the United States, which has no application to it at all, or by the law of the State or municipality under which the non-Federal project is to have its existence?

It seems to me—and upon that I am not perfectly clear—I have not had time to reflect upon it—but it seems to me that the non-Federal projects will be of such types as are or may be authorized by State or municipal law; the kind of authority that may now exist, the kind of authority that may be created next week or next month.

We have been reading in the newspapers that the Public Works Administration prepared a group of laws and sent them out to the various States of the Union for the legislatures of those States to consider. How easy it will be for some spending agency of the Federal Government to suggest to municipalities and to the States a mode or form of authorization which will take the boundary completely off this expenditure and permit all projects to be built of any type whatever? I should like to hear an adequate answer to that suggestion.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to proceed as rapidly as I can.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that part of his discussion I should like to ask him a question. I should like to understand, if the Senator can tell me, what is the significance of that clause beginning at the bottom of page 1, which says—

> And such projects, Federal or non-Federal, of a type such as is or may be authorized by law.

I am wondering why you do not say—

> And such projects, Federal or non-Federal, as are or may be authorized by law.

Why did you use the word "type" there?

Mr. STEIWER. Does the Senator want me to answer that question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, Mr. President; if the Senator can, I should like to have him answer it.

Mr. STEIWER. That amendment was agreed upon—I think it is no violation of confidence to say—by our friends of the majority in a meeting from which I was unavoidably detained, and I do not know what discussion went on there, but in the committee it was suggested that that would constitute a reasonably fair limitation upon the type of project. I have tried to argue here, either successfully or unsuccessfully, that it actually constitutes no limitation at all, but I cannot answer the Senator's question. I do not know

why the word "type" was necessarily used there. I think now it might be preferable to say "projects, Federal or non-Federal"——

Mr. BORAH. "As are or may be authorized by law."

Mr. STEIWER. "As are or may be authorized by law." I think I agree with the Senator, but I cannot answer his question.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon is somewhat inaccurate in saying that was agreed upon by the majority. As I recall, there was no particular opposition to this proposition.

Mr. STEIWER. That is true.

Mr. GLASS. It certainly was not agreed upon in any preceding conference of the majority.

Mr. STEIWER. I think when the matter was presented to the committee it was accepted and that there was no objection to it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Until recently in Congress the term "authorized by law" has been used in connection with some projects specifically authorized by an act of Congress.

Mr. STEIWER. Yes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Under the broad provisions and powers given the P. W. A. and the N. R. A. there was a broad general authorization, as I understand. There was nothing specifically authorized; there were broad general powers given to the administrative authorities.

Mr. STEIWER. Yes, that is true; but the administrator was directed to select projects, and the President was empowered to authorize them.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. STEIWER. And, therefore, to whatever extent these agencies have acted there has been created there an authorization by law.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is what I wanted to make clear.

Mr. STEIWER. That is the point I sought to make.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. So that any projects which have been authorized under the provisions of these acts which I have referred to can be said to come within the meaning of this amendment; that they are now authorized by law and may be in the future.

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; not only projects are authorized but projects of the same type may be built.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; that have not already been authorized, but if they are of the same type they may be authorized under existing law.

Mr. STEIWER. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And the Senator does not think that this removes that broad general provision?

Mr. STEIWER. No; I have tried to argue that it does not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator if the words of the qualification, "of a type", were removed would it not fail then to satisfy the general purpose which the witnesses before the committee have indicated would be in the minds of the anonymous administrators who are to be clothed with this responsibility? In other words, has not the discussion before the committee, insofar as any information has been provided it with regard to projects, indicated a field of activity which is not authorized at present by law, and which could only be brought within the boundaries of this amazing appropriation by the use of the longer phrase, "of a type authorized by law"?

Mr. STEIWER. I think it is true that in the main the activities contemplated are not specifically authorized by law. I think that the work-relief projects within the discretion of the administrator or under his resolution might very well be of a type authorized by law, because there are so many types authorized by law that unless the administrator is a man of rather transcendent imaginative powers he will not find it possible to select anything which is not authorized by law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What I am trying to inquire is if the use of this authority were to be confined to specific projects for which there is an actual congressional authorization, it would fall far short of the ambitious prospectus which is rather anonymously discussed by the prospective administrators?

Mr. STEIWER. Possibly that is the reason why the word "type" is employed in the amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, they would at least have to stay out of the stratosphere if we eliminated those three words.

Mr. STEIWER. I hope that Senators will not detain me further on the interpretation of the language. I have already consumed more time than I wanted to employ on that feature, and I desire to discuss some other phases of this very important matter.

IS RESOLUTION BASED ON SOUND GOVERNMENTAL POLICY?

The joint resolution reported today from the committee permits the President to carry into execution the suggestion made in his message to Congress by which he would remove three and one-half million men from the direct-relief rolls and place them on a work-relief roll at what is styled a security wage. The evidence discloses that the average cost per capita, under the direct-relief system, is approximately $25 per month. It is contemplated that the average security wage will be $50 per month and that another $50 per month will be employed for each worker in the acquisition of materials and equipment in order to maintain the necessary work projects. In other words, the unit cost within the contemplation of the sponsors of this legislation is approximately $100 per month, which is four times the unit cost under the present system of direct relief. In plain language this means that we are asked to appropriate and to spend for relief $4 where we now spend one. Stated in another way, it means that the public debt for relief purposes will grow four times as fast as it has grown under the present system. It means that the deficit in the operations of the Federal Government, so far as relief is concerned, will be four times as large as it would be under a system of direct relief. The appalling possibilities of this situation become increasingly clear. We know that on the less expensive basis of direct relief the Government can continue caring for those in distress for a very long time to come. We do not know and can only speculate upon the length of time the credit of the Government will be able to carry the loan on a work-relief basis at a cost of four or five billion dollars per year. The work-relief theory on so grand a scale is an untried theory. In its behalf are urged two important arguments:

First. That direct relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration and is thus destructive to the national fiber.

Second. That a security wage paid for labor on useful works produces something of value and at the same time stimulates a demand for materials and thus effectually aids the materials industry.

In my humble opinion both these arguments are tenable. I agree with the ideology which prompts them. The very practical question is whether the credit of the country will indefinitely endure against the financial requirements necessary to sustain the ideal. If recovery shall come promptly, then private industry will absorb the relief workers and gradually lessen the demand on the Treasury. If recovery shall be retarded, the number on relief work will not be diminished but, on the contrary, it is most likely that the number will be increased. A disturbing fact is that the sponsors of the pending joint resolution seem willing to bet that recovery will come soon enough to save the Nation from the disaster of ever-increasing debt, with final inability to service the debt and to meet the cost of the work system which is contemplated by this joint resolution. If their surmises and speculations prove to be sound, all is well for America. If, however, their expectations shall not be realized we will find that we have invited national catastrophe by permitting zealous optimists to submit our Government to this monumental risk. It is even possible

that the wage-relief scheme will ultimately and in its final effect destroy the credit of the American Nation.

It was disclosed at the hearings that the appropriation carried by the pending joint resolution is estimated to meet the requirements for a year. If expectations shall not be realized, the problem at the end of the year will be infinitely more serious than now by reason of the mounting public debt and of the inevitable demand that it be further increased. This demand will be supported by the necessities of the people and no man is wise enough to know whether any way may then be found to extricate our country from the difficulties which this legislative proposal invites.

To the objection that my opposition to further enactments for wage relief may be interpreted as a preference for the dole, I want to add that if I felt free to choose I would not prefer the dole. I do not approve a dole. I reconcile myself to the payment of dole or direct relief because it is the least expensive of the proposals made in order to relieve distress. I prefer direct relief because I favor a system within the sound credit of the Nation, as against the more elaborate system and the larger expenditure for wage relief. I am unwilling to vote for unnecessary increase in public debt, with the inevitable hazard of destruction of the governmental credit.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. If one could know how this money is going to be expended, if the legislator could have some idea as to how it is going to be utilized, I would have no trouble about voting for work relief instead of for doles. I think the statement made by the President that the effect of work in preserving the moral and spiritual character of the American citizen is almost incalculable in its worth; but what troubles me is that we are voting $4,000,000,000 and we really do not know whether it will be expended for a dole or whether it will be expended for public works.

Mr. STEIWER. If I may interrupt the Senator, so far as the joint resolution is concerned, the money may be expended either way, under the discretion of the spending agency, to the full extent of any sum of money which may be provided.

Mr. BORAH. I should be quite inclined to follow the President in his theory of taking men off the dole and putting them to work, for I think that is vital; but when I am asked to vote for a proposition, not knowing whether I am taking men off the dole or not, it presents a very difficult problem.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if I may so state, the whole bill is based upon the theory that the President is going to do what he says he is going to do; that is all there is to it. There is not a provision in the bill which requires a dollar to be expended for any particular project, and the committee proceeded upon the basis that the money is always to be expended either for direct relief or for work relief.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not challenging anybody's integrity of purpose, but I do not think we can liquidate relief necessities in a few months; and, even if we could, I should like to know how it is going to be done before I vote $4,000,000,000 to do it. As I have said, I do not underestimate at all the strength of the argument presented by the President as to the wisdom of taking men off the dole and putting them to work, but it leaves me in a rather difficult position as a legislator when I am not told how it is going to be done.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I think there is no disagreement and I have heard of no controversy over the President's proposal to take men off direct relief and place them upon work relief. Of course, it is better for the three and a half million men to take them off the direct relief, and, to the extent that is practicable and possible, it is better for the country at large to take them off direct relief; and yet it is going to be difficult once we put them on work relief ever to place them back on direct relief. If we find that the $5,000,000,000 does not accomplish the object which all of us, the President and the Congress, seek to accomplish, then we are going to be confronted with a problem at the end of a year infinitely more serious by reason of the fact that we shall have exhausted $5,000,000,000 of the credit of our country, and we do not know what is going to be the situation at the end of the year. It seems to me that the prudent thing to do is to spend the lesser amount of money. It is true that it is not the best service to those on direct relief; I realize that; but, on the other hand, it comes nearer to a sound financial proposal; it is better for the credit of the Government; and, in the long run, it may be better for those on direct relief and may be better for the 120,000,000 people who are not on direct relief. We are dealing now with the welfare and perpetuity of our country; and, as I regard this matter, we are dealing with forces so great and with sums so large affecting the credit of our Nation in so substantial a way that we have a right to ask not only what we are doing to the three and a half million men but we should ask also what are we proposing to do now and ultimately to the rest of the Nation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Reverting to the question which was asked by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I ask the Senator from Oregon if he does not recall the testimony adduced before the committee, chiefly that of Admiral Peoples, to the effect that there was what he called a large reservoir of projects which could be availed of for the expenditure of money for work relief?

Mr. STEIWER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; Mr. President. I read Admiral Peoples' testimony twice.

Mr. STEIWER. Did the Senator get anything out of it?

Mr. BORAH. I thought when I first read it that I must have overlooked some important point in it, but when I read it the second time I found there was nothing definite in it; that it was perfectly vague; that it did not give me any information whatever as to how this money is going to be spent. Having, in some degree, a rather ample imagination, Admiral Peoples did indicate the range of possibilities within which the money might be expended but there was nothing definite, nothing specific whatever in his testimony.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wish the Senator would let me make a little reply to the Senator from Idaho. If the Senator from Idaho were a candidate for reelection, he would find out how they would spend some of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORAH. Why mention that? [Laughter.]

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield, but I am almost at the point of saying that I do not want to yield any further, because I wish to proceed as expeditiously as possible to the further presentation of my ideas upon the pending joint resolution.

Senators who know me well will, I think, agree that during my brief service in this body it has been only on the rarest occasions that I have ever criticized any President, either Republican or Democratic. It is always painful to me to take part in criticism of the Chief Executive of this country. It is much happier for me to recognize the splendid service which he has rendered to the country. But I can plead in extenuation of certain remarks that I am about to make that I did not bring this joint resolution before the Congress. No Senator brought it here. Administrative agencies, acting pursuant to the Presidential desire, have caused the joint resolution to be introduced. If it is to be discussed with the candor and courage which its importance requires, there is no escape from a discussion of the capacity of the administration to disburse this money under the boundless limitations of unqualified discretion.

What is there in the record of expenditure of relief moneys which justifies the belief that the President is especially fitted to carry into effect the purposes of the joint resolution? What is there in the record of the spending agencies which justifies our faith in them or sustains the belief that the unknown and unidentified agencies which

it is supposed will deal with this appropriation will proceed wisely and efficiently in carrying into effect the objectives of the joint resolution?

The United States Treasury statement as of the close of business January 31, 1935, page 4, gives the cumulative report of "funds appropriated and allocated to emergency organizations, expenditures therefrom, and unexpended balances." This report covers all appropriations for emergency purposes made under this administration and all expenditures. Under the item of Public Works it gives the following classifications having unexpended balances in the sums indicated:

Loans to railroads	$64,996,520
Loans and grants to States and municipalities	606,143,958
Public highways	184,514,030
River-and-harbor work	169,430,846
All other	576,648,572

Under a separate item of "Emergency housing" it notes an unexpended balance of $133,157,545. In another separate item of "Subsistence homesteads" it notes an unexpended balance of $45,373,317. In another separate item it lists as "Unallotted funds by the Public Works Administration" $16,717,276. The total of these several items, all of which have been appropriated for emergency relief work of one kind or another and all of which have been handled by the Public Works Administration, is $1,796,981,064. This is a little in excess of 50 percent of the original appropriation of $3,300,000,000 provided in the Public Works Act enacted June 16, 1933.

I referred a little while ago to the Public Works Act. I read now from section 203 (a) so far as it applies to the point I wish to make:

> With a view to increasing employment quickly (while reasonably securing any loans made by the United States) the President is authorized and empowered, through the Administrator or through such other agencies as he may designate or create, (1) to construct, finance, or aid in the construction or financing of any public-works project included in the program prepared pursuant to section 202.

Nineteen months have elapsed. Nearly $2,000,000,000 of the $3,300,000,000 still lies in the Treasury. It is true most of it is allotted. It is true most of it is obligated. It is true that in the course of 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 years it will be expended, but I repeat the statement I made a little while ago that the course taken by the President in the disbursement of this great fund of $3,300,000,000 shows the President was not very much concerned that the $3,300,000,000 be spent to increase employment quickly. Now he is asking from the Congress a larger fund and authority much less restrained, and asks that it be available until June 30, 1937.

What do we know, what can we even surmise as to the rate at which expenditure will be made or as to the use that will be made of this money or whether it will be employed to provide employment, or whether it may be employed ultimately in part for some other purpose?

I have here some figures of very considerable interest. There was a report made by the Public Works Administration on February 10, giving figures as of January 1, 1935, rather than as of February 10. I take the figures of expenditures from this report and calculate in percentage the amounts which have been expended, the amount under construction, and the amount not yet started.

We find that 14 percent of all construction projects have been completed, making the computation on the basis of total value of projects. We find on the same basis that 63 percent of all construction projects are presently under construction and on the same basis that 23 percent of all construction projects are not yet started.

We find moreover from a report made November 18, 1934, that of the non-Federal projects which have been undertaken pursuant to this mandate of the Congress, seven-tenths of 1 percent have been completed. Let me repeat that figure: Seven-tenths of 1 percent have been completed. Forty-four percent of these projects are under construction and 55 percent of the non-Federal projects are not yet started. All these computations were made on the basis of the value of the project. Does that record indicate a high capacity in carrying out the directions of the act? Does it suggest an organization capable of exercising a boundless discretion most wisely?

The fact is the rate of expenditure was so disappointingly slow that the President deemed it necessary to create the Civil Works Administration where employment might be readily attained. He accordingly set up a system of civil works which provided employment during the winter of 1933 and 1934 for a large number of workers. For approximately 4 months the number employed was in excess of 2,000,000 workers and attained a peak of 4,107,164.

It is particularly pertinent at this time to recall three statements made by President Roosevelt and the occasions upon which they were made. The first was in his special message to the Congress, May 17, 1933, in which he proposed the launching of a pretentious public-works program. In that message he said:

> A careful survey convinces me that approximately $3,300,000 can be invested in useful and necessary public construction, and at the same time put the largest possible number of people to work.

The second was upon the occasion of his signing the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933, which authorized the creation of the Public Works Administration and carried an appropriation of $3,300,000,000 for the prosecution of a public-works program. In that statement the President said:

> The second part of the act gives employment by a vast program of public works. Our studies show that we should be able to hire many men at once and to step-up to about a million new jobs by October 1, and a much greater number later.

But by October 1 it was perfectly evident the program was a failure. Instead of 1,000,000 men having been put on the pay rolls, the records show less than a quarter of that number had been taken out of the ranks of the unemployed and placed on public-works construction. The bulk of these were on public-highway construction, which had become a routine matter with the Government for many years. It was an established governmental institution which was able to proceed promptly and incidentally was the only one that showed a fair degree of dispatch in meeting the mandate of the Congress.

The administration faced the necessity of making every effort to find employment for as many as possible before the winter set in. Out of this necessity was born the Civil Works Administration. In launching the Civil Works Administration, at a conference at the White House November 15, 1933, which was attended by governors, mayors, and Civil Works administrators, the President explained in the following language why the Public Works program had failed:

> We might as well be perfectly frank. It has been exceedingly difficult, honestly, to allot the entire sum of $3,300,000,000 to worth-while projects.

Mr. President, we might intrude there with the thought that under the existing situation it will be still more difficult, for the record shows that one-third of all the employment is in four States of the Union, and that the type of worker—that is to say, the experience and capability of the unemployed—is such that it is going to be very, very difficult, indeed, to find projects which will be suited to their needs.

The Civil Works system was criticized on the score of waste and extravagance, and finally was discontinued by the order of the President. It was administered by Mr. Hopkins. In its stead the President brought about the organization of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. This resulted in a change of name and to some extent in a change in the character of projects, but the Administration was still under Mr. Hopkins. Evidently the President was far from satisfied with the work-relief program that left millions on direct relief. In his message to this Congress he said:

> I am not willing that the vitality of our people be further sapped by the giving of cash, of market baskets, of a few hours of weekly work cutting grass, raking leaves, or picking up papers in the

public parks. We must preserve not only the bodies of the unemployed from destitution but also their self-respect, their self-reliance, and courage and determination.

That was a declaration to which all may assent. This is heroic language, but it must be borne in mind that the system against which the President cries out to the Nation is one of his own making, established by an agency of his own creation, and through agents of his own selection. His statement indicates that he regards this particular expedient as subject to severe criticism. The President's statement is of great interest because the administrator of this agency claims that it has provided employment for 2,225,000 persons, and the highest estimate of unemployed to be furnished work-relief under the pending resolution is 3,500,000; so the proposition of the President to transfer the unemployed from the direct-relief roll to the work-relief roll involves the transfer of approximately 1,275,000 unemployed, and not 3,500,000. In the light of recent developments, it would seem that the President was actuated by further and undisclosed reasons in his plan to terminate the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and to substitute a new and coordinated agency. It seems that the administration regards the Federal participation in emergency relief as too generous, and desires that the ratio of Federal contribution to the contribution of the States and local governmental agencies be reduced.

Representative BUCHANAN, the chairman of the House committee having this resolution in charge, speaking the viewpoint of the administration, points out that in January 1933 the Federal Government furnished only 51 percent of the entire money for relief, whereas in January 1934 it furnished 53 percent, and in December 1934 it furnished 75 percent. For the purpose of this discussion, I make no quarrel with the administration upon its desire to withdraw in part from its cooperation in furnishing relief through the Emergency Relief Administration.

It must be remembered, however, that the Federal contribution was radically increased during the months preceding the election of November 1934, and that there were those who charged that the generous contribution of the Federal Government was influenced by political considerations. I do not make this charge. I should like to exonerate the administration in part from this charge. It cannot be exonerated, however, from the charge that it has violated its pledge to compel States and local communities to do their utmost before the Federal Government extended relief.

Upon signing the unemployment-relief bill May 12, 1933, the President stated:

> The principle which I have on many occasions explained is that the first obligation is on the locality. If it is absolutely clear that the locality has done its utmost, but that more must be done then the State must do its utmost. Only then can the Federal Government add its contribution to those of the locality and the State.

On June 14, 1933, in an address to the conference of relief administrators summoned to the White House, the President restated in clear and forcible terms the attitude of the Federal Government in the following language:

> It is essential that the States and local units of government do their fair share. They must not expect the Federal Government to finance more than a reasonable proportion of the total.
>
> On this $500,000,000 the Federal Government is putting up for relief I think I should make it perfectly clear again that it is only to be used where it is honestly shown that the localities have done everything they can possibly be asked to do, both through local and private charity and public appropriations, and that the State governments have also done everything they can possibly do.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. At that point, does the Senator know of any yardstick by which the Government officials gage what States are to put up money and what States are not to put up money?

I come from Louisiana. I read in the newspapers that Arkansas does not put up any money for this purpose, and that Mississippi does not put up any money for this purpose, and that Maryland does not put up a dime for this purpose, but they say that Louisiana has to put up money in order to get any of this money. Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. STEIWER. I do not know about the yardstick.

Mr. LONG. I know that to be a fact, so far as concerns Louisiana, because I went back to the Legislature of Louisiana, when it was being asked from the Washington office that we relinquish all control over the men who spent the money; and we relinquished and abdicated. In fact, we had already abdicated. Then, the next thing we knew, the officials here said they were not going to continue to put up any more Federal money unless Louisiana came through and did its share; and when they began to attack me personally, while I was here in the Senate, because the Legislature of the State of Louisiana was not contributing money, I went back and wrote and undertook to help them pass, and they did pass, legislation to receive some more of these funds to be spent by their own appointed men.

No sooner had I done that than I picked up the newspaper, and I read—it might not have been true—that the Governor of Arkansas appointed his own men, and did not put up a dime; that the Governor of Mississippi appointed his own men, and they did not put up a dime; and a few days ago I read that the Governor of Maryland appointed his own men, and that he did not put up a dime.

I do not mind being discriminated against, you understand. That is all right; that is in the business; but why not write in this joint resolution that any State represented by HUEY LONG shall put up so much, and any State represented by somebody else shall put up nothing? Let us know just where we stand. It is not fair to me not to know what I have to do during the coming year. I do not mind their doing it. They are going to do it; they have done it; but just let us be honest, and let me know where I stand, so that I can make preparations to do what is necessary. That is what the joint resolution ought to contain. Just let it be shown if that is to be the kind of dispensation and distribution that is to be made of the money.

I have yet to hear a man defend that system. I have yet to hear a man rise on this floor and say that we should make fish out of one and fowl out of another. As a matter of fact, they make us go up and get money to give to our political enemies to spend against us. That is what we have to do.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield if I am allowed to yield. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I remember that it has not been long since the Senator from Louisiana, on the floor of the Senate, boasted that he had gotten for Louisiana more Federal moneys than had been received by Arkansas, Mississippi, and some three or four other States in that part of the world; and I assume that he was speaking by the card, because he is a "getter." There is no question about that.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is slightly mistaken. Wait a minute; I am going to give the Senator the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon further yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STEIWER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LONG. During the election in the city of New Orleans, when they were running an anti-Long ticket down there, I did submit a map to show that during that election period the State of Louisiana got more money than Missouri, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Florida combined; but when the election was over and the anti-Long man had been elected, they threw up their arms and said they had a deficit down there in that fund, and we had to go back and help them raise part of it.

It is true that there have been large sums spent there—larger sums, in some instances, than would have been spent had I voted with the administration, for obvious reasons. What boots it that they pay too much attention to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] when they have him anyway—that is, when he is going to vote for these things anyway—and it is generally accepted that the chances are

that he may not receive the encouragement that I will receive when I am on the other side?

The facts are there, however, that the State of the Senator from Arkansas gets the money, and they have not put up anything, unless I have been wrongly informed, and I have never been disputed about these funds. Unless we put up the money, we have on the front page of the newspapers the statement that "Huey Long and Oscar Allen are starving the poor people of Louisiana to death because they will not match the relief money of the Federal Government"; and yet right over to my left is the State of Mississippi. They do not put up a 50-cent piece. Right over to my north is the State of Arkansas. They do not put up two bits; and I read that over here in the State of Maryland they did not put up a thin dime.

As a result of it we have written here what? A policy that wherever I live we are not going to get any Federal money unless we put up some. Notwithstanding the fact that they have been telling you how deplorable a condition Louisiana is in as a result of my "misrule" down there for 4 years while I was Governor, notwithstanding the paralysis which is said to have afflicted that State, they have gone to the paralyzed institution and required a matching of Federal funds, while the States blessed with a more benevolent administration, to the north and to the east and immediately to our right, pay nothing!

Is there anything in this bill to stop that, or are we just going to say that this is not a real bill? This is a "boodle" bill. This is what I would call, not a relief measure, except as an incident, but as a main proposition it is a "boodle" bill. Boodle! That is all that can be made out of this bill.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, it would take a bolder man than I am to inject myself into a controversy between the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, but possibly it will be permissible for me to throw such light on this matter as I am able to by referring to the records of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.

These records will give my friend the Senator from Louisiana cause for both satisfaction and irritation. The records that have been furnished me are for the first 21 months of the existence of the agency. In my opinion they demonstrate that the agency has failed utterly to comply with the Presidential formula which I have already quoted. On the contrary, relief moneys have been distributed practically without system, without regard for any formula. Nobody has required localities to do everything possible.

According to the report—and I read the figures with some trepidation—Louisiana for the first 21 months had contributed 2 percent. That was before they exacted the new legislation to which the Senator just now referred. At the same time Alabama contributed 4 percent, Arkansas 3 percent, Georgia 5 percent, Mississippi and South Carolina 1 percent each, North Carolina 6 percent, and Tennessee 3 percent.

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

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. As I understand the Senator's figures, they disclose that during the first 21 months Arkansas has contributed one and one-half times as much as Louisiana has contributed.

Mr. STEIWER. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is illustrative of the accuracy and reliability of the statements of my good friend the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Oh, no——

Mr. STEIWER. The distinguished leader of the majority is damning his State with faint praise, because Louisiana contributed only 2 percent and Arkansas 3 percent.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. STEIWER. It is nothing for either of them to boast about.

Mr. ROBINSON. The statement made by the Senator from Oregon in that connection is correct. The National Government, in its administration of destitution relief, has expended large sums in the State of Arkansas, and I dare say it has done the same thing in neighboring States. The difficulty in our State has been that all the political subdivisions of the State, including the counties and municipalities, as well as the State itself, have been and are in such a financial condition that they have been unable to make the contributions which I and others would like to see them make. It is a regrettable condition, but there has been a heavy burden of relief imposed by reason of the circumstances to which I refer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Oregon yield to me to correct those figures?

Mr. STEIWER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Here are the facts about those figures. Those Government figures are just as accurate as are the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly more accurate than the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Just a moment; we will see about that.

The facts are that the State of Louisiana spent $100,000,000. Pursuant to the call of the President of the United States, the State of Louisiana raised $100,000,000 for relief work in the manner requested by President Hoover. We spent $100,000,000. The authorities here never considered that $100,000,000. We spent every dime we had—every dime we could raise—and during that period, when the Federal Government gave us about ten or fifteen or twenty million, we spent $100,000,000. We spent that money in connection with the Federal Government, and instead of putting up 2 percent, the fact is that we put up 85 percent. Those are the facts. The records will bear me out that we floated a bond issue and sold the bonds and spent $100,000,000. That is the amount.

We have never been able to get the statisticians here in the Government service to give us credit for that. There are three kinds of fakirs, and the statisticians come in the last class. We have never been able to get them to do anything but to say that the State of Louisiana was hopelessly involved, hopelessly in debt, notwithstanding the fact that we met the problem of relief, not only before other States met it, but we met it when called on.

Let me state something else they will not give us credit for. We went out and raised $500,000 in cash, or about that sum of money, and carried on a relief roll of our own, by a nonpartisan committee, over and above the hundred million dollars in bonds, and they have refused to list upon their statistics the $500,000, a deliberate, perjured piece of fakery, a deliberate piece of fraud, a skin game from top to bottom to keep it from being known that the State of Louisiana led the world. The State of Louisiana was the first State that ever raised a dollar for relief, publicly and privately, in this work. Still there are the statistics there to show that Arkansas put up 3 percent, and Louisiana put up 2 percent.

Why is that? Because today Arkansas puts up nothing, Mississippi puts up nothing, and in order to justify the fact that they do not make Arkansas and Mississippi put up a dime, they have to put up some kind of a fake statistic back there to make it appear that away back Louisiana contributed nothing, when, as a matter of fact, Louisiana put up 85 cents of every dollar that was spent, and constructed in Louisiana every public improvement we could think about where we had the money to construct it.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, while the Senator from Oregon is being interrupted, will he permit an inquiry?

Mr. STEIWER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I wanted to ask whether or not there was any testimony adduced before the committee showing the extent to which, if this measure shall be enacted as it is now, with all of the authority given to the President, the agencies set up by the President will construct electric light and power plants in the various States, and also whether or not there was any evidence tending to show, or which indicated, that already communications had been made to some legislatures, as I know one has been sent to the legislature of North Carolina, asking them to enact legislation, or looking to the enactment of legislation, giving the Federal Government the right of eminent domain for the construction of power plants and electric-light activities.

Mr. STEIWER. Mr. President, that fact did not appear before the committee and, generally speaking, no projects were identified or listed; on the contrary, witnesses appearing in behalf of the bill stated merely the kinds of projects that made up what they call the great reservoir upon which to draw, and nothing precise was presented.

Mr. President, I have no way of testing the accuracy of the figures included in the report of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. I merely read them as they are, with the assurance to the Senate that I am endeavoring to read them as they are written in the report. I do not know to what extent they correctly portray the situation in the State of Louisiana.

I read earlier in my remarks a summary of figures of contributions of certain States where the contributions had varied from 1 percent up to 6 percent. I want now to compare these contributions with others. I find from the report that contributions were made as follows:

	Percent
Massachusetts	67
Connecticut and Delaware	66
New York	51
California	47
New Jersey	45
Maryland and Pennsylvania	47
Iowa	45

The drought-stricken States of Kansas and Nebraska contributed over one-third of the total amount expended in their States for relief. South Dakota, which was probably the worse stricken of any of the States of the Union and where, according to the statement of the Relief Administration, 34 percent of the population was on relief rolls, nevertheless contributed over 11 percent of the relief money used in the State, and Oklahoma, another stricken State, contributed 15 percent.

In the expenditure of the P. W. A. funds the administration did not violate the legislative mandate of increasing employment quickly. It merely failed or neglected to live up to it. But in the expenditure of the F. E. R. A. funds the administration was not guilty merely of failure or neglect to live up to its own mandate of fair and impartial distribution of funds. By its own confession it actually violated its own formula, and after declaring to the country that relief would be extended only after local agencies had done their full share, it proceeded in the most flagrant manner to impose relief upon some areas in sums in excess of the requirements thought necessary by the local agencies, and in nearly all areas with utter disregard of the capacity of the local agencies to deal with their own problem. There is no other way to reconcile a local contribution of 66 or 67 percent in one State and a contribution of less than 1 percent in another State. Much less can you reconcile a contribution of 6 percent in the rich State of North Carolina as against a contribution of 15 percent in a State like Oklahoma which was a glaring example of a great community stricken with drought and depression.

In the Southern States, in the majority of which the Federal Government furnished more than 95 percent of the total relief funds, much of the distress, according to reliable authorities, was occasioned by the Government's own policy of crop reduction. Many magazine and newspaper articles have appeared over the signature of reliable observers, to the effect that much of the poverty in the Southern States was occasioned by the outlawing of the small cotton planter under the terms of the cotton-reduction program. These articles were based upon first-hand information obtained by the writers. A most competent authority, J. S. Wanamaker, of South Carolina, president of the American Cotton Growers Association, in a public statement carried by the press associations January 27, 1935, states that the cotton-reduction program was responsible for putting 40 percent of the cotton growers of the South on public charity.

I have no way, Mr. President, to attest to the accuracy of that statement, but I do assert that under the record as made by the Relief Administration and under the testimony adduced through the public prints there is here a situation which cannot be reconciled upon any theory of impartial administration of these funds or upon the theory that the Relief Administrator lives up to the formula which the President made.

We are traveling in a vicious circle when we set up emergency machinery and appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to carry out a program purporting to improve the condition of our people and hasten the return of prosperity, and at the same time permit administrative acts which render public distress more acute and add great numbers to public relief rolls to be supported out of public taxes.

Whatever may have been the occasion for the vast increase in Federal contribution, it is obvious that the situation is neither supported nor defended by the administration which brought the Federal Relief Administration into being. Representative BUCHANAN, in his remarks upon January 23, 1935, made this statement:

> First, if your present system is continued, whereby the Federal Government furnishes 75 percent of the total amount for relief and local committees determine who shall be put on the relief roll and what amount shall be given them, God pity Uncle Sam and his Treasury.

This profane prayer was a cry for relief against the administration's own system by one of the administration's stalwarts occupying a most responsible position in the House of Representatives. The statement implies that the excessive expenditures had been occasioned by the fact that local committees determine who should be placed on the relief roll and what amount paid to them, but before the Senate Committee on Appropriations Mr. Hopkins made it abundantly clear that the Federal Emergency Relief Administration retained sufficient control of the funds so that the Federal Administration was in position to dominate the action of the local groups. He said in effect that he supervised the distribution; that he made rules and regulations governing it and required that the accounts be audited. Moreover, that he approved the personnel, and in at least one case, according to his own admission, for all practical purposes he selected the personnel. It would seem, therefore, that the Congressman must blame someone other than the local committees for the extravagance against which he complains. Where is there any assurance that in the expenditure of $5,000,000,000 there would be any improvement in this system of administration?

Is confidence in the aptitude and capacity of the President and his agencies to be increased merely because the Executive abandoned C. W. A. when it was under a Nation-wide criticism and because now he proposed to abandon the Federal Emergency Relief Administration when it is brought under criticism by the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and when its processes are disowned and denounced by the President himself?

The Senate Committee on Appropriations endeavored to ascertain the identity of the person or agency to whom the expenditure of the $5,000,000,000 would be intrusted. That identity has not been established. It appears that we must cast our final votes upon this resolution without information concerning the spending agency. We only know that the resolution purports to clothe the President with authority to delegate in entirety the vast body of powers conferred upon him by this resolution, and we know that whatever the delegation may be the spending will be done at the discretion of the President and of those to whom the delegation is made without substantial restraint and with but little control by the Congress which is exercising its constitutional power to appropriate nearly $5,000,000,000 of the people's money.

We know, further, that the expenditure and the means to be employed in effectuating the objectives of the resolution will be determined by a President who, in the administration of relief, has heretofore departed radically from his publicly proclaimed purposes and who has denounced and repudiated two agencies to which he had previously given life, and that in one case he had discontinued an agency only to institute a new one under the same administrator. We also know that in spending the money provided by this resolution the President may continue the services of all of the existing personnel with its record of inefficiency and waste. These possibilities are alarming when it is remem-

bered that the only statement made by the President—and not to the Congress, but to the press—is to the effect that the spending would not be supervised by the Secretary of the Interior, whose administration, although lacking in dispatch, has up to this time been both orderly and honest.

It seems strange that the one who, above all others, has freed the administration from politics and has insisted upon the honorable distribution of the money voted by the Congress is the one and the only one concerning whom there is a declaration that he will not be consulted or at least he will not be placed in the charge of the expenditure of the proposed appropriation.

I have endeavored earlier in these remarks to make clear that the pending resolution is more than a mere appropriation of approximately $5,000,000,000. In addition to that appropriation it is essentially a plan to delegate enormous powers and to create in the President almost an unqualified and unrestricted discretion in expenditure of the appropriation. Congress should refuse to make this delegation. This body has already delegated to the Executive more power than any administrative officer can perform. The President is clothed with more responsibility than it is humanly possible for one man to discharge. To add to this authority and increase the responsibility will make the Executive branch of the Government less and not more efficient. The new authority includes power to select projects; to determine how much shall be expended in the national defense; to determine the policy of the Government with respect to the development of hydroelectric power; to experiment in a variety of schemes for social uplift; to determine the course of history with respect to concentration or distribution of population; to formulate a program of farm relief; and to determine the policy with respect to the disposal of exportable surpluses. It includes also the power of eminent domain which is one of the highest attributes of sovereignty. These and other like matters are highly legislative in character. A persuasive argument might be made that the delegation of these powers is violative of the fundamental law and that the legislation is therefore unconstitutional. I do not, however, at this time urge this objection. I say merely that the powers are too great to be administered by any executive; that the concentration of authority in one man's hands is inimicable to free institutions; that it takes away from the Congress the making of decisions which Congress must make or else subject itself to the charge of abdicating its traditional and constitutional function.

If we are to understand what it is that we are called upon to do in giving the Executive substantially a complete control of $5,000,000,000 of public funds, let us bear in mind that the Treasury of the United States contains nearly $2,000,000,000 of the unexpended balance from the $3,300,000,000 provided for public works under the act of June 16, 1933, and the act supplemental thereto, which I think carried $400,000,000 besides. The Executive also has in his complete charge another $2,000,000,000 which is a part of the so-called "profit" resulting from the nationalization of gold. Still other unexpended funds are under the control of the President. The daily statement of the United States Treasury for January 18, 1935, discloses unexpended balances of $5,724,254,139. Thus it is seen the President has in his charge in excess of $5,000,000,000, part of which is obligated but a substantial part of which is unobligated, and it is subject to the complete control of the President. So far as the two billion stabilization fund is concerned, neither the President nor the Secretary of the Treasury is under any obligation to report to the Congress or to the country. To this $5,000,000,000 it is now proposed to add nearly $5,000,000,000 more, and thus to place in the hands of the administrative government nearly $10,000,000,000. Of this huge sum nearly seven billion may be used at the discretion of the President and his administrative agencies. So great a power was never in history concentrated in the hands of one executive. But the unrestrained management of public funds is only a trifle compared to the economic and general governmental powers which have been delegated by Congress to the President since March 4, 1933. The willingness of the Congress to respond to the demands of the Executive will be recorded in the history of the Republic as the most marvelous phenomenon in the political life of this generation. Let me remind Senators that these concentrated powers include, among others:

Power to increase or decrease the wages of Government employees as provided in the so-called Economy Act of March 20, 1933.

Power to close any bank or all banks, State or National, and to keep them closed for any period of time which the President may direct, and to fix the terms upon which they may reopen.

To outlaw the possession by any citizen or any corporation of gold or gold certificates and to compel such property to be delivered to the Government in exchange for whatever kind of money the Government chooses to offer.

To fix, within certain broad limits, pensions and compensation to be paid to veterans of the wars and to their dependents. This power, I am glad to say, was materially modified by subsequent congressional action through which the Congress asserted its authority and performed its traditional function. The effort to wrest this authority from the President was resisted by him and attained success only by enactment over the veto of the President.

The concentrated Executive powers include also the power to raise and lower postal rates which gives the President punitive power over the public press.

Power to cancel or annul existing ocean and air mail contracts.

Power to make public the income-tax returns of individuals, in his discretion.

Power to regulate the value of money and to debase the dollar by reducing its gold content 50 percent at the time the power first became effective.

It includes also power to start the printing presses and to issue $3,000,000,000 in irredeemable greenbacks and to compel the Federal Reserve banks to purchase up to $3,000,000,000 in Government securities.

This is only a partial statement in the vast array of concentrated Executive powers. Delegated by Congress is the power to require industry, or groups of industries, to adopt codes of practice affecting wages, hours, working conditions, prices, and curtailment of output. These powers have been delegated to administrators and to deputy administrators and are being exercised by a multitude of subordinates and assistants who write codes and fix penalties for their violation. Congress also has clothed the President's Secretary of Agriculture with authority over agriculture by which he and his subordinates are permitted to levy and collect taxes and to curtail production and thus determine the destiny of the agricultural elements in this country.

His commissions and agencies control the stock exchanges and permit or deny a security market an opportunity for acquisition of capital for the rebuilding of American industry. They dominate the banks and monopolize the money market to insure the sale of Government issues. They make trade treaties without necessity of the advice and consent of the Senate, and, through the control of all the monetary powers, tariff duties, and the basis of production of industry and agriculture, artificially stimulate and to a large extent regulate prices of commodities, fix the cost of living, and determine the economic status of the men, women, and children who make up the population of the United States. So vast a power transcends the imagination. Its magnitude is so utterly beyond the grasp of the human intellect that the business leaders of the Nation, together with business executives everywhere, stand in dismay in its presence. Lack of a definite plan in the exercise of this power, as well as complete uncertainty concerning the dispositions which will be made before the end of today and in the course of tomorrow, leaves the country utterly without confidence, without spirit, and without initiative. Within the human heart there is not courage sufficient to bear up against the evil of so great an uncertainty. The result might have been foreseen. It was foreseen. But protests in the name of the welfare of the people of this country received but scant con-

sideration. The theorists, the experimenters, and "brain trusters" have prevailed. Delegation after delegation of power has been made until the concentration is now complete, and a bewildered Nation knows not which way to turn. It is not surprising that we have failed in our program of recovery and that in comparison with other nations, which have had no new deal, our position is most unfavorable and our recovery most seriously retarded. The appropriation of $5,000,000,000 in the form of a blank check, to be used at the discretion of the President, inevitably will make the situation worse, not only because of an unbalanced Budget and of increased debt but because it increases the uncertainty which already brings dismay to American business.

One of the objectives of the resolution is to provide relief from hardships attributable to wide-spread unemployment. Will the President add to forests and parks and thus remove land from the tax rolls in the burdened States of the West in order to implement a program to provide such relief, or will he instead, under the terms of the House resolution, acquire and nationalize the railroads? Congress does not know, but Congress will be held to the knowledge that in complete ignorance of fact it delegated to the President the power to do both of these things in order, in his discretion, to provide relief from the hardships attributable to unemployment.

Those who criticize this unprecedented and boundless concentration of power and those who question the wisdom of this appropriation in violation of the fundamental theories of our Government that the people, through their legislative body, should hold the purse strings, meet with but one answer of rather tiresome repetition. This answer was made in the House of Representatives by Congressman BUCHANAN, who, in defending the pending resolution, said:

> Can you not trust the President? The people of the United States trust him. Cannot this Congress trust him?

Perhaps the best commentary upon such an argument was made by the United States Supreme Court in its recent decision in the oil-code case. The argument was seriously advanced by the Government's attorneys that the code was defensible upon the ground that the President would not be guilty of maladministration of it. The Supreme Court commented upon that argument as follows:

> The question whether such a delegation of legislative power is permitted by the Constitution is not answered by the argument that it should be assumed that the President has acted, and will act, for what he believes to be the public good. The point is not one of motives but of constitutional authority, for which the best of motives is not a substitute.

Mr. President, I now conclude. I wish to reiterate, in substance, that which I said earlier in my remarks, namely, that there is no possible legislative difficulty involved in this situation. The Senate, with the concurrence of the House, can separate the direct-relief money from the work-relief money. We can, by appropriate legislation, provide relief money sufficient to enable the President to care for those who are in distress; we can then take under consideration, in a deliberative way, the question of considering the work-relief program, the appropriation of $4,000,000,000 and the safeguards which we ought, in all conscience, throw about that kind of an appropriation. If we will do that, we shall not be obliged to apologize hereafter for the abdication of the functions which the Constitution gives to us. If we will do that, we shall be able to answer every requirement in the emergency through which our country is passing at this time, and in the end we shall be able to enact a proper, reasonable, fair, and constitutional law which will place due restraints upon those who are to administer the appropriation and provide that justice shall be done to all concerned without partiality as between States and communities. We will know, moreover, that we have performed our mission and that we have taken a course which will not alarm the people of the country and further frighten the business elements of the Nation so that recovery will be still further retarded. I thank the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2030. An act authorizing the States of Washington and Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho;

H. R. 2874. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Eleven Points River in section 17, township 23 north, range 2 west, approximately 12 miles east of Alton, on route no. 42, Oregon County, Mo.;

H.R. 3018. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 3057. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oklahoma to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Arkansas River south of the town of Sallisaw, in Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties, at a point approximately 15 miles north of Keota, in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 3891. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at Conway, S. C.;

H. R. 3983. An act to legalize a bridge (known as "Union Street Bridge") across the Dan River at Danville, Va.; and

H. R. 4018. An act to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. I inquire what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no business before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, am I recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Can I get recognition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can secure recognition to introduce some business before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Very well; I move to call up the resolution which I submitted this morning. In support of that——

Mr. CLARK. I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. The point of order is that, under the rule, a resolution has to lie over for 1 day if objection is made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the point of order is well taken, and it is sustained.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order. There is a possibility of the rules of the Senate being suspended, and I make the motion now that the rules of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of immediately proceeding to the consideration of the resolution which I submitted this morning.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG. I understand that parliamentary tactics are being used to keep the facts from coming out here today, and I want to talk on the motion to suspend the rules. I have moved to suspend the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XL a motion to suspend the rules must lie over for 1 day and must be in writing.

THE ADMITTED VIOLATIONS OF THE LAW BY POSTMASTER GENERAL FARLEY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to the consideration of the first bill on the calendar. I shall ask the Senate to take cognizance of the following principles of law by which the Senate guides its conduct:

First, it is provided by the statutes of the United States that—

> No head of a department or other officer or clerk in the employ of the Government shall receive or agree to receive any compensation whatever, directly or indirectly, for any services rendered, or to be rendered, to any person, either by himself or another,

in relation to any proceeding, contract * * * or other matter or thing in which the United States is a party (sec. 1782, Rev. Stat. U. S. (1 U. S. Comp. Stat., p. 1212)).

Second, the law provides:

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States * * * each of the parties * * * shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. (See Rev. Stat., sec. 5440.)

Third, the Criminal Code of the United State, section 35, as amended, title 18, section 83, of the United States Code Annotated, says:

Whoever shall enter into any agreement, combination, or conspiracy to defraud the Government of the United States, or any department or officer thereof, or any corporation in which the United States is a stockholder, by obtaining or aiding to obtain the payment or allowance of any false or fraudulent claim, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

Fourth, I direct this particularly to the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]—

Fifth, as has been interpreted by the Postmaster General and by this United States Senate, particularly in the matter of the contracts let for carrying the United States mail by airplane, where bidders are in collusion in making their bids on a contract for services to be rendered or supplies to be furnished in which the United States is interested, that such collusion is a civil and criminal offense against the United States.

I hope I shall not be required to argue either of these matters because I have merely quoted the law, except as to the fourth; and as to that, I have stated what we have accepted on the floor of the Senate as it came from the lips of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Now, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, I invite your ear and heart to consider a letter written and signed for and in defense of Mr. James A. Farley on the 19th day of October 1934, by one R. H. Hunter. I shall ask that, at the conclusion of my remarks, the whole letter and the answer thereto may be printed. But I am not concerned with the general colloquy or the campaign which it affected. I am only concerned that Senators should note certain things which the letter written in defense of Mr. Farley admits. They are as follows, as taken from Mr. Hunter's words, viz:

First. The United States Government promoted, financed, supervised, and acted as general overseer for the Hillside home development project in New York, advancing something less than six million dollars.

I make no point of the fact that this money was advanced for the work of slum removal out at a place where there were no slums. I pass that point by and ask the Senate to take knowledge of the facts that the Hillside home development project was a Government project promoted, advanced, supervised, and overseen by the United States Government and with its money.

Second. No contract could be let, nor could even a bid be opened, except under the immediate eyes and supervision of the Government aides placed in charge of the project to disburse the Government's money.

Third. James A. Farley, the Postmaster General of the United States, was interested in the sale of materials for the project through the General Builders Supply Co., in which he is heavily interested and "of which James A. Farley was the head."

I wish the Senate to take note that I am merely quoting from a letter officially issued in defense of and for Mr. Farley.

Fourth. In the awarding of the contract for brick—

I am reading now from the letter—the same—

was divided in equal thirds among three material supply companies, of which the General Builders Supply Co.—

Farley's company—

received one-third.

So that, in addition to the violation of the other laws quoted above, of necessity there must have been collusion among those bidding on the brick, openly consented to by the Government agents, to have had three equal bids and to have awarded same to equal thirds, one being the concern of James A. Farley.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that our law goes so far as to prohibit the head of a department of the United States from participating—

directly or indirectly * * * either by himself or another * * * in relation to any contract in which the United States is a party.

For fear it may be thought by some that Mr. Farley may hide his personal and official identity behind the corporation of which he is a member, I call the Senate's attention to a long list of cases, one of which is the case of Magruder against Drury and Maddox, trustees, cited by my friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] in his discussion of the air mail matter here, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Two hundred and thirty-fifth United States Reporter at page 106, wherein it is held that such laws forbid one in a fiduciary capacity to have an interest opposite to his principal or to make anything out of a contract executed with his principal in the transactions carried on with firms and corporations in which he is interested the same as to the transactions carried on by the individual in his own name.

In other words, in this case Mr. Drury's offense had been carried on in the name of a firm by the name of Drury & Ames, a corporation. The court said that does not make a bit of difference, that does not change the situation by one jot or tittle. The man interested in the corporation in a fiduciary capacity is the same whether he deals with it through a corporation or otherwise.

So, Mr. President and Members of the Senate, unless Mr. Farley's ally and defender has misstated the facts, in other words, unless the man writing this letter for Mr. Farley misstated the truth, or unless the newspapers purporting to publish this letter in defense of Mr. Farley have forged the same, none can doubt, under the law, where Farley stands in the transaction prohibited by law. He stands guilty of the violation of at least three and maybe four separate criminal statutes; that is, on the basis of the letter written for Mr. Farley.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK. Who wrote the letter to which the Senator has been referring?

Mr. LONG. I have that here, and I am going to put it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. That letter was writen by Mr. R. H. Hunter, vice president of the Hillside home development project, I believe it is, and was written in reply to a letter written by Mr. Moses, a commissioner in the State of New York.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have any warrant whatever for the statement that this letter was written by authority of the Postmaster General?

Mr. LONG. Yes. It was a campaign document issued in the campaign in New York in which Mr. Farley was leading.

Mr. President, I ask that the Hunter letter may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, together with the reply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not want to bring up other matters stated in these letters at all, because I am undertaking to have the Senate accept nothing except what is specified as a fact from Mr. Farley's side of the question. I do not want to have a colloquy over some of the other things that Mr. Moses said. For instance, Mr. Moses, I

understand, intimates that this was supposed to be a slum removal, when there was no slum. That is not material to my point.

Mr. Moses also said that while they took other people's property for relief purposes at the assessed value and could get more property at the assessed value, yet in this case they paid two times the assessed value. I do not want that noticed, because that is not my point.

Mr. Moses further said, Mr. President, that in selling this land to the Government at two times the assessed value, whereas they were getting everybody else's property for the assessed value, they exempted the property in front on the road so that after the Government had built up the back part, they would still have left the business part. But I do not want that noted, because that is not the point I am making now.

All that I want the Senate to consider is the fact that, according to their own letter, he showed three statutes had been violated, and more than likely, I think, a fourth, although I would prefer that the benefit of the doubt be given to the Postmaster General. All benefit of the doubt I want accorded Farley. There is a slight one-tenth of 1 percent possibility that the fourth statute has not been violated, which I think may entitle him to the benefit of the doubt, however slight it may be. But I have submitted these letters and I have sent them to the desk to be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I do not intend to finish discussing the matter now, because I have something else to say.

I want the Senate to know that I have been very careful in what I have said. I said here the other day, may it please the Senate, that down in West Virginia they had an election on for United States Senator. I said that they telephoned down there to a man who was a leading factor in the B. & O. Railroad and called upon him to support Mr. Clem Shaver, who was at the time an employee and agent of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I said that at that time the B. & O. Railroad had pending an application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to borrow $50,000,000; and I said that Mr. Farley telephoned down there to get that man to switch over, or to go for Mr. Clem Shaver, at the time that application for a $50,000,000 loan was pending with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I did not see it in the newspaper, but I was telephoned last night that throughout the country, or at least in West Virginia, it has been printed that this loan had been made to the B. & O. Railroad long before Clem Shaver was a candidate for the United States Senate and that he could not have had anything to do with it. I am very particular about my facts; so I telephoned down to West Virginia, and I got the date when Mr. Clem Shaver announced as a candidate for the United States Senate. He announced as a candidate for the United States Senate on July 7, 1934, the last day when he could file his candidacy, and the election occurred on August 6. He announced and filed on July 7.

I read the following from page 17 of the Baltimore Sun of July 14, 1934, 7 days after Clem Shaver announced as a candidate for the United States Senate, and 23 or 24 days before the election:

B. & O. will float $50,000,000 notes; R. F. C. agrees to take any part of loan unabsorbed by public. By J. F. Essary.

It says here, "Continued from page 20." I turn over to page 20, and I see this heading at the masthead of this article:

B. & O. to float 5-year notes of $50,000,000; R. F. C. agrees to take any part of loan unabsorbed by public; stock of Reading to be collateral; money to be used to meet maturities and clear bank obligations.

I ask that the entire article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. LONG. I will state to the Senate the further fact that this man, who was the head knocker down there in that railroad, who had that application for a loan of $50,000,000 pending with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by the name of Cornwell, championed the cause of Mr. Clem Shaver from that day until the election, and carried the only county in that whole territory in favor of Clem Shaver. The only county he carried was the one dominated by the man whose concern was borrowing the $50,000,000, who received that message to get in line for Clem Shaver before they made the loan.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Has the Senator read Governor Cornwell's statement, carried in the newspapers this morning?

Mr. LONG. No, sir.

Mr. CLARK. To the effect that he had been supporting Mr. Shaver from the time of his announcement, calling attention to the fact that Mr. Shaver had managed his own campaign when he was a candidate for governor of West Virginia, and had been chairman of the State committee during his candidacy for governor?

Mr. LONG. No, sir! I did not read Mr. Cornwell's statement, but I have some mighty good men prepared to take the witness stand under oath and tell about it. Don't worry about my proving anything here when I assert something—not a bit in the world. I expected Mr. Cornwell to say that. That is the only thing he could say. I will not summon Mr. Cornwell, but I will summon somebody else. Some of them are not very far from right where the Senator is sitting, right close. Do not ever worry about this thing.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator be a little more explicit?

Mr. LONG. No; no more explicit right now.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator state whether he is referring to any Member of the Senate?

Mr. LONG. On the advice of counsel, I decline to answer the question. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. That is very characteristic of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Oh, no; oh, no. The Senator cannot say that. That is proper. I have not the authority to answer those questions. The Senator will not be disappointed about the proof.

Mr. President, I sent to the desk earlier in the day a resolution. I should like to state just what I have asked in this resolution. I have asked in it that the Department of the Interior of the United States Government furnish the Senate the reports and the data that have been assembled by its investigator, Louis Glavis, with regard to P. W. A. projects in which Mr. Farley has directly or indirectly participated, and also with regard to the Stewart concern which I mentioned some days ago on this floor.

Mr. President, this resolution will not come up until the following day when the Senate meets. I do not know whether we are going to adjourn until Friday morning, or until Saturday morning, or until Monday morning; and I am not going to make any point about any early adjournment or early reconvening of the Senate. That is not the point I am making; but I have laid before the Senate a resolution asking the Department of the Interior to send to us these data. That will not cost anything. The material can come here free. It can be in the custody of the Senate, surrounded by such safeguards as the Senate may see fit to clothe it in, and it ought to be in the possession of the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

I made a statement here, however, that someone has questioned in a news article that I have been told about. I do not take the time to read all these news articles. I rely upon the accuracy of my friends, because some of these are not matters that require investigation; but I am told that there was some kind of a pooh-pooh given by the United Press and the Scripps-Howard papers to my effort to have Mr. Farley investigated, and I am told that they flouted the idea that they had anything to do with any income-tax matter, or that any of their officers had anything to do with anything that might have been settled or adjusted, or fraud alleged concerning it that could affect

them. I do not want anything I have to say here to be left in doubt, if I can help it; so I have before me the Sunday Star of Sunday morning, March 11, 1934, reading from page 1, the first two columns on the right-hand side:

United States prepares to act against A. W. Mellon in tax-evasion drive—Jimmy Walker, Thomas S. Lamont, and others named in Cummings' announcement.

This was before they gave out the announcement that all these men had been called off Mellon and Lamont and sent down to Louisiana to get HUEY LONG. This was a little before that time.

Aluminum company scrutinized; 3-year limit to apply; Justice Department authorizes district attorneys to ask indictments by grand juries.

Who are the men they named? They say there that they are going to indict Thomas S. Lamont, Andrew W. Mellon, James J. Walker, and Thomas L. Sidlo, law partner of Newton D. Baker, of Cleveland, Ohio. Mr. Sidlo was the comptroller and the general counsel of the Scripps-Howard or United Press newspaper interests.

Mr. Sidlo was called on for a statement, or somebody was called on for a statement for Mr. Sidlo. I have not read this since March; but, as I remember, I read something from Sidlo there about this thing. Let us see.

Here is the compromise offer, on page 6, from Sidlo:

COMPROMISE OFFERED; SIDLO'S PARTNER SURPRISED BY APPARENT REFUSAL

CLEVELAND, March 10.—Commenting on the Department of Justice's projected criminal prosecution of Thomas L. Sidlo for alleged evasion of income taxes, Paul Patterson, one of his partners in a prominent Cleveland law firm, asserted tonight Sidlo had made to the Government what is technically known as an "offer in compromise."

Sidlo was reported by his associates to be at the home of Robert P. Scripps in southern California.

Asserting the Justice Department's intention to prosecute Sidlo is "a surprise to me", Patterson said, "while I knew the matter was being discussed in the Department of Justice, and although I knew the Department was considering what is technically known as an 'offer of compromise' by Mr. Sidlo, I had no inkling that the offer would be refused."

Mr. Sidlo's offer was to pay the entire amount alleged by the Government to be due and the 50 percent penalty plus interest. The question at issue is one of law surrounding the methods of claiming deductions—

And so forth.

Notwithstanding that he believed it his entire right to take deductions for these losses, he did make the offer to the Government which covers tax, penalty, and interest, the maximum amount the Government could possibly recover in any action.

In other words, Mr. Sidlo offered to pay the 50-percent penalty required in case of fraud, plus interest, all that the Government could recover at any time. That was Mr. Sidlo's offer. Notwithstanding that, says the Washington Star, the Solicitor General of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States saw fit to do the unusual thing of announcing the names of four prominent men against whom they would proceed by indictment and prosecution—something unheard of in the annals of criminal law prior to that time.

What happened? What happened? Did they prefer any indictment or prosecution against Mr. Sidlo, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers and the United Press? Not so that you can tell it; but about this time, Mr. President, the Scripps-Howard people moved in and began to horn in on the investigation of Mr. Farley, and lo and behold, there was a "Hush! Hush!", and they ran one edition of their newspaper carrying Exposure No. 1, and following that time no man has ever yet heard the Scripps-Howard newspapers say further of the conduct of Farley, and no man has heard the national administration say anything about indicting Sidlo, the comptroller and counsel of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

O, my friends, misery loves company. We feel kindly toward our fellow man in similar situations. There you have it. There you have it, call it law, call it government, call it what you wish, backed up by the pages of the Washington newspapers, carrying full-fledged—and I have it here in my pocket—carrying full-fledged a letter, and I have in my hand a copy of the letter, sent through the United States mail to an employee of the United States Government in Washington, D. C., on a letterhead carrying the name of James A. Farley, and it says:

If you will notice from the attached appeal, we are making an effort to assist the National Democratic Committee in paying off its deficit. If you can help, won't you please let me hear from you as soon as convenient?

Enclosing him a blank to fill out with the amount that he will give.

That was sent out to employees of the United States Government, to send them $531,000, or as much of it as they can, and they say in this letter that "we have decided to limit the amount anyone can give to $1,000 in order to spread it around." That is a marvelous limit. Nobody could send them more than a thousand dollars. Of course, I am satisfied that if somebody asked for a suspension of that rule he might get it. [Laughter.] At any rate, if we forget everything else that has been said and everything else that has been done, we find that they go out to North Dakota and find a Governor out there by the name of Langer, who issued a letter in an effort to collect $170 from Government employees. He tried to get $170, but he collected only $83. They did not all come in.

Oh, what did they do? The majesty of the law had been flouted, and they haled into court the Governor, elected by the people. Farley is not elected by the people. He could not be elected justice of the peace in any ward in the United States of America tomorrow. But Farley's crowd, through the district attorney, haled the Governor of the State, "Come into court, ye demon. Come hither. You are accused of having done the monstrous act of accepting $83, and trying to get $83 more, from employees of the United States Government."

What did they do? They indicted him, convicted him, removed him from office, and he is today on his way to the Federal penitentiary, notwithstanding the fact that Farley, even after that, sits in the city of Washington sending hither and yon applications to people subject to his ipse dixit to send money in to the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, that is what we have come to. More than Cicero could say about Cataline, "Does he live? Does he live? Yea, more, he walks into the Senate." Ah, Mr. President, in the case of Farley, we may cry, Does he live? Yea, more, he supplants the United States Senate. He exercises the power which the United States Senate once, in the days of yore, was supposed to exercise.

Where is the Senate? More under the hat of the Postmaster General today than it ever was under the control of any man. The gentleman exercising that power, prescribing the rules and regulations, and enforcing them, appointing the district attorneys of the United States and removing the district attorneys of the United States, prosecuting those who are interested in Government contracts, prosecuting those who solicit Government funds, even to the little man Merrigan in Louisiana, who solicited, I think it was, a hundred dollars from some employees—prosecuting and indicting him, and threatening to put him off—that man violates the laws openly and without serious fear of conviction or prosecution.

It is all right. We sit here. Defend it on the ground of party? Oh, yes, defending the party! Defending the party! Defending the party!

He is the National Democratic chairman, he is the chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee of New York, he is the Postmaster General, he is the Democratic Party of the United States, the eyes, the ears, and, if it has a heart left, the heart. [Laughter.] Only one heart there is left in the Democratic Party—in the bosom of Farley. He is today regulating and running those affairs.

Mr. President, I see this in the Washington Daily News of today:

Democratic chiefs ponder safe course in Long-Farley row.

There is no row between me and Farley. That is a mistake. There is no row there. I have been stating, up to this time, the admitted things which have been published in Mr.

Farley's defense. I am only quoting the law that has been applied by his own appointees and others.

Democratic chiefs ponder safe course in Long-Farley row.

This is a Scripps-Howard paper.

Political potentialities of disputes may cause Senate to consider charges.

The feud between Huey Long and Jim Farley has the Capital by the ears, awaiting the next move.

It has all sorts of political potentialities, involving even the 1936 Presidential election.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR (Democrat, Tennessee), chairman of this committee and one of Farley's champions in the Senate—

Mr. President, that is what I resent, because the Senator from Tennessee thought I was making that kind of a statement the other day when he resented what I said, and I made haste to assure him I did not. This is what I resent:

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR (Democrat, Tennessee), chairman of this committee and one of Farley's champions in the Senate.

They even refer to the Senator as the champion of Farley in the Senate. Imagine the insult that has been cast on him! [Laughter.] I move that we cite this newspaper for contempt. [Laughter.]

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR * * * said today he would call his committee together in a day or two to consider LONG's resolution for an inquiry.

LONG will be invited before the committee to state the grounds for his charges. The committee then must report back to the Senate, either to recommend an investigation, or report there is no basis for one. The vote will come upon acceptance of this report, whatever it may be.

When the committee reports to the Senate there will be an opportunity to ascertain the truth of rumors that Republicans are secretly egging the Louisiana Senator along in his warfare on the administration.

They will find out whether it is Republicans or not. They are going to find out that the only Senators here who said anything to me about this are Democrats, on this side of the Chamber, and before this thing is through with, if they tell me about it, I will tell you about it. They will probably be telling you about it before it gets through.

Mr. President, there is honor left in the Democratic Party, whether you believe it or not. There is honor left in this party. Even considering me out of it, there is still honor left in the Democratic Party. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

This paper further says:

It is no secret that they are delighted at the embarrassment he causes from time to time.

On the contrary, the worst thing that can happen to the Republican Party today is for Farley to be kicked out. Just as certain as 2 times 2 make 4, let this man be kept in, and the Democratic Party, with five billion or ten billion or any other number of billion, will not have as much chance of getting in the next time as a snowball has of going through a fireplace. The worst thing the Republican Party could have done to it today would be to have the Democratic Party clear its skirts of this kind of infamous smell. They do not want it done. In my opinion, of course, they have to protect their record over there and claim to be more honest than we are. They will probably vote with me this time. If they had voted with me on silver, they would have been a lot better off, but they did not do it. The worst thing that can happen to them is for the Democratic Party to clear its skirts and put this man out.

It looks as if they are trying to make a pallet for him to fall on. They are going to give him a little easing out. This headline appears in an article written by one of his defenders, writing in the Washington Post, day before yesterday, February 12. Over the column written by Mr. Elliott Thurston is this headline:

Farleyism is raising issue of good faith; party independents grow increasingly uneasy over new-deal political methods.

Further down in the article it is stated that they ought to take Farley out of the Postmaster General's Office and leave him in charge of the Democratic Party, and that in that capacity he could still dispense the patronage and about run things anyway, in that capacity, by getting out of the Postmaster General's Office.

I ask that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to sound this word of warning. Some of the gentlemen on this side of the Chamber propose that Mr. Farley get out of the Postmaster General's Office and stay in charge of the Democratic Party; but you cannot do that to us, not on your tintype. If he is not fit to be Postmaster General, he is not fit to be head of the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party, which to my country has been a pillar of fire by night and a pillar of cloud by day, through which we have rescued the country from every tragedy and from every scourge, will not be content to have its white banner, unsoiled and untarnished, carried in the smeared hands of James A. Farley. One would be as much an outrage performed against the common weal and welfare of this country as the other would be, and I sound the warning now, we will accept no such compromise as that. We have shown these facts here through admissions.

I send to the desk the article in the Scripps-Howard newspaper from which I have quoted, in order that it may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I understand, none of these requests for extensions of the Senator's remarks have been put to the question.

Mr. LONG. I will have them put now. I will ask that the articles which I have sent to the desk be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. I object.

Mr. LONG. I ask if it be the wish of the majority of the Senate, Mr. President, or if they have any objection to having these articles printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, instead of taking the time of the Senate to read them all now? I ask that the Senate be polled on that question viva voce, whether they would like me to read them, or let the short articles, they are not long, be printed in the RECORD without being read. Am I not entitled to a vote on that question, Mr. President? I am not familiar with the practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana to have the articles in question printed in the RECORD. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. LONG. The Senator called for a division too late, Mr. President. He is a great parliamentarian, but he asked for it too late.

Mr. CLARK. I ask for a division, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is asked for.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the division is taken I wish to say, regarding one of these articles, that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] handed it to me on yesterday and asked that it be inserted in the RECORD—I am referring to the Elliott Thurston article—because it does represent the independent thought of this country respecting Mr. Farley. I did not offer it, simply because I had not had an opportunity. I think the Senator from Louisiana is wholly entitled to have Mr. Thurston's article printed in the RECORD, and if the Senator from Nebraska were here I am certain that he would emphatically defend the demand, and request that the article be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is this question debatable?

Mr. COUZENS. A parliamentary inquiry!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the question debatable?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Missouri if he wishes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made a speech apparently in his own right.

Mr. LONG. I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I have no desire whatever to interfere with the right and courtesy customarily extended to any Senator to have documents printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of his remarks; but during the last 2 or 3 days the Senator from Louisiana has been pursuing a policy of making such unrestrained attacks of a most abusive character upon public officials, following it up at the last meeting of the Senate day before yesterday with an attempt to insert in the RECORD, by unanimous consent, a violent, abusive article about the same public officials, that I should like to know what the matter is which it is requested be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. I think the Senator is entitled to that explanation. I am only inserting the article from the Sunday Star of Sunday morning, March 11, 1934, containing an announcement of the Attorney General of the United States, and the reply issued to it by Mr. Sidlo's partner; the announcement in the Baltimore Sun on the 14th day of July 1934, of the loan by the R. F. C. to the B. & O. Railroad of $50,000,000; and the article in the Washington Post of the 12th day of this month, by Mr. Elliott Thurston, regarding the issue of Mr. Farley.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the insertion of those articles. What I had objection to was the practice of the Senator from Louisiana in saying that he would have articles inserted in the RECORD without disclosing what they were, and without the question being put to the United States Senate.

Mr. LONG. I beg the Senate's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana renew his request?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and the articles referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit B, article from Baltimore Sun; exhibit C, article by Mr. Elliott Thurston; exhibit E, article from Sunday Star.)

Mr. LONG. So now, Mr. President, there is in the RECORD what I ask every Senator to read. I ask Senators tomorrow morning, when they get their CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—because I wrote out the first three or four pages of my remarks today so that they might be quoted word for word and letter for letter of the law—I ask Senators, when they get their CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning, to open it up and peruse the quotations and the articles which I have inserted in the RECORD; and I say further to my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] that I have offered this article from the Scripps-Howard newspaper without for a moment consenting to the appelation that he sits here as a champion of Mr. Farley. I do not intend to have this matter tried out before the Post Office Committee as to what facts we are going to prove. I do not understand that to be their function. I do not understand that we are going to have all the supposed evidence submitted to that committee now, because there never has been such a procedure as that followed in history that I know anything about. So, Mr. President, I say further to my friends of the Senate and to these publications we are trying to do what is necessary for honest government. I resent the statement that the Senator from Tennessee is a partisan or that I am a partisan. Perhaps I brought about that accusation by my suggestion that both the Senator from Tennessee and I ought to be eliminated from this committee. I now revoke any such insinuations or propositions; and I will ask that this committee be constructed along the regular lines, without eliminating either the Senator from Tennessee or myself, but with the usual regard that is given in appointments under resolutions of this kind.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. When I introduced the resolution to investigate Harry Daugherty, who was at that time Attorney General of the United States, I asked and secured a special committee to investigate the charges, and I myself was a member of that committee. I saw nothing inappropriate in my acting in that capacity, and I conducted the investigation myself. There were 3 Republicans and, as I recall, 2 Democrats upon that committee. The investigation was not sent to the Judiciary Committee at all at that time. We asked first for a special committee of the Senate to be selected from the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That was prior to 1930, was it not?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. In 1930 the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Fess, offered and secured the adoption of an amendment to the rule by which, whenever a resolution was introduced calling either for an investigation or for other substantive action which created a charge on the contingent fund of the Senate, either direct or indirect, such resolution must be sent to the committee having charge of it, and they must first pass on it. There has been a change in the rule since the Senator presented his resolution concerning Mr. Daugherty.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I understand that that change in the rules has taken place. What I meant to suggest, however, was that had that particular investigation—and I think the Senator will agree with me—gone to the Judiciary Committee there never would have been an investigation of the Department of Justice at that time. However, we insisted upon a special committee being appointed, and it was appointed by the Senate.

I think it is perfectly proper under the rules—and I have no fault at all to find with the procedure—that the resolution should go to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; but there is nothing wrong, I submit to the Senate, in asking that a special committee of the Senate of the United States be designated in this particular instance.

So far as I am concerned, while it is inconceivable to me that the Postmaster General should do many of the things which have been charged to him in this instance, notwithstanding that fact, I submit that when charges of the character that have been made are made on the floor of the Senate, the Senate owes it to itself, and the Postmaster General owes it to himself, to want a fair and impartial investigation made; and if the Senator who makes those charges desires a special committee, I think a special committee should be appointed for that purpose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I said that this resolution was passed in 1930. I am in error about that. It was passed on January 20, 1932, when the rules were changed as I have suggested.

Mr. LONG. Yes; I had understood that. The matter was called to my attention the other day. I say, though, Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, prior to yielding to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], that my statement on the floor of the Senate as to changing the rule and the custom has been objected to by certain Senators; and as to that part I ask the Senate to consider that I entirely withdraw my suggestion as to the personnel and expect the customary rules to be followed in the selection of the committee. I hope, Mr. President, when this investigation is held, that that which I do not expect to happen will happen, and it will be found that there is not a word of truth in these statements, not even in those made in defense of Mr. Farley, which show a clear violation of the law. I hope that will be found to be the case. It will not hurt me. Go ahead.

I should like to see the people of the United States have some confidence restored in Government which they do not have now in certain quarters. I wish the people of the

United States, falling on their knees at night to pray to Almighty God, could believe there is purity, honesty, and righteousness in every part of the Government fabric and particularly at the top. But, ah, Mr. President, when we allow the tarnish of wreckage, when we allow the pollution of the souls of men to be inflicted upon these people from the very sunlight itself, when we allow it to be spewed among them that the crooked tactics condemned by law, for which all men should serve criminal terms, are none the less proper to be practiced by a man holding in one hand expenditures and in the other hand the dispensation of justice, what can we expect in the way, manner, or form of confidence in Government from the minds and souls of men, women, and children, 125,000,000 of them, scattered throughout the length and breadth of this land?

I did not admire Mr. Coolidge. I was not one of his admirers. I know he was probably a man of good motives; but he held Daugherty in the Cabinet just so long as he dared to hold him, until the fire got so close that he had to make him go. He held him there at the cost of many Senators' political lives, for many a man who served with distinction in the United States Senate had to go the way of the missing, owing to the defense he undertook to make of Harry Daugherty and the corruption that he fostered in the United States. So many a man was sacrificed.

The time, Mr. President, to defend a man is when he is in a position to have a defense made for him. I have been subjected to impeachment proceedings. I selected as my counsel in the trial of the impeachment my colleague [Mr. OVERTON], who sits in the Senate, subject to the understanding that when he was even remotely convinced that there was one slight taint of corruption about my official conduct as Governor of the State of Louisiana he would immediately withdraw as my counsel of record. I went through that, not once but twice; and today, if we are to have this kind of thing continue and the newspapers are to flaunt in their columns that there is a Farley bloc in the Senate bent upon keeping him from being exposed, that is almost like pleading guilty to an indictment; that is not only Farley's plea of guilty to the indictment but it puts the United States Senate itself on trial. It pleads the guilt of the Senate that the man who himself undertakes to prevent trial has in the Senate confederates conspiring to keep him from standing trial.

Those are charges reflecting upon the integrity and the honor of every man sitting in this body, that in these matters of such taint and rottenness and fraud and corruption and pollution partisans are undertaking to shield this investigation for fear of disclosures that must of necessity come to light.

God forbid the day that this honorable body, composed of honorable men, will consider that it must shield corruption, slime, and filth affecting 125,000,000 born and many yet to be born. God forbid that the Senate may ever justly be accused of having undertaken to thwart or to prevent the facts being brought out and the disclosures made concerning the character of public conduct of this man.

I thank the Senate.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Herald Tribune of Oct. 27, 1934]

TEXT OF MOSES-HUNTER LETTERS INVOLVING STRAUS CHARGE

The texts of Russell H. Hunter's letter to Robert Moses on the Hillside housing development and Mr. Moses' reply follow:

OCTOBER 19, 1934.

Hon. ROBERT MOSES,
State Office Building,
80 Centre Street, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I have been amazed at the statement carried in the afternoon's papers of October 17, 1934, attributed to you in connection with the Hillside housing development and the alleged patronage which resulted in the award of large contracts to the General Builders Supply Co., of which James A. Farley was the head and in which you allege he is still interested; and to the further fact that the employment of labor on this enterprise was controlled by Edward J. Flynn.

The fact that you refer to the enterprise as nearly $8,000,000 in value and that the loan was received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is as inaccurate as your information on the other two subjects.

This company in years past has done a large business with the General Builders Supply Co. for the obvious reason that a builder of large buildings is very likely to use the largest building supply organization on a large part of his work, but on this enterprise the amount of business placed with them was but one-fifth of the total.

PUTS COST AT $5,700,000

The building contracts on the Hillside housing development are but slightly over $4,000,000, and the entire project is but approximately $5,700,000, the loan on which was made, not by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.

It is a requirement of the loan agreement that the subcontracts be awarded to the lowest bidder, with sealed bids opened in the presence of a representative of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works and the New York State Board of Housing and that all contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidders under the specific supervision of the Government authorities.

The largest material contract was for portland cement, and the General Builders Supply Corporation got no part of this order. The next largest contract was for brick, which was divided in equal thirds among three material supply companies, of which the General Builders Supply Co. received one-third.

Under the loan agreement with the Government, it is provided that employment be given, where they are qualified, to ex-service men with dependents, and then in the following manner: To citizens of the United States and aliens who have declared their intentions of becoming citizens who are bona fide residents of the State of New York and/or county of Bronx, State of New York.

The interpretation which has been placed upon these preferences is that veterans receive the bulk of the employment.

The building trades in New York have been working under agreements with unions for a great number of years, and under these agreements the employment is kept largely in the hands of the union organizations. Our loan contract with the Government provides "that organized labor, skilled and unskilled, shall not be required to register at local employment agencies, but shall be secured in the customary way through the recognized union locals." Since practically all labor in building trades is organized labor, the employment has been done on this job in the customary way through the recognized union locals.

ASSERTS FLYNN NEVER ASKED FOR HELP

We have never, directly or indirectly, received a request from Mr. Flynn to put a single man to work on this job.

We have never guaranteed the cost as part of the agreement with the Government for the loan, and have resisted the efforts of petty politicians to have their henchmen put to work, consistently and regularly, to such an extent that I can assure you there is not a single workman on the job who was placed there by political preference of any kind.

I am reluctant to believe you would make the statements attributed to you, unless you had been grossly misinformed by someone, and am therefore placing the facts before you in the hope that you will correct the erroneous position in which you have placed yourself, and I should be very glad to hear from you on the subject.

Very truly yours,

R. H. HUNTER, *Vice President.*

REPLY FROM MOSES

Mr. Moses made public the following reply to Mr. Hunter's letter:

OCTOBER 26, 1934.

RUSSELL H. HUNTER, Esq.,
Vice President Starrett Bros. & Eken,
Fifth Avenue and Thirty-fourth Street, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of October 19 with reference to the Hillside housing development. There is not a word of truth in your reply.

I assume that you were writing a self-serving letter for the record to protect Senator Straus and your company, not to speak of the other people in the background.

I did not make the statements you referred to as to the source of your loan and as to the amount. I know perfectly well how your loan was obtained, and I have the general figures. You know that I was the chairman of the State emergency public works commission appointed by Governor Lehman, and that every application to the R. F. C. went through our hands until the R. F. C. was superseded by the P. W. A. You know perfectly well that Senator Straus originally made his application to us for this loan and that he did not obtain the loan through us, but later, after the R. F. C. records were turned over to the P. W. A. Why quibble about a lot of foolish, inconsequential details?

MOSES WANTS NO SPOOFING

I know all about the sealed bids and subcontracts. I did not say that the General Builders' Supply Co. received more than one-third of any particular order. I said that Mr. Farley was declared in on it, and that he controls a group of supply companies which monopolize the market. You know this is true, and that the N. R. A. code business has made this monopoly even stronger than it was before. What is the difference as to just how they divide it up among themselves on this or that occasion? You know how it is divided up. You are in the building business. Don't try to spoof me about it, or the public.

As to the matter of employment, I am fully aware of the rules about citizens, aliens, residents of the State, veterans, etc. The

fact still remains that the employment was largely done by Mr. Flynn through Mr. Flynn's man, Keegan, who was wished on you by Flynn. You know perfectly well who Mr. Keegan is and why he was put there, and you know that all kinds of political preference can be exercised within the Federal rules. Did you approve of the appointment of Mr. Keegan? Did it look good to you? When you say that you have never, directly or indirectly, received a request from Mr. Flynn to put a single man on the job, you know you are simply evading the whole question. Mr. Keegan is Mr. Flynn's man. Do you happen to know Mr. Fitzpatrick, who is Mr. Flynn's shadow, and will you have the effrontery to say that he had nothing to do with this job?

FINDS PRICE OF LAND EXCESSIVE

Let me ask you something else while we are on the subject. What do you think of the price for land paid to Senator Straus? When the senator originally talked to me about this project he told me that it was primarily philanthropic and that his heart just bled to provide cheap houses for the people in the Bronx. I had no time to go into the details of the matter then and no machinery to make a check on his figures. I thought it was worth while getting work under way even if the projects were a long way from perfect, and I assumed that he was not going to profiteer at anybody's expense.

Since then I have heard some very strange things about the price at which the land was put in. Is it not true that this land belonged to the Straus family for a long time; that, in fact, it is part of an estate; that the family was stuck with this land and could not dispose of it; that it brought in nothing; that it was sold to the limited dividend company at a price in excess of what it could possibly bring on the market; that the price paid was over twice the assessed valuation just fixed by the city for tax purposes for the following year? You know there was plenty of land to be obtained for the assessed valuation. I bought playground land for the city on this basis in every borough. The difference meant about $200,000 to Senator Straus.

Is it not true that Senator Straus held out all the valuable frontage on the Boston Post Road so as to cash in on it by building stores and other commercial developments to be patronized by the tenants when the housing development is completed, and that what he sold to the company was nothing but back land?

DISCUSSES OSTRICHES

The Straus corporation which sold this land was called the "Ostrich Realty Corporation." An ostrich is supposed to be a bird that sticks its head in the sand and doesn't know what is going on. Perhaps all of the people of the city are not ostriches.

If Senator Straus made no claim to be anything more than a very slick trader, and if he admitted that he bargained with the very political leaders he is opposing in the municipal election, I should have a good deal more respect for him. When, however, he pretends to be a philanthropist, civic champion, and uplifter, it becomes a little disgusting.

I trust that when Governor Lehman accepts the nomination of the Liberal Party at the hands of Senator Straus he will explain the Hillside land matter and the connection of Farley and Flynn with the patronage and building racket.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT MOSES.

UNLOADED FAMILY LAND FOR HILLSIDE HOUSING PROJECT AT DOUBLE ITS VALUE, CANDIDATE SAYS; GOVERNOR IS TOLD TO SHUN TAMMANY; INDEPENDENTS, DEMANDING SHOWDOWN, CHARGE HALL USES EXECUTIVE'S PRESTIGE FOR OWN ENDS

Robert Moses, Republican candidate for Governor, charged yesterday that Nathan Straus, leader of the anti-Tammany Liberal Party, supporting both Gov. Herbert H. Lehman and Comptroller Joseph D. McGoldrick, used the Hillside housing project in the Bronx for his personal profit to the extent of $200,000 and still had further profits in prospect. The project is financed by Federal loans.

Simultaneously, the Liberal Party warned Governor Lehman that Tammany Hall, in whose headquarters Governor Lehman opened his campaign, was undertaking to use him for its own purposes, and that the independent Democrats of the city do not want to hear him speak under Tammany auspices.

NO TRUTH IN LETTER, SAYS MOSES

Mr. Moses made his charges against Mr. Straus in an exchange of letters between himself and Russell H. Hunter, vice president of Starrett Bros. & Eken, contractors for the Hillside project. Mr. Hunter's letter protested against a previous attack of Mr. Moses charging that the General Builders Supply Co., in which Postmaster General James A. Farley, chairman of the Democratic National and State Committees, is interested, had received substantial awards for materials, and that Mr. Farley and Edward J. Flynn, Democratic leader of the Bronx and Governor Lehman's secretary of state, had used the project for patronage and political purposes.

Mr. Moses acknowledged receipt of Mr. Hunter's protest and said, "There is not a word of truth in your reply."

Mr. Moses reiterated his charges that the Hillside project was being used for political purposes. In addition, he charged flatly that Mr. Straus had sold his family property to the Hillside Holding Corporation for twice its assessed valuation and had withheld the frontage along the Boston Post Road.

FORESEES NEW PROFITS

The post-road frontage, according to Mr. Moses, will be highly valuable for business purposes when the housing project is completed and tenanted.

Mr. Moses said that, as Governor Lehman's chairman of the State Emergency Public Works Commission, he was told by Mr. Straus, applying for a loan, that the Hillside project was primarily philanthropic and that his heart just bled to provide cheap houses for the people in the Bronx. The loan was later obtained from the Federal Government.

"If Senator Straus made no claim to be anything more than a very slick trader, and if he had admitted that he bargained with the very political leaders he is opposing in the municipal election", Mr. Moses commented, "I should have a great deal more respect for him. When, however, he pretends to be a philanthropic, civic champion and uplifter, it becomes a little disgusting."

Mr. Straus' reply, when informed of the Moses letter, was to wish Mr. Moses luck in his campaign.

Answering the previous denial of Mr. Straus' associates that they had consulted or been influenced by the Flynn political machine in giving employment for political purposes, Mr. Moses named specifically Thomas F. Fitzpatrick, secretary of the Bronx County Democratic Committee, and Charles E. Keegan, who was secretary to Joseph V. McKee as president of the board of aldermen, as political contact men.

The "limited dividend company" referred to in Mr. Moses' letter was understood to be the Hillside Holding Corporation, which by law would be limited to a dividend of 6 percent. The price alleged to have been paid for the land was $412,090, in securities of the purchasing company. The assessed valuation of the property in 1933 was reported at $233,100, and in 1934 at $201,300.

If Governor Lehman continued to accept the support of the Liberal Party, Mr. Moses expressed the hope that he would explain the whole matter.

STRAUS COMMENT ON LETTERS

Mr. Straus made the following comment on the letters:

"Bob Moses will be in the limelight for another 10 days and is entitled to all the fun he can get out of it. As one of his oldest friends, and the man who sponsored his entire park program in the State senate, I wish him all the luck in the world."

The Liberal Party statement demanding a show-down between Governor Lehman and Tammany Hall as a result of the Governor's two speaking engagements in Queens was issued by Langdon W. Post, tenement house commissioner, an associate of Mr. Straus in the Liberal Party.

The statement follows:

"Tammany Hall is trying to make capital of Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, not to serve him. When its attempt at gag rule failed and Governor Lehman insisted he would speak at the Liberal Party rally in Flushing High School on Wednesday, October 31, Tammany today showed its disregard for his welfare by assigning him a speaking engagement on the same platform the night previous. Common-sense rules of campaign management dictate against any such waste of his time and indicate that he should reach as many population centers as possible. But Tammany is playing Tammany's game and not Mr. Lehman's. The move is typical of the stupid arrogance and cynical selfishness which the city got itself rid of last fall. Tammany out of office has learned no lesson and acts just as Tammany in office acted.

"If Tammany really has Governor Lehman's interests at heart, there is still time for it to arrange for a different auditorium on Tuesday night. It is impossible for us to do so Wednesday night, as no other auditorium of sufficient size is available. As things stand, Tammany seems to have brought on a show-down. After the two meetings Tammany will have evidence that there is a great element of independent Democrats in Queens who want to support Governor Lehman but would not support Tammany under any conditions. They want to hear him, but they do not want to hear him under Tammany auspices. The present public-be-damned and Lehman-be-damned attitude taken by Tammany about the Queens rally is in itself sufficient explanation of why this is so."

The statement was issued after a meeting of the steering committee, consisting of Mr. Post, City Chamberlain A. A. Berle, Jr., and Mr. Straus, with the Liberal Party leaders of Queens.

"I was present at two conferences with the Board when they dictated letters to Governor Lehman on this subject. I know exactly what was in these letters. I suggest that either the housing board or governor Lehman make public the letters written to the Governor about Mr. Flynn. Governor Lehman has no control over Mr. Flynn as secretary of state, and he doesn't even know where he is for weeks at a time.

"It is no answer to my statements to say that Jim Farley's firm only got a fraction of the building contracts. Everyone knows that the General Builders Supply people control most of the building materials in this community outside of gravel, sand, and trap rock, and that they have intimate relations with the people who control that branch. The General Builders Supply is a good deal of a racket. If you plan to build anything, you play with them or you don't build."

Earlier yesterday Commissioner Moses discussed, acrimoniously, Governor Lehman's appearance and address at the Tammany Hall rally of the night before.

"He attacked the old guard and promised to make the Tammany boys the lifeguards of the State", the Republican gubernatorial nominee commented. "While he is denouncing the old guard and appropriating the post of generalissimo of the Tammany forces, he should call the roll of some of his own staff.

"First, there would answer Gen. John Boyd Thacher, who made the notification speech on Monday and who for the last 8 years has been the mayor of the O'Connell brothers' conquered province

of Albany. He has a fine, progressive, independent, forward-looking organization without an old guardsman in it, and consisting entirely of enthusiastic young amateurs and idealists, bent on improving the slot-machine racket, the baseball pool, and the beer-running game.

"Next would answer General Farley, of the builders' supply corps. Then Gen. Eddie Flynn, an impractical young political dreamer, and Gen. Vincent Dailey, that alabaster box of precious political ointment. Then there is General Dooling, a raw recruit with only two generations of Tammany district leadership back of him, not to speak of Gen. Basil O'Connor (President Roosevelt's former law partner), another political idealist, absent last night on department business—a new dealer who deals them from the bottom of the pack.

"All of them, of course, Sir Galahads of the young guard. Give them a Tammany legislature and see what they will do to the State."

EXHIBIT B

[From the Baltimore Sun of Saturday morning, July 14, 1934]

B. & O. TO FLOAT 5-YEAR NOTES OF $50,000,000—R. F. C. AGREES TO TAKE ANY PART OF LOAN UNABSORBED BY PUBLIC—STOCK OF READING TO BE COLLATERAL—MONEY TO BE USED TO MEET MATURITIES AND CLEAR BANK OBLIGATIONS

By J. F. Essary

WASHINGTON, July 13.—Financial plans of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, involving a $50,000,000 5-year 4½-percent note issue, worked out in cooperation with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, were announced here late today.

Under this plan the carrier is given a guaranty that the R. F. C. will loan any part of the sum which it is proposed to raise that the money market does not put up, but it is stipulated that the market must be felt out by the company before coming back to Washington.

This is the first piece of financing of the sort to be undertaken by a railroad, or to be participated in by the R. F. C. There have been other loans to railroads by this corporation, to be sure, but none on such terms as are laid down.

TO PUT UP READING STOCK

Another interesting fact is that the Baltimore & Ohio, in order to get this money, is virtually "hocking" control of the Reading Railway. It is putting up as collateral more than 1,000,000 shares—common and preferred—in the Reading Co., along with $38,000,000 of its own 6-percent bonds, to secure the new note issue.

The Baltimore & Ohio has heavy holdings in the Reading, holdings which it has been accumulating over a long period of years with the ultimate expectation of absorbing that property into the Baltimore & Ohio system. The par value of Reading stock given to secure the present loan is given as more than $56,000,000. No value is placed in today's statement upon the bonds offered as additional collateral.

JONES ANNOUNCES AGREEMENT

Negotiations for this loan have been in progress between the B. & O. and the R. F. C. for some time, and today their consummation was announced in a statement by Jesse H. Jones, chairman of the corporation. In this statement Mr. Jones said:

"The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. authorized its bankers, Messrs. Kuhn, Loeb & Co. and Messrs. Speyer & Co., to sell, as agents for the road, a $50,000,000, 5-year, 4½-percent secured note issue at par and accrued interest. The present approximate market value of the collateral securing the issue is 170 percent of the loan and consists of 232,000 shares (par value $11,600,000) first preferred stock of the Reading Co.; 332,000 shares (par value $16,600,000) second preferred stock of the Reading Co. (each share being convertible, at option of the Reading Co., into one-half share first preferred stock and one-half share common stock); 566,000 shares (par value $28,300,000) common stock of the Reading Co.; and $38,000,000 principal amount, refunding and general mortgage 6-percent bonds, series E, due April 1, 2000, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.

DIVIDENDS EXCEED INTEREST

"The dividends as presently being paid by the Reading Co. on the stock which in part secures this issue exceed the interest requirements on these notes.

"The bankers' charge, including their expenses incident to offering the issue, is to be 1 percent of the face value of the notes sold by them. The proceeds of the issue will be utilized to pay at maturity $17,500,000, 2-year, 6 percent notes held by the public due on August 10, and the balance is for payment of $25,500,000 due the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on August 10 and for other corporate purposes, including payment of temporary bank loans aggregating $4,275,000, the latter sum being the railroad company's entire indebtedness of this character.

R. F. C. AGREES TO EXTEND HELP

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has agreed, subject to approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to lend the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. at the same rate and terms any part of the $50,000,000 issue that the banks do not sell; that is, 99 percent of the face value of the notes, or at a gross cost to the railroad company of 4.70-percent interest, including bankers' commissions and expenses.

"By handling these notes on this basis the bankers are cooperating with the administration in reducing interest rates.

"The negotiations, which have been under way for several weeks, were concluded in New York City by Chairman Jones, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Mr. G. M. Shriver, senior vice president, acting for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and Mr. George W. Bovenizer, for the bankers."

EXHIBIT C

[From the Washington Post of Feb. 12, 1935]

FARLEYISM IS RAISING ISSUE OF GOOD FAITH—PARTY INDEPENDENTS GROW INCREASINGLY UNEASY OVER NEW-DEAL POLITICAL METHOD

By Elliott Thurston

Men in and out of public life who are independents in politics, who hoped the new deal would accomplish political as well as other reforms, who appreciate the difficulties and are therefore loath to criticize, find themselves unable to explain or defend President Roosevelt's tolerance of what has come to be branded in current political parlance as Farleyism.

Independents who have supported the President, who would like to continue to support him, find this issue constantly obtruding. It raises in their minds a vitally important question of good faith. They are not only unable to offer satisfactory explanation or excuse when the issue is brought up, as it is bound to be sooner or later in discussions of the new deal, but they are sincerely troubled about their future course. They do not see how they can consistently support an administration which continues to countenance political practices and methods incompatible with good government.

Rather they find it increasingly difficult to justify to themselves and to others their continued support of an administration that has so far failed in a reform upon which the success of all other reformation, and in fact the very survival of this Government, depends.

Not even the most ardent of party loyalists can make what is implied by Farleyism square with the urgent, undeniable need for the best procurable brains if the Government is to function successfully now that it has assumed vast new administrative responsibilities. The issue presents itself repeatedly. Currently the spoilsmen, openly encouraged by the disarmingly candid Mr. Farley, threaten to raid such of the relief, reform, and recovery agencies as have so far escaped their influence.

This is nothing new to be sure. It is only another manifestation of the familiar appetite for patronage. It is only another aspect of that political theory by which the new deal could appeal in 1932 for the support of independent voters and "nominal" but dissatisfied Republicans, and then by 1934 turn a cold shoulder toward some of the most prominent independents who accepted the appeal in all sincerity.

How can politically independent men and women in or out of office who wish the new deal well, who would like to be able to continue to have confidence in it, reconcile the President's protestations with the performance? Is the answer that Mr. Roosevelt wants to carry through the political reforms which he has so often urged, but that he dares not run the risk of disturbing the political machine until he is reelected? Is Mr. Farley's occupancy of dual political and official roles, denounced by the President and denied to others, a matter of expediency until after 1936?

Even that assumption, which is the most charitable explanation possible, offers scant assurance for those independents who would like to retain faith but find it fading in the face of what has happened and what is still happening. For the question of good faith reaches beyond the issue of patronage or political reform. Just as the credibility of a witness in court is impaired by an exhibition of duplicity, so the new deal's contradictions between words and deeds serve to undermine confidence in other promises and professed intentions.

Because Mr. Roosevelt has publicly espoused the merit system, because he has solicited support on the ground that the national interest transcends partisanship and party interest, because he has selected and supported in many cases appointees who have been chosen for competence, regardless of politics, he has led a large following among the independents to expect from him the same courage in effecting political reform, the same willingness to break with what in this case is a dishonored tradition, that he has displayed in dealing with other reforms. Failure on this score fills them with misgivings that will not and should not down.

Another Presidential race is not so far away. Whether there will be another conference of progressives remains to be seen. In any event, the question of credibility, of sincerity, raised by the political practices of which Mr. Farley is a symbol can hardly be ignored. Some of the independents feel, and cannot be blamed for feeling, disillusioned. Some no doubt are permanently embittered and estranged. Others, while disappointed in the political performance as measured against the promise, are probably prepared to make the best of a bad situation, if no greater hope of reform is offered.

Nevertheless, they are now disquieted and disturbed as they view the political horizons. They would prefer to be told frankly that the past performance is a matter of expediency, than to be led to wonder whether they have been misled; than to have no answer to an insistent, inescapable question. To such independents the continuance of Farleyism can only be a challenge to good government and to good faith.

EXHIBIT D

[From the Washington Daily News of Feb. 14, 1935]

DEMOCRATIC CHIEFS PONDER SAFE COURSE IN LONG-FARLEY ROW; POLITICAL POTENTIALITIES OF DISPUTE MAY CAUSE SENATE TO CONSIDER CHARGES

By Thomas L. Stokes

The feud between Huey Long and Jim Farley has the Capital by the ears, awaiting the next move.

It has all sorts of political potentialities, involving even the 1936 Presidential election.

Resenting the Louisiana Senator's vicious attacks on the Postmaster General, administration leaders have been jockeyed into a delicate position by the Kingfish's demand for an investigation of Farley activities, including the letting of contracts for the New York City post-office annex.

AWARE OF HIS PLANS

They are fully aware of the Senator's intention to carry on his war against the administration by striking at its chief politician, and thus to promote LONG's own campaign for the Presidency.

But they also know that to shield the Postmaster General from an inquiry would merely give LONG an excuse for further tirades.

The issue rests temporarily in the Senate Post Office Committee, which is padded with many of Farley's friends, but it must come back before the Senate for a decision sooner or later.

WILL CONSIDER DEMAND

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR (Democrat, of Tennessee), chairman of this committee and one of Farley's champions in the Senate, said today he would call his committee together in a day or two to consider LONG's resolution for an inquiry.

LONG will be invited before the committee to state the grounds for his charges. The committee then must report back to the Senate, either to recommend an investigation or to report there is no basis for one. The vote will come upon acceptance of this report, whatever it may be.

When the committee reports to the Senate, there will be an opportunity to ascertain the truth of rumors that Republicans are secretly egging the Louisiana Senator along in his warfare on the administration. It is no secret that they are delighted at the embarrassment he causes from time to time.

Democrats say that behind the reported Republican encouragement of LONG is a hope that he will run as an independent for President in 1936 and wean away enough votes from Roosevelt to give the Republicans a chance.

EXHIBIT E

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of Sunday morning, Mar. 11, 1934]

UNITED STATES PREPARES TO ACT AGAINST A. W. MELLON IN TAX-EVASION DRIVE; JIMMY WALKER, THOMAS S. LAMONT, AND OTHERS NAMED IN CUMMINGS' ANNOUNCEMENT; ALUMINUM CO. SCRUTINIZED; 3-YEAR LIMIT TO APPLY; JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZES DISTRICT ATTORNEYS TO ASK INDICTMENTS BY GRAND JURIES

By the Associated Press

Criminal proceedings for alleged tax evasion against Andrew W. Mellon, former Secretary of the Treasury, and James J. Walker, former mayor of New York City, are to be instituted soon by the Justice Department.

Attorney General Cummings made this announcement last night, adding that similar proceedings also would be brought against Thomas S. Lamont, member of a prominent New York banking firm, and Thomas L. Sidlo, law partner of Newton D. Baker, Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of War.

The cases, Mr. Cummings said, have been referred to the Federal attorneys at New York, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland "with authority for presentation to grand juries under the laws against tax evasion and avoidance."

In addition, the Attorney General announced the department was inquiring into the practices of the Aluminum Co. of America, a Mellon-controlled concern, which he has characterized as "a 100-percent monopoly in the producing field."

OTHERS FORECAST

Assistant Attorney General Frank J. Wideman, head of the newly created tax division of the Department, said other cases of a similar nature were pending for trial and still others in course of preparation.

The Justice Department said that possible penalties for filing a false income-tax return range up to $10,000 in fines or 5 years in prison or both.

The Department said the 3-year statute of limitations covers such cases, indicating that should indictments be returned they would have to be confined to acts committed within the past 3 years.

Martin J. Conboy, United States attorney for the southern district of New York, conferred with Attorney General Cummings this week and presumably the cases against Lamont and Walker were discussed at that time.

District Attorney Horatio S. Dumbauld, of the western Pennsylvania district, will take care of proceedings against Mellon and Emerich B. Freed, of the northern Ohio district, will present the case against Sidlo to the grand jury there.

ACCUSED BY M'FADDEN

Mellon, for years an outstanding figure in the world of business and finance, became with the return of the Republican Party to power in 1920 equally prominent in public life. He served under three Presidents until named by Hoover as Ambassador at London.

Mellon is one of the wealthiest men in the country. His interests, centering in the Mellon National Bank and Union Trust Co. of Pittsburgh, trace a course throughout the Nation's industrial structure.

The Aluminum Co. of America has long been the target of monopoly charges in its field. The Mellon interests also control Gulf Oil and have huge holdings in the steel mills and coal mines of Pennsylvania.

In May last year, Representative McFadden, Republican, Pennsylvania, in a statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, accused Mellon of "an apparent evasion" of personal income taxes while Secretary of the Treasury, which McFadden said in a single instance involved more than $1,000,000.

The private finances of former Mayor Walker of New York were conspicuous in the removal proceedings against him in 1932 before Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York. Walker resigned at the height of the inquiry which grew out of a legislative investigation of the municipal government of New York City, directed by Samuel Seabury.

The crux of the financial transactions was the dealings of Walker and the mysterious Russell T. Sherwood, who was missing at the time of the removal proceedings. Sherwood dramatically reappeared in New Jersey in 1933 and was a witness before a Federal grand jury in New York City. Walker denied Sherwood was his business agent and handled hundreds of thousands of dollars for him, as charged by Seabury.

Sherwood's reappearance prompted grand jury questioning by George Z. Medalie, then United States attorney in New York City. There were reports that Walker's tax returns were scrutinized at that time.

Walker has been living in Europe for more than 18 months.

LAMONT MORGAN MEMBER

Thomas S. Lamont is a son of Thomas W. Lamont, and, like his father, is a member of the banking firm of J. P. Morgan & Co.

War on tax evaders officially was declared December 30 when Attorney General Cummings created the tax division in order to combine more effectively Federal agencies charged with enforcing the law.

This step was believed to have been taken in part as the result of the acquittal of Charles E. Mitchell, former head of the National City Bank of New York, on charges of income-tax evasion. That trial was one of the first of its kind to have been held since enactment of the income-tax law.

The Mellon case arose when a suit was brought against him in the District of Columbia, in which certain charges were made against the former Secretary. Later a resolution was introduced in the Senate asking the Department of Justice to investigate, and other requests came from the House. As a result of this, the Department undertook the investigation. Ordinarily the Department of Justice has not conducted such investigations, leaving them to the Treasury.

Under the present circumstances, as regards the Mellon case, the Department of Justice has moved with the knowledge and approval of the Treasury Department.

AMOUNTS KEPT SECRET

The Justice Department said the Treasury had full information about all four cases and was working in cooperation with the Department of Justice in getting material ready for presentation to the grand juries.

Justice officials would not say how much money was involved nor what years the alleged violations of the income-tax laws took place, explaining it was just such information which the Government wished kept secret for the purposes of prosecution.

Young Lamont told the Senate Banking Committee in June 1933 his wife purchased stock he sold at the end of 1930, the sale enabling him to deduct $114,807 from his 1930 taxable income. He said she had paid cash for the stock and borrowed an equal amount of money from him.

There was no understanding, he said, that he would repurchase the stock. But he acknowledged that he did buy back the shares at about the same price Mrs. Lamont had paid.

"I was advised", young Lamont testified, "that under these circumstances I was fully within my rights in deducting from my income returns for the year 1930 the amount of loss sustained."

At that time the 34-year-old banker also asserted the Internal Revenue Bureau had reviewed the transactions and made no complaint.

DRIVE LAUNCHED

At the conclusion of the Morgan hearings Guy T. Helvering, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, announced a drive to prevent loss-showing stock sales designed to "evade or reduce" income-tax payments.

Legislation to tighten the income-tax laws is pending in the present Congress.

MELLON AVOIDS COMMENT—FORMER STATEMENTS BLAMED POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

PITTSBURGH, March 10 (A. P.).—Andrew W. Mellon, former Secretary of the Treasury, received reporters tonight in his house slippers, commented on the cold weather and snowstorm, but refused to say anything about tax prosecutions which Attorney General Cummings announced will be undertaken against him.

"I have nothing to say—it just wouldn't suit me to say anything", said the 79-year-old financier.

He appeared in perfect health, remaining standing while he talked.

Asked if he had expected the suit, he asserted, "Oh, no; oh, no. I don't want to be quoted now."

RECENTLY BLAMED POLITICS

In a recent talk with the Associated Press, during which investigations of his income tax were known to be under way, Mellon said he considered the move as "pure political propaganda."

"Both the question of income taxes and the Aluminum Co. of America have been threshed out time and again in so-called 'investigations' and in the courts", the former Treasury Secretary said then.

"Election time is approaching. The Democrats are anxious to swing Pennsylvania into their column. They are straining to aid their cause.

FOLLOWED POLITICAL CAREER

"As a recognized figure in Republican circles, they are aiming propaganda at me, but really firing at my party.

"Remember, I was in business more than 50 years before I assumed a public office in 1921, and that all the attacks began after that date."

United States District Attorney H. S. Dumbault said he has not been advised of the papers in the Mellon prosecution being forwarded from Washington.

CONBOY IS SILENT—LAMONT REPORTED TO BE OUT OF CITY

NEW YORK, March 10.—Martin J. Conboy, United States attorney for the southern New York district, declined tonight to comment on charges of tax evasion by James J. Walker, former mayor, and Thomas S. Lamont, member of the J. P. Morgan Co.

Conboy said he had not received official notice of Attorney General Cummings' order to present the cases to the grand jury.

Lamont was reported to be out of the city and could not be reached for comment.

"COMPROMISE" OFFERED—SIDLO'S PARTNER SURPRISED BY APPARENT REFUSAL

CLEVELAND, March 10.—Commenting on the Department of Justice's projected criminal prosecution of Thomas L. Sidlo for alleged evasion of income taxes, Paul Patterson, one of his partners in a prominent Cleveland law firm, asserted tonight Sidlo had made to the Government what is technically known as an "offer in compromise."

Sidlo was reported by his associates to be at the home of Robert P. Scripps in southern California.

Asserting the Justice Department's intention to prosecute Sidlo is "a surprise to me", Patterson said, "while I knew the matter was being discussed in the Department of Justice, and, although I knew the Department was considering what is technically known as an "offer of compromise" by Mr. Sidlo, I had no inkling that the offer would be refused.

Mr. Sidlo's offer was to pay the entire amount alleged by the Government to be due and the 50-percent penalty plus interest. The question at issue is one of law surrounding the methods of claiming deductions from his gross income on account of losses which he, as a taxpayer, thought he was entitled to take.

"Notwithstanding that he believed it his entire right to take deductions for these losses, he did make the offer to the Government which covers tax, penalty, and interest, the maximum amount the Government could possibly recover in any action."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I withdraw the motion.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF RULES XXVI AND XXVII

Mr. McCARRAN. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read, with a view to having it immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 80), as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"3. Every bill and joint resolution reported from a committee shall lie over 2 days for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct."

Resolved further, That rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"3. It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report shall have been printed in the RECORD, and such report shall lie over 2 days for consideration, except on either of the 6 days preceding the end of a session."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, manifestly the resolution involves a matter of importance, and should go over. I object to its present consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON. It should go to the Committee on Rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand correctly that the Senator from Nevada desires the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the circumstances, I desire that it shall go over for 1 day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

EXTENSION OF AIR MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to Senate bill 932.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 932) authorizing the Postmaster General to extend certain air mail contracts for a further period not exceeding 6 months, which were, on page 1, to strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and insert: "That section 15 of the act entitled 'An act to revise air mail laws, and to establish a commission to make a report to the Congress recommending an aviation policy', approved June 12, 1934, as amended, is amended by striking out 'March 1, 1935', and inserting in lieu thereof 'April 1, 1936'"; and, on page 1, to strike out lines 9 to 11, inclusive.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON SPECTATOR AND MIRROR

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Spectator and Mirror.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I inquire what is the nature of the article presented by the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SCHALL. It has to do with a letter which I wrote to the President some time ago in response to a letter he addressed to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to see the article before it is ordered printed. Will not the Senator postpone his request until tomorrow?

Mr. SCHALL. If there is objection, I will do so, or I will have it read tomorrow or have it read now.

Mr. McKELLAR. For the present, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. TRAMMELL, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters in the State of Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER (for Mr. COPELAND), from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the following nominations:

Walter Herbert Bainbridge, of Texas (vice Charles Shaw, promoted), to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy);

Edward Bunyan Brown, Jr., of South Carolina (vice Walter Herbert Bainbridge, promoted), to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy) by promotion from aid (with relative rank of ensign in the Navy); and

William Noble Martin, of Oklahoma (vice Edward Bunyan Brown, Jr., promoted), to be aid (with relative rank of ensign in the Navy) by promotion from deck officer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar. If there be no further reports of committees, the calendar is in order. The legislative clerk will state the first nomination on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the post-office nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBINSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 15, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 14, 1935

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James D. McEachern, Brundige.
Levie C. Sirmon, Dozier.
Willie W. Whittaker, Flomaton.

GEORGIA

Howard Perry, Ellijay.
Jessie T. Freeman, Greenville.
Marion Lott, Hahira.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ray A. Hicks, Colebrook.
Harry W. Ladd, Plaistow.
James R. Kill Kelley, Wilton.

OKLAHOMA

Rosa B. Britton, Cyril.

TENNESSEE

Shelbin C. Malone, Henderson.

TEXAS

William D. Reed, Holland.
John W. Hardison, Whitney.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We lift our breath in prayer to Thee, O God. We thank Thee that the still, small voice speaks not in stormy haste. Thou dost arouse spiritual emotions in the patient, waiting soul. So, Heavenly Father, we look up to Thee, dreaming and doing, thinking and working, and we pray that the unity of these may exist in our thoughts, each keeping the other strong and pure. We beseech Thee to save us from the oppression that drowns and bewilders and to let fall Thy radiant beams upon our pathway. Inspire us with the love that honors law and with that power that lifts man upward. Heavenly Father, in the past Thou didst walk with our humanity "in the cool of the day amongst the trees in the garden." Be merciful to give us an abiding sense of Thy presence and let us hear Thy welcome footfall in the garden of our earthly lives. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2030. An act authorizing the States of Washington and Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho;

H. R. 2874. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Eleven Points River in section 17, township 23 north, range 2 west, approximately 12 miles east of Alton, on route no. 42, Oregon County, Mo.;

H. R. 3018. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 3057. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oklahoma to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Arkansas River south of the town of Sallisaw in Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties at a point approximately 15 miles north of Keota in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 3465. An act permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3891. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at Conway, S. C.;

H. R. 3983. An act to legalize a bridge (known as "Union Street Bridge") across the Dan River at Danville, Va.; and

H. R. 4018. An act to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 31. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Chester C. Groff;

S. 250. An act authorizing the Brookewell Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.;

S. 266. An act to provide for the erection of a public historical museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont.;

S. 274. An act for the relief of Charles C. Floyd;

S. 347. An act for the relief of James J. Jordan;

S. 567. An act for the relief of Sarah Lloyd;

S. 633. An act for the relief of Isaac Pierce;

S. 634. An act to authorize the sale of a portion of the Fort Smith National Cemetery Reservation, Ark., and for other purposes;

S. 651. An act for the relief of Harry Flanery;

S. 653. An act for the relief of James W. Carmichael, deceased;

S. 732. An act for the relief of Zinsser & Co.;

S. 733. An act for the relief of William Burke;

S. 735. An act for the relief of Wiener Bank Verein;

S. 737. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906, as amended;

S. 746. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Thomas, alias Joseph Thomas, alias Thomas O'Donnell;

S. 812. An act authorizing the Arizona State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll or free bridge across the Colorado River at or near Parker, Ariz., within the Colorado River Indian Reservation;

S. 871. An act authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Sgt. Alvin C. York as a major in the United States Army and then place him on the retired list;

S. 886. An act for the relief of Marino Ambrogi;

S. 887. An act for the relief of Edward T. Costello;

S. 888. An act for the relief of Joseph Gorman;

S. 889. An act for the relief of Albert A. Marquardt;

S. 890. An act for the relief of Michael J. Moran;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Hector H. Perry;

S. 893. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Sullivan;

S. 920. An act for the relief of Ruth J. Barnes;

S. 943. An act to amend section 21 of the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 945. An act to amend sections 11 and 24 of the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 999. An act for the relief of Judson B. Isbester;

S. 1009. An act for the relief of George W. Baker;

S. 1019. An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate

Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes;

S. 1076. An act relating to the Oregon-Washington Bridge Board of Trustees;

S. 1144. An act to further extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo.;

S. 1176. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Coyne;

S. 1222. An act to further extend the times for commencement and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.;

S. 1300. An act to amend the War Department appropriation act relative to the operation of motor-propelled vehicles;

S. 1301. An act to provide further for the maintenance of United States Soldiers' Home;

S. 1302. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army, and for other purposes;

S. 1304. An act to amend section 47c, National Defense Act, as amended, relating to military training required to entitled members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps to receive commutation of subsistence;

S. 1308. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill.;

S. 1309. An act to amend section 114 of the Judicial Code to provide for terms of District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin to be held at Wausau, Wis., and for other purposes;

S. 1336. An act to amend paragraph (f) of section 4 of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1342. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to Board of County Commissioners of Itasca County, Minn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the road between the villages of Cohasset and Deer River, Minn.;

S. 1348. An act for the relief of James Darcy;

S. 1519. An act permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia;

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate and report on the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and on all other companies engaged directly or indirectly in telephone communication in interstate commerce, including all companies related to any of these companies through a holding-company structure or otherwise; and

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the use of public parks, reservations, and other public spaces in the District of Columbia, and the use of tents, cots, hospital appliances, flags, and other decorations, property of the United States, by Washington (D. C.) 1935 Shrine Committee, Inc., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 932) entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to extend certain air-mail contracts for a further period not exceeding 6 months."

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND THE CITIZEN

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Division of Investigation of the Department of Justice, before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in New York on February 7.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman with what subject the speech deals?

Mr. CONNERY. Law enforcement and the citizen.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

I am here today to talk of matters vital to the peace and happiness of the law-abiding citizen. It is true that part of my discourse will concern the vast fingerprinting and identification activities of the Division of Investigation of the Department of Justice. However, in order to approach this subject, it is necessary to tell of the tremendous maze of criminal activities which are tangled with the fabric of our social order.

We look upon great industrial enterprises as big business. The biggest business in the United States is that of stealing, robbing, thieving, kidnaping, and murdering. The figures which have been compiled showing $15,000,000,000 as the cost of the criminal industry each year are not fanciful ones. They are absurd minimums based upon the belief that every criminal costs no more than $1,000 a year. When you look upon the records of such cases as the Urschel kidnaping, in which "Machine Gun" Kelly was chased 20,000 miles before he was captured; when you see the trial of Frank Nash, whose activities, with those of his associates, meant a trail of destruction, murder, kidnaping, suicide, and gangster killings, plus, of course, the countless banks which were robbed, you will find a cost running well into the millions, if pursuit, incarceration of prisoners, capture of hangers-on, and other items are to be considered. I could go on endlessly with examples of this type. It is only necessary, I believe, to you as intelligent citizens, to understand that it would be mere repetition.

This all sums up into one conclusion. This is your expense. This is the bill you must pay. The fate of robbery, kidnaping, or murder can come to any of you. Thus, there is no way of estimating the cost either in money or in sorrow. There is no means of determining or estimating the loss of happiness. There is no way of learning the mental agony of those who must protect themselves against the activities of gangs; against the shadow of the kidnapers which constantly creeps across the household of thousands upon thousands of American citizens. All these are items of expense which must be paid out of the hearts, the pocketbooks, and the minds of the good American people.

There is something which is even more deadly, even more insidious, even more viciously criminal than the activities of such persons as I have mentioned. It is the power, the influence, and the constant interference with the course of justice pursued by those persons who make crime possible—the criminally minded attorney and the criminally minded politician.

We have allowed to be built up in this country a system which runs from the cheap office-holding panderer and the vote-getting activities of a local ward heeler in a small country town to the controlling influence of vast cities where that power is a greater one in many instances than the power of the courts in which we impose our trust and faith. It is greater than that of many police forces. It is more powerful than prosecuting attorneys. It is a dishonest power which unless checked threatens to become greater than the honesty of our American citizenry. This is the influence which politics plays in the hampering, the hamstringing, and the garroting of the honest officer who would reach out and drag the criminal from his lair.

You may say that these are general terms. That is true. They are general terms, because this activity is a general activity. It is something which permeates the fabric of our daily life. A person who has no pull, no drag, no "in" as they call it, who is not wired in to the places of power, must stand craven and trembling and take his punishment. But the stronger and more influential a man is through his political affiliations, the greater crimes he can commit and laugh at the law. It is interesting to watch the progress of the politically protected criminal. I have in mind case after case where young men have started in reformatories and been released from them, gone to sentences in other reformatories or penitentiaries, and then suddenly became, on their release, persons of influence in their communities. They control districts. They deliver votes, and after this is done, you see a sudden change in the treatment accorded them by law-enforcement agencies.

You find arrest after arrest by honest police officers and you find acquittal after acquittal where cases have been dismissed or nolle-prossed or the indictment quashed. Who does this? The police who arrest this man? The officers who have risked their lives to take into custody some vicious criminal, who perhaps is carrying a gun and has a permit to do so, given him through political affiliations? Or is it some power which is greater than that of other law-enforcement agencies? I give you this to think over and, I hope, to act upon.

It is a habit of politicians to start the insinuation that because a city or a community has an excess of criminality, there must be something wrong with the police. This is a red herring drawn across the trail to lead good citizens astray. The hardest job that a law-enforcement officer faces is not that of chasing the criminal, but of keeping his job in the face of a tremendous political barrage of influence and propaganda. If some slight thing goes wrong in a police department, there is always someone, and often with an ulterior motive, to demand an investigation, thus throwing the police department into a perfect turmoil of explanations in an effort to survive.

After all, law-enforcement officers are human beings. They have their homes. They have loved ones. They have their debts. They have the burdens and the tribulations which beset any of us in the usual course of life. Therefore, like the human being, they must think of their job; they must fight and defend it; and when a law-enforcement officer must spend the greater part of his time defending himself from ulterior influences instead of

chasing criminals, then a situation is created which is dangerous to our country's peace, its security, and happiness.

It has been my good fortune to be placed in a position where the entanglements of politics are barred from the pursuit of the criminal. When in 1924 the Division of Investigation was formed under Justice Harlan F. Stone, then the Attorney General of the United States, one of the pillars supporting its structure was that there should be no interference from any and all political forces. This has been adhered to strictly, and under the Honorable Homer Cummings, present Attorney General of the United States, leader in the present determined drive against American crime, the policy of hands off has been pursued to the highest possible point.

It is the belief of the Department of Justice that there should be some organization to point a way out of the morass of crime which has in the past bogged down our country, menacing its safety and security, and impeding its material progress. This job has been given to the Division of Investigation headed by myself under the direction of the Attorney General, and through his fearless attitude in the promulgation of new laws, a relentless, sustained, and determined movement has been begun. The word "campaign" to describe this movement is an inadequate one, because it indicates a duration of time. There shall be no end to this crusade until the criminal element as concerns Federal crimes, has been made to know the power, the majesty, and the never-ending vigilance of the Government's ability to outlaw and punish offenses against its statutes.

May I direct your attention to the results of such cases as the Urschel kidnaping, in which 16 persons already have been sentenced to prison and fully half a score more await trial? Let us take the Dillinger case. This man was the flag bearer for the underworld. He had protection in more ways than one. He had friends, criminals though they were, and he possessed stolen machine guns sold to him by persons who had bought them under the guise of legitimate purchases. John Dillinger is dead, sent to his grave by the bullets of the Division of Investigation. His chief lieutenants are dead. There is not today one living major member of the Dillinger gang. More than 40 persons who harbored and aided and abetted him have been sentenced to the penitentiary or are awaiting trial. Special agents of the Division of Investigation are on the trail of others, and they will get them.

There is one more instance which I must mention in connection with this most reprehensible crew; it is of a man whose name, I hope, forever will stand disgraced—the cowardly slayer of Special Agent W. Carter Baum. And in contrast to this craven spirit of murder, I desire also to salute in reverent memory two sterling officers who gave their lives that American homes and American possessions might be made and kept safe. I am proud to say that in the face of death, with a cowardly killer spattering forth missiles from his machine gun, they did not falter but fired straight and got their man. "Baby Face" Nelson is dead. May the memory of him be a short one, except as it reminds us of the heroism of Inspector Samuel P. Cowley and Special Agent Herman E. Hollis, representatives of the Division of Investigation, whose sacrifice will be honored in the records of the Department of Justice.

Again, in the examples of fearless pursuit, may I cite the case of Clyde Barrow and his murderous woman, Bonnie Parker. After a trail of death and robbery extending through many States, they finally were killed in the State of Louisiana some 8 months ago. They deserved to be killed. Only a week ago, after the same painstaking inquiry by which the Division of Investigation wins 93.81 percent of all cases it takes to court, 23 persons were indicted in Texas for their share in the harboring and aiding of these outlaws. I hope it is not repetitious to say that the shrewdest, most desperate gang of outlaws within recent years, the Barker-Karpis kidnaping gang, has lost three of its members through death at the hands of special agents of the Division of Investigation.

The Barker-Karpis gang did not operate solely through its own efforts. It was necessary for them to have aid in a dozen different forms. The Division of Investigation is striking at that aid through 22 indictments returned by a Federal grand jury at St. Paul, and I can promise more. All of this has been brought about through the capability of new laws sponsored by Attorney General Cummings and enacted by the Seventy-third Congress. At last the Division of Investigation has the legal backing with which to proceed. It may amaze you to know that, until about a year ago, it was not a Federal offense to kill or assault a Division of Investigation officer. Nor was it even a Federal offense to rob a depository of United States funds as long as it was done with a machine gun or other deadly weapon; if a man merely embezzled, he could be sent to a Federal penitentiary, but if he endangered the lives of bank officers and bank customers and took their money by force, only State officers could pursue him. Those in fear of kidnaping were not sufficiently protected. Special agents did not have the power of arrest within the full meaning of the law. They did not even have the right to carry arms with which to protect themselves.

All that has now been changed. The Division of Investigation of the Department of Justice within 8 months of the date of the time of the passage of these laws became a militant law-enforcement agency. Every special agent is a crack shot with rifle, machine gun, pistol, shotgun, and tear-gas weapon. But because he knows how to use all these implements of legitimate warfare is no reason to believe that the Division of Investigation is an organization of killers running wild and shooting at random. In all instances we make every effort to bring about a peaceable arrest. As an example of that, residents of New York need only recall the arrest of one of the most desperate gangs known within recent years, the notorious tri-State gang, which included two men who had escaped from the death cell while awaiting execution, who were captured recently in New York City without the firing of a shot. However, I take this occasion to serve notice upon the criminal underworld that any resistance of arrest with recourse to firearms will be met with the high courage and coolness of intelligent officers who can face death and shoot straight.

May I say a word about these special agents? More than 83 percent of them are college graduates or certified public accountants. They have been trained diligently over a long course in all forms of scientific deduction, detection, and apprehension. They are masters of interrogation. They are experts in persistence and they are specialists in the belief that once upon the trail of an offender against Federal laws they must never cease until their man is captured and proved innocent or guilty. In this connection it would perhaps be desirable for me to compare the Division of Investigation with the far-famed Scotland Yard of London.

Such remarks as I may make must not be taken as derogatory to this fine old police organization. We have heard many times that a much desired object would be to transfer Scotland Yard to the United States. With all necessary obeisance to that great organization, I must say that we have something better than Scotland Yard in our own Division of Investigation. Our men are more highly educated. They are more highly trained. They are experts in trailing men and women of criminality from one end of the possessions of the United States to the other. Scotland Yard, when all is said and done, is merely the municipal police force of the city of London, with an area of 700 square miles. It has 19,769 officers. The Division of Investigation has a maximum of 598 field officers, less than one-thirtieth the force of Scotland Yard. Within the last year more desperate criminals have been caught, convicted, or killed while resisting arrest than in an entire decade of Scotland Yard's history, and this over a combined area of more than 3,000,000 square miles.

It is true that Scotland Yard gave to law-enforcement agencies the Henry system, by which fingerprinting became a tremendous force in the apprehension of criminals. Today Scotland Yard has 500,000 fingerprints in its criminal files. The Division of Investigation has 4,800,000 sets of fingerprints in its files, while every day there rolls in an additional 2,800, meaning that at least six times every minute during the working hours the fingerprint card of some arrested man goes into the permanent files, from which it never can escape. This is the biggest repository of criminal information in the world. Through its facilities of more than 7,300 contributing agencies it acts as a constant protector for the American people. Day by day the old alibi of mistaken identity is ending. It no longer assists the criminal to say that his name is John Jones, while the wanted man is known as "Henry Smith", because when the 10 prints of his fingers go into the identification unit of the Division of Investigation the infallible record is there in the marks of his digits which say that this is the wanted man, and there is no possible manner in which the identity can be denied. Upon many of these cards as they rest in the fingerprint files are pink slips with heavy black print which denotes that these men are wanted at some part of the country for anything from mere thievery to murder. Thirteen times or more every day, 365 times a month, and for the last fiscal year 4,356 times these cards were matched with the newly arrived prints from some law-enforcement agency perhaps 3,000 miles from the place of the crime, thus enabling fugitives to be apprehended and punished when otherwise they might have escaped.

However, the item which I am sure will interest all of you is the power which the science of fingerprinting possesses in civil life and about which, in particular, I have been asked to speak this afternoon. The entire purpose of fingerprinting is the protection of the honest citizen. It will be recalled that several years ago there were numerous mail robberies occurring in the post office at New York. During the investigation which followed 460 persons in the Registry Division were fingerprinted in an effort to afford leads helpful in the solution of the robberies. Of the persons fingerprinted 49, or more than 10 percent, were found to have previous criminal records. Of these 49, 7 admitted that they had obtained their positions in order to rob the mails.

There is no reason, to my mind, why every person who is an applicant for a position of public trust should not be willing to be fingerprinted. There are today vast numbers of public workers in cities, States, and counties about whom little is known. It should be compulsory that their fingerprints be taken before they be employed as servants of the people. To such a course there no doubt would be many objections. That is all the more reason it should be done. One crook can raise more noise against progress than a hundred honest men can make for it. Let me cite some figures.

About 6 years ago the United States Civil Service Commission began routing its fingerprints through the identification unit. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, 1 person in every 13 was found to have a criminal record. The next year 1 in 14 was discovered to be a criminal, and these, as well as those of the previous years, had run the entire range of crime from disorderly conduct to bigamy, counterfeiting, arson, burglary, and murder.

After the publicity given to these searches, the word passed to some extent through the underworld that it was unsafe for persons with criminal records to take a civil-service examination. Thereupon, the ratio dropped to 1 out of every 22. It now has fallen to the extent where only 1 person out of every 42 who applies for a civil-service job has a criminal record. The same rooting out of criminal elements in public office could be promised for the various States if fingerprints of applicants could be routed through this unit.

The lawless element seems especially desirous of getting into positions of trust. In July 1929 the fingerprints of 81 applicants for positions in the Los Angeles, Calif., police department were searched and 7 were revealed as having previous records, including 1 manslaughter case, 1 hold-up and 1 grand theft.

Less than 3 years ago the police department at Mount Vernon, N. Y., referred the fingerprint cards of 299 applicants to the division. Seven of these were found to have criminal records. During December of 1933, 280 prints were received in the identification unit from the police department of Miami Beach, Fla., in the cases of persons who had applied for positions at the various resort hotels and establishments. Eighteen of these individuals had previous records; they included the passing of bad checks, contributing to the delinquency of a minor, breaking and entering, and assault to kill.

Thus, the work goes on endlessly, protecting a winter resort from persons of bad reputation, keeping a police force clean, establishing the past of a criminal who seeks to plead a previously unsullied record—these fingerprints are silent policemen, on guard 24 hours of the day. What they do to strike fear into the heart of a criminal they also can do to give peace of mind to the honest citizen.

A fingerprint is nothing more nor less than a signature which cannot be forged. When the stigma which criminal work has attached to the science has been removed, its potential uses in commercial, civil, and private life are enormous. If every important document bore the fingerprint of its signer there would be no long, expensive civil suits with forgery as the basis; the fingerprint would be there as an unchangeable seal to mark the authenticity of the document. It can be used in all matters which may be contested, and it should be used. It is my personal opinion that the time will come when every honest man will be glad to have his fingerprints on file in the noncriminal or citizens' section of the identification unit in Washington.

This civil section is becoming a matter of importance. Only a week ago a request was received from a large corporation dealing in explosives asking for 1,400 fingerprint cards, so that the prints of every employee might be placed on file in case of some catastrophe in which identification might be difficult. The fingerprints of hundreds of school children are being placed in this civil identification file for their protection. At intervals we read of train wrecks, casualties at sea, and other disasters where the list of known dead is followed by an even longer enumeration of the unidentified. Again were the fingerprints of these persons on file there would not be the long, horrible days of waiting on the part of relatives while the body of their loved one lay on a morgue slab unidentified. In hundreds of murder cases every year it is necessary to use fallible means of identification because the infallible one has not been provided.

The threat of kidnaping hangs over many families. The fingerprints of those who fear abduction should be on file in Washington. Wherever persons fear accident or death, or even illness which may strike away from home, their guardians should rest in the identification unit in Washington the fingerprints which can almost immediately establish identification. Persons of prominence suffer constantly through the activities of impersonators, who often run up bills, pass bad checks, and create difficulties. It is sometimes difficult for the real person to establish his true identity against that of the impersonator. But it could be done easily if fingerprints were on file. Thus the possibilities for use in civil, business, and private life extend endlessly. And there is even a more important angle—that of safety after death.

To illustrate, I first must cite a criminal case. Eleven years ago—August 21, 1924, to be exact—a murder was committed in Roanoke, Va. An individual known as "Andrew Hansbrough" was reported to be wanted for this crime, and a copy of the wanted circular, containing fingerprints, went forward to the identification unit to be filed for later reference. There it remained for 9 years.

On December 7, 1933, the police department at Columbia, Mo., was called to investigate a murder. A dead man had been found in an abandoned house in the southern part of Boone County, Mo. There was no evidence pointing to the slayer, nor was there anything by which the police could gain a clue as to the identity of the murdered man.

Some time passed between the time of the murder and that of finding of the slain man. By the time the police reached this out-of-the-way abandoned shack nearly 6 days had elapsed since the killing. Yet the lines and ridges and other marks which form the fingerprints of a human being are so tenacious that even at this late date it was possible to gain a set of impressions. These were taken and forwarded to the Division of Investigation. With their arrival the 9-year-old search for Hansbrough, wanted for the Roanoke murder, was ended. These fingerprints of a dead man, forwarded from Columbia, Mo., corresponded exactly.

It is to be assumed, of course, that Hansbrough had relatives and persons who cared sufficiently about him to send for his body and to see that he received burial. Even if this were not the fact in this particular case, the opportunity was provided, the man's identity was learned, the mystery of his disappearance cleared up, and a manner provided in which relatives or other interested persons could procure his body, knowing it to be the one they sought.

Now, let us change this into a hypothetical case, and one which, in some form or another, happens all too often. We will suppose, for instance, that Hansbrough, instead of being a murderer, was a highly beloved man. We will say that he had been a professor, kindly, thoughtful; a person who had guided countless young men and women from adolescence into manhood and womanhood. Thousands of persons in all parts of the country loved him—any of them would have been willing and eager to come to his aid in time of trouble.

We will say that excessive study and mental effort had caused an attack of amnesia and the kindly old man had wandered away, to be lost to his searchers. Years passed. The thousands of dollars which had been spent upon the search for him had been in vain. At last, ill, weakened, still stricken with the malady which had destroyed his memory, he was found and taken to some public institution. The officials there strove to learn his identity and failed. In a final effort before he died, they took his fingerprints and forwarded them to Washington. Back came the answer, "No record."

The criminal, because he was a criminal, had a record of identity on file in Washington. But the kindly professor had none; penniless, he was buried in the potter's field—because he was an honest man.

If that sort of thing means anything to you, it is only necessary to write the Division of Investigation, and a specially prepared, noncriminal, fingerprint card, plus necessary instructions, will be forwarded. The same facilities are available for all the angles of fingerprinting which I have outlined, whether for cities and States for the protection of their personnel, or for the private citizen wishing to guard himself against accident, abduction, or amnesia.

This is a service of the people and for the people. It is compulsory in only one aspect; the criminal must give his fingerprints; the honest citizen has the right to choose. There is no connection between the two—the Department of Justice holds fine distinctions between the honest persons it wants to protect and the dishonest ones it seeks to run down and properly punish.

So now we come to a summation of the citizen's place in this determination to end the defiance of the criminal world. I have said before that the Department of Justice feels its duty to be that of pointing the way. Once this way has been pointed, the only method by which crime can be eradicated is by the absolute cooperation of every law-enforcement officer plus the power of every good citizen in America. Law enforcement can only be as good in a community as the desire of that community's population demands that it be good. It is a matter which demands constant vigilance. It demands that the police be freed from the political fetters which hamper them.

It demands that when enforcement becomes lax, committees of forward-looking citizens be formed at once to learn why this laxity has been allowed to develop. It is foolish to say that a police department is failing to do its work—a law-enforcement agency only fails when there is some excellent reason for it. It stands to reason that men who must risk their lives to apprehend dangerous, murderous criminals are not going to fail when that failure means danger to themselves. Therefore, it is a citizen's duty to look behind these matters. It is the citizen's duty to see that criminal attorneys or "lawyers criminal", as the Attorney General calls them, are forced out of their alliances with the underworld and are properly punished. It is the citizen's duty to see to it that the prisoner is not coddled nor allowed to be freed through easy and sometimes, I regret to say, financially reachable persons with powers of clemency.

Parole today is becoming one of the major menaces of America. Through its misapplication, convicts are being freed with little or no supervision, and often with no sound reason for release. The records of certain States in this matter are a disgrace to America. To my mind, there can only be one reason why thousands upon thousands of men who have repeatedly committed crimes are set free to commit other and often more dangerous offenses against the law. This is the failure of public officials to faithfully carry out their public trust, placing paramount the welfare and interests of society.

It is your duty to see that something is done about this. It is your duty also to see that laws, apparently innocent upon the surface, are not passed which give the criminal an advantage over the honest citizen in the trial of his case. Certainly, there should be justice, and unfailing justice, for anyone who is brought face to face with a criminal charge. But, certainly also, the prosecution of an offender should not be reduced to an absurd travesty in which justice does not depend upon the facts of the case but upon the antics, the tricks, the unscrupulous methods of crooked attorneys, and the loopholes provided by loosely framed laws which permit the criminal element to laugh at our statutes.

A great part of the tremendous crime problem which exists today is due to the fact that otherwise upright persons condoned certain acts during recent years and allowed a condition of laxity to spread until it has infiltrated every portion of our Commonwealth. So I say to you now that the Division of Investigation hopes that it can point the way by the giving of its scientific training, of its tremendous crime laboratory, of its great fingerprint system, built up through years of arduous effort, and, plus all this, the courage and nobility of highly educated hard-working men whose offering in this cause includes even that of their lives. The Department of Justice hopes to enlist the interest and the active support of the American people in their respective communities in a sustained national movement to deal with the criminal menace. But a beacon light cannot shine in a fog. May you, as persons of standing, of reputation, of high-minded citizenship, assist us to clear this murky atmosphere and bring to the American people the peace, the freedom, and security to which they are so justly entitled.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that there are several special orders already for today.

Mr. MORITZ. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes immediately after the disposition of the special orders.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object provided there is no other business to come before the House this afternoon. Perhaps it would be well to have the majority leader tell us whether there have been plans made for special business today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. As I understand, there are two bills that are coming up, and if we have time, we expect to start on the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNELL. It is expected that the Private Calendar will be taken up this afternoon?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; later in the afternoon. We have an hour and a half or 2 hours of speeches, then a couple of bills under special rules.

Mr. SNELL. What bills are to come up this afternoon?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. One of them is in reference to the San Diego exposition.

Mr. BLOOM. There is another rule, but it will not take much time.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I dislike to object, but there are rules for two bills to come up for consideration today. We are very anxious to get these bills disposed of. They have been pending for several days, and I understand it will not take long to dispose of them. If the gentleman will make his request after these two measures have been disposed of, I shall not object.

Mr. MORITZ. All right. I will modify my request to meet the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. BLOOM. The request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that he be permitted to speak for 10 minutes immediately after the disposition of the special orders on the Speaker's table?

Mr. MORITZ. That is right.

Mr. SNELL. That will be before these bills to which the gentleman from Tennessee refers.

Mr. BLOOM. No. This is a special rule.

Mr. SNELL. It is not on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the rules are not on the Speaker's table.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consented to wait until after these bills have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania amend his request in that respect?

Mr. MORITZ. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he may have permission to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the special orders for today and disposition of the two measures referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, at the conclusion of which I shall submit a unanimous-consent request which I think is very urgent.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization have reported unanimously H. R. 3472, to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874), and House Joint Resolution 71, to provide for the return to the Philippine Islands of unemployed Filipinos resident in the continental United States or the Territories thereof, to authorize appropriations to accomplish that result, and for other purposes.

Both of these bills attempt to repatriate Filipinos in the United States to go back to the Philippine Islands. I believe they want to stay there provided we give them some method of getting over there. The bill (H. R. 3472), will repatriate 100,000 or more of these aliens who are stranded in the United States and who have indicated a desire to return to their native land.

Most of these cases we find are on the relief rolls today, and by advancing their transportation expense, which will be about 1½ months' relief which they would otherwise get from the relief rolls in the larger cities, we will dispose of thousands of these people who have indicated a desire to voluntarily depart to their native land. If you want to relieve the relief rolls in various communities you may do so by passing these constructive measures. This is a very urgent matter and I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to have the two bills considered at the earliest possible time next week.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SHORT. How soon do these aliens intend to return to the United States?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They cannot return, once they leave.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman stated that the transportation cost was equivalent to 1½ months' relief?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Or 2 months' relief.

Mr. BOILEAU. Why do not the various municipalities and cities that have this problem send them back without the necessity of the United States doing it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The States and municipalities did not bring them in here. They came in here under the immigration law.

Mr. BOILEAU. It would seem to me to be good business on the part of the various municipalities to get them off their hands.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It would also be better business for the United States Government to enact laws that would permit these people, including about 30,000 Filipinos and perhaps over 100,000 aliens who are on the relief roll and are stranded today, to be removed to their own country. They have indicated to the various group directors within the different areas of the cities that if they had means of transportation they would be willing to return to their native land.

Mr. SHORT. And stay there?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And stay there.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There are estimated to be 20,000,000 aliens in the United States today and that 10,000,000 of them are here unlawfully. The gentleman has had before his committee for several years a bill to stop all immigration to this country, and it ought to be stopped, and that bill ought to be reported and passed. This method of paying Filipinos, way back home is a bad precedent to be established, and such a measure ought not to pass this House, for as many others will come in their places.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the gentleman's question very accurately and thoroughly.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In answer to the gentleman, I wish the gentleman, in all fairness to the House and to himself and to me, would stop asking me a lot of nonsensical questions.

Mr. BLANTON. It is nonsensical to have 10,000,000 aliens unlawfully in the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Wait a minute. Give me a chance to answer the question. I want to be fair with the gentleman and give him information. If he does not want the information, all right.

Mr. BLANTON. I have asked no questions and have asked for no information. I think I have about as much

information on the subject as the gentleman has. I have been studying it just about as long as he has.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman want an answer to his question?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall vote for any bill the gentleman will bring in here to stop immigration from coming into this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Here are two bills by which we can relieve the country very materially with respect to the relief rolls of the various communities of the United States and they will remove to their native land hundreds and, perhaps, thousands of aliens who will go back to their own countries and stay there.

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

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I have studied this question as long as my friend from Texas and I wish to say to him——

Mr. BLANTON. You have been studying it for 50 years then. That is the length of time I have been studying it.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I have studied it that long.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do not take this out of my time, because I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SABATH. I should like to answer the gentleman by stating that he is absolutely erroneous in his statement that we have 20,000,000 aliens illegally in the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has made a mistake of just 10,000,000 as to what I said. I said we had 20,000,000 aliens in the United States, and 10,000,000 were here unlawfully. We are going to attend to one of them, who got in here unlawfully, before long, a certain Mr. Bruno Hauptmann, by sending him to the electric chair. But there are hundreds of others just like him here in the United States, who ought not to have ever gotten across our borders.

Mr. SABATH. I am with the gentleman in desiring to send all of them who are criminals back where they belong.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the two measures, H. R. 3472 and House Joint Resolution 71——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want just 1 minute to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not object to 1 minute.

Mr. MOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas asked a question which was a very pertinent one. It appears he did not want an answer to it, but I think the Speaker is in position to give an answer and I hope he will do so for the benefit of the rest of the Members.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If I could be given the time, I should be pleased to answer any question you might propound to me that I would know about.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will discuss that question, we shall all be very glad to hear him.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I should like to dispose of this important question, and then at some time in the very near future I shall be pleased to discuss that.

Mr. BLANTON. I shall not object to the gentleman proceeding, but I shall object to the subsequent unanimous-consent request which he has in mind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from New York proceeding for 1 additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 3472 and House Joint Resolution 71, each providing an economical plan for the permanent removal from public and private relief rolls in the United States of certain unemployed and distressed persons who are aliens, may both be called up some day in the near future and given preferred status for consideration by the House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to revise and extend my remarks on these two measures, I wish to explain briefly to the House why I think passage of both of them immediately would be beneficial to this country.

House Joint Resolution 71 relates to Filipinos who are stranded in the United States and Territories. Citizens of the Philippine Islands are nationals of the United States, but Congress has not invested them with United States citizenship. Prior to the act of March 24, 1934, the Filipinos, although not citizens, were free to enter and reside in continental United States or any Territories of the United States to the same extent as citizens. The Filipino owes allegiance to the United States, but the immigration laws, which place restrictions on the admission of aliens, have no application to nationals who are not aliens. Up until the act of March 24, 1934, no effort was made to place any restriction on the movement of Filipinos.

As a consequence, therefore, many Filipinos proceeded to Hawaii and to continental United States, entering as passengers on vessels, as seamen, or possibly in other ways. Many of them who came were encouraged to come by advertisements emblazoned through the islands, and they came hoping to better their condition. Since they were not subject to inspection or examination and could enter without restriction, it is not surprising that many of them were incapable of being self-supporting, particularly so during unfavorable economic conditions here. It has been a natural result that a great many of these Filipinos have required, and are in need of, charitable assistance, either from public or private sources.

There certainly is less likelihood of these distressed Filipinos becoming restored to self-support here now than there would be if we could return them to their native surroundings. This House joint resolution proposes to afford legislative authority for sending them back to their homeland.

Any Filipino who wants to take advantage of this privilege will be required to make a voluntary application to the Secretary of Labor. It is not a compulsory law, but the acceptance of the benefits would carry certain penalties due to provisions of current law.

If any Filipino is removed to the Philippine Islands under this resolution, it would then be necessary to hold that his residence in the United States had been terminated and therefore, under the provisions of the act of March 24, 1934, he could reenter only under the same conditions applicable to all citizens of the Philippine Islands, that is, if coming for permanent residence he would have to secure and present an immigration visa and would be charged to the annual quota of 50 allotted to the Philippine Islands. He would then be in the same class as any other alien seeking admission, with one exception—he is not barred from entry because of the fact that he is ineligible to citizenship.

However, the two Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands, while appearing before our committee during public hearing on this resolution, stated quite emphatically that it was their opinion that none of the Filipinos who may be transported back to the islands under this resolution would seek to come back here, because most of them had come to the United States as adventurers, hoping to find good jobs and, having failed to do so and having fallen into distress here, they would be only too glad to get back home and would stay there.

The 1930 census of the United States indicated there were about 45,000 Filipinos in continental United States. During previous hearings on this bill witnesses estimated that about 20,000 to 30,000 Filipinos might apply for permission to return to the Philippine Islands if this resolution is enacted into law.

The movement of so many unemployed Filipinos from the public and private charity and relief rolls in the various communities of the United States would, without any doubt, be a distinct benefit to these communities and would prove helpful to many of our own citizens who also are without regular employment and who are seeking employment and who are now being supported by public relief.

The cost involved under this resolution is a mere trifle when compared to the need for continuous payment of

financial aid while these poor Filipinos are being supported here during their unemployment. The total cost for transportation would be somewhere between $30, if on Navy transports, to $95, if on commercial steamships, per head.

This House joint resolution has been unanimously reported to the House, with a recommendation that it pass, in the Seventy-second Congress, the Seventy-third Congress, and now in the Seventy-fourth Congress.

Under this present resolution, Filipinos must apply for its benefits before December 1, 1935, and none of the benefits are extended beyond December 31, 1935, except in cases when actual voyage has been initiated before the latter date, in which case the trip is to be completed to the Philippine Islands.

In order that final legislative action be completed early, I hope the House will have an opportunity to consider and pass it during the current month.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other of these two measures in H. R. 3472, this bill is a companion measure to H. J. Res. 71, since the purpose is identical. Provision is made to return distressed aliens to their native country regardless of how long they may have been in the United States if they want to go back but cannot do so because of lack of funds to pay their passage.

A part of section 23 of the Immigration Act of 1917 now provides for the payment of passage, from the United States to former residences abroad, to aliens who have fallen in distress within 3 years after entry and who desire to go back home.

This bill simply removes from existing law the limitation of 3 years within which the alien may fall into distress and secure the privilege of removal, at Government expense, from the United States back to his homeland.

During the 3 years immediately preceding current date there has been practically no immigration from abroad, and every alien who did come has been under the necessity to establish as a fact that, if admitted to the United States, he or she would not be a person likely to become a public charge, even if employment should be unobtainable over an extended period of time after admission. The practical effect has been that the portion of section 23, which is amended by this bill, is of no value to the Government or to the several communities where distressed aliens are found to live.

During the period of economic depression it has been found that many aliens in the United States have fallen into distress and have been maintained by public or private charity and have greatly desired to return to the country of their former residence. A considerable number of these have been in the United States for a longer period than 3 years, and so the existing provisions of law afforded no opportunity to effect their removal. Under adverse condition it is frequently the case that aliens resident within the country could better provide for themselves if living in their native country; and many seek an opportunity to return there, but they cannot provide their own passage money.

This bill permits them to apply for removal at Government expense and affords an opportunity for the Secretary of Labor to contract for their passage abroad at economical figures and by doing so relieve the overburdened taxpayers of this country of the continued support of these aliens who are now on public and private relief rolls and on work-relief rolls to the detriment of our own citizens who also need all the relief the Government can afford to extend to them.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization feels that this bill, and also House Joint Resolution 71, are both economically and socially desirable at the present time and would be of tremendous benefit to everybody concerned, as well as to the several cities, towns, and communities where these unemployed and distressed aliens are now the subjects of private and public charity.

For the information of the House I will say that just this month, when our committee held public hearings on these two measures, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization appeared before the committee and stated the views of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of Labor.

With regard to H. R. 3472, Hon. Daniel W. MacCormack, the Commissioner, said, "We heartily endorse the bill."

With regard to House Joint Resolution 71, he stated: "We are heartily in favor of the proposed legislation."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew my request for unanimous consent that H. R. 3472 and House Joint Resolution 71 may both be called up some day in the near future and given a preferred status for consideration by this House. I thank you.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the gentleman from New York would set a bad precedent; and would, in fact, accomplish nothing in reducing the number of aliens in this country, hence I am going to be forced to object to his request.

Paying the expenses of returning to their homes of these approximately 30,000 Filipinos would be a futile waste of public money. More than the number returned would immediately find their way here, and come across our borders regardless of laws and regulations.

I am reliably informed that large fishing vessels are now equipped, maintained, and operated to effect regular exchanges at sea; and it would, in my judgment, be ridiculous for us to return them home free of charge whenever they happen to get homesick.

I am reliably informed that if we could deport all of the aliens now in this country there would be a job for every American, and there would be no more suffering and shivering and hunger in our big cities, and there would be no need of our Government's granting relief or appropriating $4,800,000,000 to start public works.

American jobs in the United States should be and must be preserved for Americans, and we in this Congress must take decisive steps to redistribute these jobs, and take them away from foreigners and give them back to Americans.

No American has any chance whatever to get a job in any foreign country. Just try to find employment in one of them. When they learn that you are an American, you are given to understand that their jobs are for their own nationals.

As soon as the Seventy-third Congress met 2 years ago, I introduced a bill to stop all immigration for 10 years, so as to give us time to assimilate our foreign-born naturalized citizens here before we allowed any more to come, and so that we could preserve American jobs for Americans.

The bill went to the committee of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is chairman; and after I finally succeeded in getting hearings on it, the committee took a vote, and it was the vote of the chairman [Mr. DICKSTEIN] that kept the bill from being reported. If he had not cast his vote against reporting the bill, it would have been reported and passed by Congress. For I firmly believe that whenever this House gets an opportunity to vote on such a bill, it will pass it by a tremendous majority, for I believe that a large majority of the Members of Congress, both House and Senate, are in favor of stopping all immigration for 10 years, and preserving American jobs for Americans.

Is it not silly and nonsensical to have 12,000,000 Americans out of jobs, and cannot get jobs, and at the same time to have 20,000,000 aliens in the United States, and allow more of them each year to continue coming here, when Americans are in distress, and the Government is feeding and housing and supporting millions of them.

Regardless of claims continually made to the contrary, but made by persons not in favor of stopping immigration, I have reliable information and statistics to show that there are now over 20,000,000 aliens in the United States, and that of these 20,000,000, there are at least 10,000,000 of these aliens who are here unlawfully, just as Bruno Hauptmann came here unlawfully, and stayed here unlawfully, and was here unlawfully when he committed the foulest and most dastardly crime ever known to civilization, and just as this infamous Bruno Hauptmann has continued to stay here unlawfully all during these expensive weeks of trial that has cost over $600,000. There are thousands of aliens just like Bruno Hauptmann here in the United States now, unlawfully, and we must pass legislation to make them all register,

and find means of detecting them, and provide for their deportation.

On the first day of this present session of Congress I again introduced a bill to stop all immigration to the United States for 10 years. It went to the committee of which my friend from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is chairman. Why does he not report that bill? Why does he not pass that bill? The Americans in the United States want it passed. The American Federation of Labor wants it passed. The Daughters of the American Revolution want it passed. The American Legion wants it passed. The Veterans of Foreign Wars want it passed. And a big majority of the Members of this Congress want it passed. Then why is it not reported and passed? It is because the chairman of that committee is not in favor of it. It is because the chairman of that committee does not want to report it. It is because the chairman of that committee does not want to pass this bill.

If my friend from New York were in favor of that bill, he could find means of reporting it this week. He could find means of having it promptly considered. He could pass it here in this House. If he wants to do something constructive and worth while, he should pass this bill to stop all immigration for 10 years, and should pass legislation to register and deport all aliens, and then he would make it possible for every American now out of a job to have a job that is now being filled by some alien.

I want all of my colleagues to know, and I want the people of the United States to know, that just as soon as 30 legislative days have expired since this Congress convened I am going to file on the Clerk's desk a petition to discharge the gentleman's committee from further consideration of this bill; and if we can get 217 of you colleagues to sign that petition, we will take this bill up and pass it in this Congress, and we will stop all immigration to the United States for 10 years, and we will preserve American jobs for American citizens. And then Americans will not have to be on Government charity any longer. And then American citizens would not have to be fed and housed and clothed by the Government. And then this Government will not have to tax Americans $4,800,000,000 to provide public works through Government jobs for Americans if we will deport 10,000,000 aliens now unlawfully here from foreign countries who now hold American jobs that ought to be held by Americans.

Mr. Speaker, for the above reasons I am constrained to object to the request of the gentleman from New York.

THE GREAT EMANCIPATOR

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, including therein an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. KNUTSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an eloquent tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator, delivered by my colleague the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, before the Sons of Union Veterans, at Philadelphia, on February 9, 1935.

It is to me a very great pleasure as well as a very great honor to be privileged to speak to this gathering of Sons of Union Veterans. There is an added element of pleasure in the presence of a small group of Civil War veterans, the first that I have had the honor to address for several years.

As I stand before you this evening my memory goes back to the fall of 1896 when, as a barefooted boy I stood upon the curbing of Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis, and saw that mighty host of the Grand Army of the Republic pass in review in connection with their annual encampment. Then they were in their prime, clear-eyed and elastic of step. In a few months they were to elect one of their number, the martyred McKinley, President of the United States, the last of their number to be so honored. For 30 years theirs had been the guiding hand in our national affairs, and in the discharge of that duty they displayed the same patriotism and loftiness of purpose that animated and immortalized them in the unselfish service they rendered their country in 1861–65. Now, alas, their ranks have thinned until there is but a pitiful remnant of that soul-inspiring line of blue that answered the call of Father Abraham at an hour when the very future of the Republic hung in the balance. May I say without appearance of unseeming adulation that those were the golden years of the Republic.

I am honored to speak to you, their descendants, this evening. Through your veins courses the blood of that gallant body of men that helped Grant gain victory at Shiloh and Donelson; who achieved immortality at Gettysburg; who marched with Sherman to the sea in a campaign as notable and brilliant as the march of Hannibal and his legions over the snow-covered passes of the Alps; and who finally saw their sacred cause triumph at Appomattox and the glorious Union firmly established. Throughout that long and painful struggle, which was to decide for all time to come whether a union of States, conceived in the cause of human liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal, should continue to endure and serve as a beacon, lighting the pathway toward freedom to the rest of the world, or whether it should go down to destruction on the rocks of dissension, thereby forging the stronger those shackles which bound three and one-half million human beings in servitude and bondage. Throughout that long and bitter struggle the mighty hosts in blue and the sacred cause for which they so freely shed their blood and laid down their lives were inspired by leadership given them by an all-wise and all-seeing Providence.

As the procession of mankind passes in review, we observe at long intervals, and only in time of some great crisis, a figure that towers high above his fellow man, who steps to the front and by common consent assumes leadership. In times gone by the human family has been served by a number of such leaders, and in the comparatively small number George Washington and Abraham Lincoln stand out as shining and illustrious lights. Each contributed his all to the country we call our own, and their places in history are so firmly established, so well known, and so generally conceded that there is little that we can say or do to add to the luster that is theirs.

As the unbelievers said of Christ, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" So there were those who undoubtedly asked of themselves and of others, "Can it be possible that a man born in a log cabin in Kentucky, rough and uncouth, without any of those qualities which we are accustomed to associate with greatness, can it be that such a man is fitted by tradition and training to occupy the greatest elective office in all the world, the Presidency of the United States?" And it was but natural that they should thus inquire of Christ and of Lincoln, for although one was born in a lowly manger in Bethlehem, the other in a log cabin, open on one side and without windows, doors, or floor, both stand out today as the two greatest individuals of all time, and their names are written in letters of burning light that the mutations of time can neither tarnish nor dim.

We have assembled this evening to commemorate the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's birth. We are here not as partisans but as pilgrims to worship at the shrine of the man whom God gave to the American people as their deliverer in their darkest hour of despair, and in this gathering we will renew our devotion to that great man and our loyalty to the heritage that he has left us.

Many of you have been privileged to hear from the lips of your patriotic sires the story of Abraham Lincoln. Indeed, many of your fathers undoubtedly knew Lincoln, and you, therefore, have first-hand information as to the manner of man he was. His enemies caricatured him as a monster, but those who knew him could see in his sorrow-lined features the image of the Master—and that is the Lincoln his friends knew and loved and who lives and will live for all time to come.

The rugged pioneer stock from which Lincoln sprang was nurtured amidst privation and hardship such as are today unknown. They braved the lurking dangers of the forest wilderness with that assurance and confidence that has ever characterized your real American. With their onward march they constantly pushed back the frontiers, built roads, established homes, schools, and churches, carved out farms and cities in an untamed empire that was destined to become the bread-and-butter basket of the world.

The only music that he knew as a boy and young man was the singing of birds, the murmur of brooks, and the rustle of the trees. Truly, if any man grew up in close communion with his Maker it was Abraham Lincoln, the man of sorrows whose sympathetic heart embraced all humanity. His early reading was confined to six books: The Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, A History of the United States, Aesop's Fables, Weem's Life of Washington, and Robinson Crusoe. Holland has truly said: "The poverty of Lincoln's library was the wealth of his mind." With such a foundation for learning one could hardly expect the development of a mind that has given to posterity the oration at Gettysburg and the Second Inaugural Address, two of the most polished gems in all our literature. Let me read to you another of his literary gems, his letter to Mrs. Bixby:

"DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

"Yours very sincerely and respectfully,

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

Early in life Lincoln was to know his first great sorrow with the passing of a wonderful mother whom he loved with all the pas-

sionate devotion of a young and trusting heart. She had been his guide and counsellor, and of her he afterward said: "All that I am or ever hope to be I owe to my angel mother."

Former Congressman Chipperfield, of Illinois, in a masterly eulogy on Lincoln, delivered before the House of Representatives several years ago, related that at the time of her interment it was impossible to give her Christian burial, and that Lincoln grieved deeply thereat and refused to be comforted. Months afterward he learned that a man of God was at a distant point, and he set out on the dangerous journey to secure this holy man to come and perform the last rites of Christian burial at her grave. It was only when this had been done that peace and comfort returned to his heart.

Later he was to know another great sorrow. The young girl to whom he had plighted his troth and given his heart, Anne Rutledge, died just as she was entering the full bloom of womanhood. Lincoln many times visited her grave and communed with her spirit.

Lincoln had the sensitive heart of an unspoiled child. He sought the love of his fellow men, and their good will and esteem encouraged and supported him. It was but natural that one with his lofty ideals, his grandeur of thought and stability of character, should early attract the attention of his neighbors. In 1832 he was proposed for a seat in the Illinois Legislature but was defeated. He was, however, elected in 1834 and served in the legislature until 1840 when he declined a nomination. In 1846 he was elected to Congress but was not a candidate for renomination 2 years later; in 1854 he was a candidate for the United States Senate but withdrew in favor of another candidate; in 1856 he aspired to the Vice Presidency but was not named by the convention. Two years later he was a candidate for the United States Senate and carried the popular vote of the State of Illinois by 4,000 although the legislature subsequently elected Mr. Douglas, but the debates that had been held between himself and Judge Douglas during that memorable campaign made him a national figure and in 1860, at the Republican National Convention in Chicago, he was nominated for the Presidency, and elected. In 1864 he was renominated and again elected.

In my humble opinion, Lincoln's election to the Presidency was providential. In the light of the stirring events that followed his elevation to the position of Chief Executive and the masterful genius displayed by him in meeting every great emergency, including intrigue and disloyalty on all sides, it becomes more and more apparent that Abraham Lincoln, and he alone, could have successfully prosecuted the great war for the preservation of the Union.

The war opened inauspiciously. The first battle resulted in the rout of the Union forces, and for more than 2 years the secessionists had the better of it. It was only when the grim and silent Grant carried the day at Shiloh and Pittsburgh Landing that the first rays of hope broke through the gloomy, war-clouded sky. Those were days that tried his soul, and his great heart was torn by the suffering and misery that grew out of that titanic struggle. Had he not possessed the love, confidence, and affection of the people of the North, and more especially of those who left their firesides to fight for the preservation of the Union, the cause could not have triumphed. To one and to all he was Father Abraham, the man whose heart encompassed all humanity, and it was to him that the down-trodden and the oppressed looked for succor and relief.

In passing upon a case of a lad condemned to death for falling asleep at his post, Lincoln said: "I could not think of going into eternity with the blood of that poor young man on my skirts. It is not to be wondered at that a boy raised on a farm, probably in the habit of going to bed at dark, should, when required to watch, fall asleep; I cannot consent to shoot him for any such act."

The impressive sequel of this act of mercy was brought to light when the dead body of this soldier boy was found on the battlefield of Fredericksburg and next to his heart a photograph of the President, across which he had written, "God bless Abraham Lincoln."

His untimely death, just as he had reached the pinnacle of usefulness and fame, was the greatest tragedy since the crucifixion, and, strange to say, by a peculiar coincidence the end came on Good Friday, the anniversary of the death of our Savior.

It was only when the great Lincoln lay cold in death that his real greatness and nobility of character were appreciated and understood. He left behind him a monument as enduring as the ages, a united country, firmly established on the eternal principles of justice, welded together in the strong bonds of fraternity, and sealed by the sacred blood of the countless thousands who died that liberty might live. Today, threescore years and ten after his death, Abraham Lincoln is yet a living, breathing inspiration to all the people of the world, and so he will continue to be in all the centuries yet to come. We—

"Talk of thy doom without a sigh;
For thou art Freedom's now, and Fame's:
One of the few, the immortal names
That were not born to die."

In these days of stress and strife it would be well if we were to take from the life of Lincoln some of the precepts with which it is so generously interspersed. Abraham Lincoln is frequently quoted by the demagogue as proponent of the dangerous panaceas that are being proposed as cures for the ills of our body politic. He is frequently quoted in support of doctrines that seek to array class against class and which ultimately would break down the very cornerstone upon which the Republic is reared. Fellow citizens, we have never had a President who gave more meticulous and scrupulous consideration to the rights of all men. We have never had a Chief Magistrate who observed the Federal Constitution with greater reverence and respect. Indeed, his great love for our country and its institutions was his outstanding characteristic. Abraham Lincoln believed in constitutional government of the people, by the people, and for the people. He stood for sound money, for the protection of the American wage earner and producer, for adequate preparedness, and for an economic program that would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. He believed in the common man, and it is plainly discernible that one of his motivating reasons for opposing the institution of slavery was that he did not subscribe to the doctrine that free labor should be compelled to compete with slave, or forced, labor. At any time during the war he could very easily have set up a dictatorship under the plea of an emergency, but I am sure that the idea never once entered his honest and guileless mind, because it was foreign to his philosophy of life.

From earliest boyhood to the tragic end he believed in and fought for those principles of government that are essentially American; and so, my friends, let us not be deceived by what theorists and sophists would have us believe regarding the things that Abraham Lincoln stood for in the way of government.

An impartial study of his inspiring life furnishes convincing proof that he was sound to the core, ever devoted to the best of American ideals and traditions, holding steadfast to the Constitution, veering neither to the right nor to the left, and always adhering to a course of action dictated by a conscience responsive to a deep and abiding sense of righteousness.

Let us then, on this anniversary of the birth of the savior of the Republic, dedicate ourselves anew to the immortal principles for which he lived and died. Let us at this time, when fascism and communism are rearing their ugly heads in our midst, drink deep and often at those wellsprings of human thought and action that inspired the founders of the Republic and that stimulated the undying faith in his fellow man of Abraham Lincoln, and of those heroic souls who stood with him shoulder to shoulder during the darkest hours of the Republic and made this glorious country of ours free, one and indivisible. Their memory will ever remain one of the brightest chapters in our history. My countrymen, let us cleave to those ideals for which they fought, suffered, and died, ever keeping before us those principles of government which have made our country the brightest star in the grand galaxy of nations.

REFINANCING OF FARM MORTGAGES

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska urging the enactment of remedial legislation for refinancing farm mortgages.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska urging the enactment of remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages

Whereas the farmers of the agricultural regions of the United States are financially disabled; and

Whereas many farm lands are heavily mortgaged and the farmers are hopelessly in debt and many will eventually lose their farms unless relief is given; and

Whereas the prosperity of the United States and its people is dependent upon the well-being of the farmer and his ability to purchase; and

Whereas the gateway to prosperity is the gateway leading from the golden fields of the great agricultural region of the Middle West; and

Whereas the farmer and his dependents cannot and will not spend while attempting to carry a heavy load of indebtedness; and

Whereas the prosperity of the agricultural regions of this country means the prosperity of the whole country since the purchase of any machinery and any equipment as well as clothing and food will create such a demand that factories would reopen and employ more people; and

Whereas inflation would tend to enable the debtors to get out of debt and to make the whole country more prosperous, as it has done many times before in this country and is now doing in England and other countries; and

Whereas a mild inflation has helped the United States regain its prosperity on numerous occasions and is now helping England and other countries to regain prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska in fiftieth legislative session assembled,

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such

remedial legislation as will provide for refinancing through the Federal farm-loan banks of the whole farm-mortgage debt at an annual interest rate of 1½ percent and an annual amortization charge of 1½ percent of the principal, with balance to be paid in not less than 10 nor more than 20 years; that the funds for this operation shall be obtained through issuance of some $3,500,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes.

2. That a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to each of the Congressmen elected in the State of Nebraska, and that our Congressmen and Senators be urged to use their best offices to prosecute the enactment of such legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

PRESENT-DAY NEED FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by my colleague [Mr. MARSHALL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. L. T. MARSHALL at the Lincoln Day banquet at Asheville, N. C., on the evening of February 11, 1935:

The subject which it is my purpose to discuss tonight is the present need for the Republican Party. I think it an appropriate subject to discuss in connection with the celebration of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Never since the inception of the party has the country had a greater need for it and for an adherence to its fundamental principles than at this particular moment. In this period of confused thought the Republican Party must be a steadying influence. We find ourselves in the position of a minority party, a role to which we have not been accustomed. We have been, for the most part, the majority party, and it has been with a little difficulty that we have accommodated ourselves to this position. We have, however, in my opinion, filled this role better than the Democratic Party has performed its function as the majority party.

We are the party of opposition, and it becomes our duty to oppose the unsound, impractical, socialistic, and communistic legislation that is being foisted on the Nation. If we compromise with, rather than oppose, this program, there remains no real legitimate reason for our continuance as a party. We cease to be that great constructive force to which the people of this Nation have so often looked for real leadership in times of crisis. It is the duty of the Republican Party to continue to stand firm for sanctity of contracts, sound money, the protective tariff, national economy, and the rights and liberties of the individual.

The Republican Party is not dead nor is it dying, and it becomes more evident each day that a return to the sound principles of our party will be necessary to restore business confidence to the end that private industry will again employ the idle workmen of this Nation. No party is dead that receives the suffrage and approval of thirteen and one-half million voters as did our party in the election last fall. The shrinkage in the Republican vote, as compared with the 1932 election, was only one-half as great as was the shrinkage in the Democratic vote.

The result of the last election does not indicate a preference for the principles of the Democratic Party. That result was occasioned by Tammanyizing a distressed people with millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I join with Senator BAILEY, of your own State, when he said just recently, "I have no respect for a public servant who will purchase public favor with public money." The result in the last election could not indicate approval of the principles of the Democratic Party because every principle set forth in its platform of 1932 has been repudiated by the administration now in power at Washington.

Do you think that if the platform of the Democratic Party in 1932 had declared in favor of the things that have been done by the administration at Washington that they could have been successful in that election? Most certainly not.

It is amusing indeed to compare the promises in their platform of 1932 with the action taken since March of 1933. Their performance has been the exact opposite of the promises made to the people.

One of the most serious problems confronting the Nation today is the unemployment problem. The number is estimated at between ten and twelve million—more than at any time in our history. Four million are in Government employment, and it is estimated the number receiving Federal aid this winter to be 20,000,000. This is the picture that confronts us after 21 months of the new deal. The time has come when we should no longer speak of the Hoover depression, but, in the words of Senator LONG, Democratic Senator from Louisiana, if he will permit us to speak any longer of him as a Democrat, we should call it the Roosevelt depression.

I want, for a few moments, to discuss this unemployment problem. In the last session of the Congress there was appropriated $3,300,000,000 to put people to work. We were told by the administration leaders on the floor of Congress that this would bring us out of the wilderness into the promised land. The results do not justify that prediction. There are more unemployed today than at the time this appropriation was voted. In the face, however, of the failure of the program, the lower House of Congress just the other day voted $4,880,000,000, four billion of which, we are again told, will solve the unemployment problem. No one objects to the appropriation of the $880,000,000 for relief, nor would we object to even a greater amount, if such is necessary, to provide for the needs of those who are unemployed without fault of their own. We do object to the four billion, for it will not bring the results, and it is my fear that next year an even larger amount may be asked.

Gen. Hugh Johnson just recently wrote on this subject. He said that when the ten million now unemployed were in gainful employment the volume of business per year in the United States was ninety billion, and that today the volume is only forty billion. This leaves a gap of fifty billion to be bridged. I will ask you how far $4,000,000,000 will go toward bridging this gap or taking up this slack? He says that it might employ three and a half million people, but this would be temporary employment, so we would still have six or seven million unemployed with the danger that after the expenditure of this money the employment would be just as great as now. You know, I know, and everybody knows that if these unemployed people are to be reemployed it must be done by private industry.

Congress cannot enact legislation to immediately employ these people, but I state in all sincerity that Congress should refrain from passing any more laws that will hinder private industry in their reemployment. I say further that the repeal of some of these laws passed under this administration would be a great help. Much of the legislation of the last two sessions of Congress has retarded recovery in private industry. Confidence is absolutely necessary to the operation of private industry, and the legislation to which I refer, instead of creating confidence has created uncertainty and fear for the future.

I refer to the financial legislation which I do not have time here to discuss other than to say that capital will not be invested in any long-time business undertakings until there is a settled policy in regard to the financial policies of our Government. The fear of uncontrolled inflation hovers like a cloud over every board of directors' meeting in the land.

I refer also to the reciprocal-tariff legislation under which law the President has authority to reduce tariffs as much as 50 percent practically without notice or without an opportunity on the part of affected industry to be fairly heard. This legislation is a constant threat to the business activity of this Nation.

Under this legislation our Secretary of State, an ardent and enthusiastic free trader, sits down around the council table with representatives of foreign governments and there lays down a tariff policy affecting the welfare of every workingman in the United States. In the enactment of this law Congress placed the tariff-making authority in the hands of the enemies of protection.

I refer to the National Recovery Act, which must be greatly modified or repealed or permitted to die a natural death in June of 1935. You cannot improve business by putting it in a straitjacket. Forty-one million dollars has been assessed and collected in the past year from industry to operate the offices of the various code administrators and subadministrators throughout the Nation. We have fly-swatter codes, toothpick codes, necktie codes, totaling in all about 600.

Another most serious problem is our great and ever-increasing national debt. Unfortunately the people have not taken this problem seriously enough, but they are rapidly awakening to a realization of the dangerous situation.

An individual with an income of $100 per month, whether it be from business or wages, can spend $300 a month so long as he can borrow. During this period he can have a fine time just so long as his credit lasts, then his condition is worse than before. He must live, pay the interest and the debt out of his $100 per month. You might borrow $10,000 and appear prosperous so long as it lasted. What then? The same is true of our Government.

I care not how worthy the motive of Government borrowing, when the debt reaches the point that it cannot be paid by taxation then confidence in the credit of our Government is gone. If we reach that point, and we are approaching it dangerously fast, how then shall we feed the hungry and needy? Only one way and that is the Government will be compelled to start the printing presses and turn out paper money.

It is not necessary to discuss the results to follow. History has recorded the same result wherever this program has been followed.

It has been a misconceived idea on the part of many that the Government creates wealth, whereas, in fact, the Government never created a bit of wealth and never will. It is a distributor of wealth collected from the taxpayers of this Nation. Our Government debt now is $28,000,000,000, and five billion more just authorized by the lower House of Congress. How much further can it go? This is problematical—possibly another year or two.

The great question is, Will we have the courage to stop borrowing before it is forever too late? It does require courage when not only the jobless and dependent but the business man, who has benefited temporarily, are all urging that we do not stop now. We cannot stop completely at this moment, but we cannot solve our difficulties by continued expenditure of borrowed money. If we

do not stop, we will suffer bankruptcy or uncontrolled inflation or both. Either means complete disaster.

Another disturbing element in our economic life is the steady encroachment of Government upon the field of private enterprise. One example of this is the post exchange. The original purpose of this establishment of post exchanges was for the accommodation of the soldier or Government employee in isolated locations. We find them now located near towns and cities in direct competition with private industry in those localities. The merchant in the nearby community cannot compete with these. No wages are paid to the operator of the exchange, no insurance is carried, no taxes are paid, no depreciation to be charged off, and no balance sheet kept. Profit or loss is not essential to its operation. This particular matter may be of small consequence, but it illustrates the unfair competition where the Government enters private industry. It is not fair for the Government to compete with the citizens who support it.

In this connection I want to call attention to the Tennessee Valley Authority which is located not so far away. In connection with their flood-control program they are generating electricity and establishing factories to make use of this power in direct competition with private industry throughout the country. This project, coupled with the threat to establish similar projects throughout the land, is preventing investment of millions of dollars in betterments and extensions by private industry and thus holding up the employment of thousands upon thousands of idle men.

You cannot tax industry to secure a fund with which to compete with that industry without drying up the industry itself. If this program is continued, we shall wake up one of these days to find the only business left is that supported directly or indirectly by the Government. We are fast approaching a system of state socialism.

By authority of legislation passed under this administration the Government has formed several corporations under the laws of the State of Delaware and through these corporations may engage directly in any kind of business it may desire anywhere in the United States or its Territories.

One of these is called the Electric Home and Farm Authority, another is the Federal Subsistence and Homestead Corporation, another Public Works and Emergency Housing Corporation, another Federal Surplus Relief Corporation.

If one would take the time to read the powers and authority granted under these articles of incorporation, it would be most startling to the people of this country. One paragraph of the articles of incorporation of the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation grants this authority—to acquire improved or unimproved real estate and all buildings thereon and appurtenances thereto by purchase, exchange, exercise of the power of eminent domain or otherwise, whether or not in connection with the construction of any public-works project; to hold, maintain, and improve such real estate, buildings and appurtenances; and, subject to the approval of the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works or other duly designated representative of the United States of America, to sell, exchange or otherwise dispose of such real estate, buildings and appurtenances or to lease the same with or without the privilege of purchase.

Under the authority granted these corporations the United States Government, with taxpayers' money, may enter into any business in which the citizens of the United States are engaged. To what extent these corporations have been used up until now I am not advised, but in connection therewith let me say that you might as well hang a man as to keep him in suspense for 30 days.

Those advocating government in business urge same on social grounds. These folks fail to distinguish between society and government. A recent article in the Saturday Evening Post quotes Tom Paine as saying:

"Some writers have so confounded society with government as to leave little or no distinction between them, whereas they are not only different but have different origins. Society is produced by our wants and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness positively by uniting our affections, the latter negatively by restraining our vices. Society in every state is a blessing, but government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one; for when we suffer or are exposed to the same miseries by a government, which we might expect in a country without government, our calamity is heightened by the reflection that we furnish the means by which we suffer."

The Republican Party should oppose with all its vigor and determination any further delegation of authority to the executive department of our Government. Most of us thought that Congress had gone clear beyond the limit of safety along this line in the last two sessions of Congress; but if the four billion eight hundred million appropriation is enacted into law in the form it was forced through the lower House of Congress under the gag rule, all power, both real and imaginary, will have been conferred on the President of the United States. It will be most difficult to observe any authority that is denied him. It is my opinion that the people of the Nation are fast awakening to the danger of this action, and that the time has come when it is desirable—not only desirable but necessary—for the welfare of the country that Congress again function as the duly elected representatives of their constituents.

I am reminded of a story:

A man was walking down the street and was heard talking to himself, saying, "No! No! No!" Every few steps he would repeat the words "No! No! No!" His action was called to the attention of an officer, who approached him and, tapping him on the shoulder, said: "What is the matter? Are you crazy?" The reply was, "No! No! No!" Upon taking the man to headquarters and having an investigation made, it was discovered that he was a Democratic "Yes man" Congressman on vacation.

If I might be permitted to advise the Democratic administration as to what they might do during the remainder of this administration in the interest of the country, I would advise them that the one and all-important thing that they might do would be to change their attitude toward business or private industry in America.

There was introduced in the Congress just last week a bill of 178 printed pages, which I have not had the opportunity to read, and which I suppose will be brought in under the gag rule within a few days and passed by the Congress, which bill, I am informed, has among its provisions one to the effect that all holding utility companies be dissolved by the year 1940. I do not, at this moment, hold any brief on behalf of any utility company that needs regulation, but I do here and now say that this kind of legislation, rushed through Congress without time to study it, is just another act on the part of this administration that will tend to further prevent recovery of business activity.

In closing, permit me to say that we should all resolve, and it should be the outstanding purpose of the Republican Party that, in the words of Lincoln, a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

WATERWAY ACROSS THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The SPEAKER. Under a special order the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein some brief statistical statements and a radio speech which I delivered on the 9th of February over station WJSV and the Columbia System.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the House in extending unanimous consent to me for consideration of the subject which I am now about to discuss. I have introduced a bill (H. R. 2785) to provide for the construction of a canal across northern Florida, connecting the waters of the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. This is the subject of my talk this morning. This subject, to the American people, is by no means a new one. As far back as the administration of President Andrew Jackson a communication was sent by him to Congress recommending the construction of a waterway across the peninsula of Florida to connect the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. About 1880, a half century later, the matter was revived through surveys made by General Gilmore, who was then with the Board of Army Engineers. In General Gilmore's surveys it was found that feasible routes existed for the construction of this waterway. At that time the commerce of this country and the commerce of the world had not reached a development sufficient to warrant the construction of the canal. Also, American waterway development was then in its infancy, and funds for such purposes were not then as available as they are today, and not much more was said about the project until about 10 years ago.

Four years ago physical surveys of this canal were authorized by the Congress, following preliminary surveys which were made some 6 or 7 years ago. The preliminary surveys warranted the Board of Army Engineers in making the physical surveys and the Congress in passing an item in the river and harbor bill of 1930 for physical surveys. It was my pleasure to introduce both survey bills. About $300,000 or $350,000 has been spent by the Federal Government in making these surveys of a waterway to connect the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with those of the Gulf of Mexico through the southern part of Georgia and/or northern portion of Florida. A large number of routes were surveyed, and this chart or map shows several of those which were considered and upon which careful detailed physical surveys were made. Among these is one leading from the entrance of the St. Marys River across the southern part of Georgia, through the Okefenokee Swamp to the Suwannee River, and, by the way, the Suwannee River is a rather large stream, and thence down the Suwannee River to the Gulf of Mexico,

coming out at the mouth of the Suwannee River. Also, surveys were made branching off in the vicinity of White Springs, Fla., from the Suwannee River, going on out southwesterly to the Gulf of Mexico in the vicinity of Deadmans Bay and also westerly to the Gulf of Mexico south of Tallahassee, Fla. Another survey began at the Atlantic Ocean just east of the city of Jacksonville, Fla., and went northerly from the city of Jacksonville, on the southern part of the Okefenokee Swamp, through what is known as the south prong of the St. Marys River, and on in the vicinity of Jasper, Fla., and near the Suwannee River and thence south and on through the routes as indicated in the south Georgia survey.

Another entered from the Atlantic Ocean by way of Jacksonville and goes on down the St. Johns River to Black Creek, on in the vicinity of Middleburg, then across the Peninsula of Florida, just north of Starke and Lawtey, Fla., and High Springs, Fla., and thence on to the Suwannee River across to Deadmans Bay, at the mouth of the Steinhatchee River, and into the Gulf of Mexico. It also carried a survey through the Suwannee River in a southwesterly direction to the mouth of the river. This proposed route or survey extends only about 70 miles from tidewater of the St. Johns River to tidewater of the Gulf of Mexico.

Also, we have had commercial surveys of this route for a steamship canal across the Peninsula of Florida. This is the shortest possible route that could be utilized. It is less than 70 miles from tidewater to tidewater. It will also incur a low strip of land in the vicinity of High Springs and from there to the Suwannee River on to the Gulf of Mexico and, in the opinion of many engineers, is the most feasible possible route across south Georgia or northern Florida from the Atlantic to the Gulf waterway.

The Board of Engineers also carried their surveys from the Atlantic Ocean by Jacksonville, Palatka, and on down the St. Johns River to the Oklawaha River.

From the Oklawaha River across a low strip of country to the Withlacoochee River and on out to the Gulf of Mexico in the vicinity of Port English, Dunnellon, and Yankeetown. This survey also carries another route from the vicinity of Ocala, Fla., in a northeasterly direction, then in a westerly and a southwesterly direction to a point between Cedar Keys and Port English and Dunnellon. That also encounters a low strip of country which is easily dredgeable and through which a canal can be constructed with a minimum degree of cost. This St. Johns-Oklawaha-Withlacoochee Rivers route via Ocala is considered very feasible.

There is another route branching off also from the St. Johns River, going across Santa Fe Lake, down the Santa Fe River on to the Suwannee River and on out to Cedar Keys, Fla. By some of the most learned engineers in America that has been approved as one of the most feasible routes for a ship canal across the northern part of Florida and the southern part of Georgia.

Now, in the construction or dredging of this canal in the eastern portion of the State of Florida and south Georgia, for that matter, we find a sandy loam soil which is very easy to dredge and which can be dredged at a very low cost. Across the main ridge we encounter mostly a sand and clay formation, and in the low strips, in the vicinity of Silver Spring, Fla., and Paynes Prairie, Fla., all of that central portion, including also the Okefenokee Swamp section and the Suwannee Valley section, we have a soft, mucky soil, which is very easily dredged.

On the western side of the State of Florida and also the central portion of south Georgia we encounter there a soft-rock formation which can be dredged and removed with our modern dredges at a very reasonable price per cubic yard. I shall be glad to put the actual cost of construction per yard in my remarks.

This canal, as a steamship canal, will carry a bottom width of about 250 feet in the contracted rock sections and will be widened out to about 400 feet in the sandy or soil sections. It will be 35 feet deep. As for its being feasible, I do not believe that any of the engineers now in the Public Works Administration or with the Board of Army Engineers hold anything except that one or more of these routes are entirely feasible, and that they justify construction. That is, the cost of construction is fully justified as a river and harbor project and as an unemployment-relief project.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I am glad to yield to the Chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it contemplated that ships will go through there under their own power?

Mr. GREEN. It is contemplated that ships can go through there, I understand, under their own power. There shall be no impediment to ships passing directly from the Atlantic Ocean on out through into the Gulf of Mexico.

Under the provisions of this bill the President is authorized to accept any route which has now been surveyed, or he may have surveyed additional routes, and determine which is the most feasible and logical route for the canal. He is given full latitude to employ such engineering facilities of the Government, such engineering facilities in civilian life, and such funds as may be now available or may in the future be available for river and harbor projects or for unemployment-relief projects, or any public-works projects, money which may now or in the future be available.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman please tell us how much mileage will be saved if the canal is constructed?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to do that. The various routes differ as to the length of the canal. The shortest route from tidewater to tidewater is less than 70 miles. The canal on that route would probably be, from the Atlantic to the Gulf, some 90 or 95 miles long. The route through the Santa Fe section probably will reach a little better than 100 miles in length. The route through the Oklawaha-St. Johns-Withlacoochee-Ogala section, which is the one shown on the map by the large marker, and which has been by many engineers considered very feasible, will be a little more than 150 miles in length.

Mr. COCHRAN. But what is the distance around now?

Mr. GREEN. Something like 1,000 miles from New Orleans to New York will be saved in distance, and more than 3 days' round-trip running time from New Orleans to New York will be saved.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then if this canal is constructed, ships from Germany, England, and other foreign nations, as well as our own ships, will be able to get to Houston, Galveston, New Orleans, and the other ports on the Gulf, at least 3 days sooner than they would if obliged to go around as they are now?

Mr. GREEN. There is no doubt about saving in time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman feel that that is going to be very advantageous to foreign manufacturers, as well as eastern manufacturers, in lessening the cost of bringing their products to the Southern States, especially the Gulf States, and seriously injuring industries in the Mississippi Valley, which have had that trade territory for many years?

Mr. GREEN. Of course, any advantage which would be realized by foreign vessels in transporting their commerce to America will be doubly realized by American vessels transporting theirs in and out to foreign countries, and the American people will be materially benefited by this canal. The Mississippi Valley will receive primary benefits.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words, you admit it will enable the foreign countries and New England States to ship their goods by way of the Gulf of Mexico and into the Gulf States 3 days sooner than they can now ship them by boat, and that it will be of great benefit to the American people. Now I say it will benefit one section at the expense of the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. GREEN. But it will save more than $36,000,000 annually to the producers and consumers of America in transportation costs. The producers and consumers in the Mississippi Valley will receive greater benefits than any section of the country.

Mr. COCHRAN. But look what it will do to industries in my section of the country, in the Mississippi Valley, that, as I say, did enjoy and now enjoys in part that trade, which will be taken away by New England manufacturers and foreign manufacturers?

Mr. GREEN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. I do not believe any advantage will be taken away from the Mississippi Valley section or the control of the Mississippi Valley. The river itself is more than 2,400 miles long; it has a basin of more than 1,250,000 square miles; and every industry in this great valley section will reap the benefits of this canal across Florida. Take, for instance, the iron industry in Pittsburgh. Why has it been possible for it to endure? Because Pittsburgh gets its raw material and its fuel over the Monongahela, the Allegheny, and the Ohio Rivers.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman look at the map and note that Pittsburgh is not in the Mississippi River Valley?

Mr. GREEN. But it emphasizes the importance of inland waterways.

Mr. COCHRAN. Get a little farther west.

Mr. GREEN. I go next to Youngstown, Ohio. Why did Youngstown, Ohio, petition the Congress to improve the waterway leading up to Youngstown? Because they found it necessary for them to get water transportation in order to compete with the railroads in the delivery of their fuel to Youngstown.

Now, let us go to the gentleman's own section, Missouri. I believe—in fact, I know—the gentleman is always vigorously interested in the improvement of the Missouri River Valley. They have already spent $6,000,000 or $8,000,000 on the Missouri River alone.

Mr. COCHRAN. Make it $66,000,000 and it will come nearer the facts; and, even so, there is hardly a boat to be found on the river. It is said the river will be used next year. Personally I doubt it.

Mr. GREEN. Would the gentleman be willing to have the Missouri plugged up, let the flood waters go wild over Missouri, and let the rich bottomlands of his State be destroyed?

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will permit a further interruption, I may state that we have spent $66,000,000 on the Missouri River. The gentleman can go there today and he will have a hard job finding a boat operating on the river. But that is not the question. I am saying the Mississippi Valley has already suffered enough by construction of canals.

Mr. GREEN. Now, if the gentleman will yield to me, where do the people of the gentleman's State ship their corn, their hay, wheat, their cattle, their hogs, their dairy products, and other produce?

Mr. COCHRAN. We do not ship the products the gentleman mentioned by boat. The barges do handle some wheat.

Mr. GREEN. With the aid of this canal the gentleman will find opened up for the products of his State a far shorter route to European ports. With the improvement of the upper Mississippi Valley, they can load their cattle on boats on the Mississippi River and ship them up to Chicago and save $3 out of $4 for transportation to the Chicago stockyards.

Mr. COCHRAN. What I want the gentleman to do is to realize what the Panama Canal and the canals in Texas have done to the industries of my own city, St. Louis.

Mr. GREEN. In order to offset any disadvantage which may have occurred to the States immediately west of the Great Lakes and south, this canal across Florida will counteract any disadvantage they suffered through the construction of the Panama Canal?

Mr. COCHRAN. Why, if the gentleman from Florida will permit, I have seen with my own eyes 8,000-ton ships tied up at the docks in Houston, having come from Germany and New England by way of the Gulf and the canal in Texas. Great ships bring the finished products of the New England States and of Europe away up into the State of Texas by using canals. St. Louis formerly shipped those products to Texas.

Mr. GREEN. Does the gentleman favor railroad or water transportation?

Mr. COCHRAN. I favor both, but I am studying that question right now; it is very doubtful in my mind whether or not we should be so liberal in the future in spending our money upon rivers as we have been in the past, certainly not until we see that we can get some advantage from it. I want to see if the rivers are going to be put to work. I have always supported appropriations for river and harbor improvements, but I cannot say that I am entirely satisfied with the amount of tonnage carried on some of the rivers we have improved.

Mr. GREEN. I am particularly interested to know whether the gentleman favors railroad or water transportation. The Mississippi Valley Waterways Improvement Association, and practically all other interests in favor of cheaper transportation, have endorsed this project. Also many of our colleagues from the Mississippi Valley.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman from Florida might state in reply to the gentleman from Missouri that Congress has surrendered all control over waterways, that it is now in the hands of the P. W. A. So the gentleman's statement that he would have something to say about it is rather a mistaken assumption.

Mr. GREEN. I am inclined to believe that 9 out of 10 Representatives in the Missouri Valley and the Mississippi Valley are able to see great benefits from waterway developments, and from a canal across Florida.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to reassure the gentleman from Missouri about foreign ships dumping a lot of foreign products in his territory. If this map before us is correct, they all go in that general direction, do they not?

Mr. GREEN. They return here.

Mr. GIFFORD. Few seem to return; many seem to go.

Mr. GREEN. The Mississippi Valley trade, the Gulf trade, the Atlantic coast trade, in fact all American trade will be stimulated, increased, and benefited by this canal.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. What are the several estimates of cost made by the engineers involving the construction of these canals; and what do the engineers say in justification of such a large expenditure of public money?

Mr. GREEN. The engineers have given various estimates of the cost of construction according to the various routes and kinds of canal. The estimates run all the way from nearly $400,000,000 to as low as about $110,000,000.

It has now been concluded that one of these routes, the one here with the large marker, the St. Johns-Oklawaha-Withlacoochee, can be constructed for from $110,000,000 to $143,000,000. That is the estimate of the Board of Army Engineers. The Public Works' engineers estimate that it can be completed for $115,000,000. An engineer in private life, and a very good one, has estimated that it will cost less than $100,000,000 to build a sea-level canal from ocean to Gulf.

Mr. COX. How are the American people to be compensated for this expenditure of public money as given by the engineers?

Mr. GREEN. They are to be compensated in the reduction of transportation costs, strengthening our national defense, and in many other ways. The American shippers and consumers will save approximately $36,000,000 annually in transportation costs alone after this canal is constructed. It will carry one-third to one-half more tonnage every year than is now carried by the Panama Canal. The Panama Canal now handles from eighteen to twenty million tons per year and pays to the Federal Government some $14,000,000 to $18,000,000 a year in tolls alone. It carried during the peak years from 1928 to 1930 about 30,000,000 tons a year. This canal, when constructed across the State of Florida, according to conservative estimates, will carry from forty-two to sixty million tons of commerce annually.

Mr. COX. What did the engineers say with respect to whether or not this canal has any military value?

Mr. GREEN. It does have a military value. We all hope that wars may be outlawed forever, but according to the action in the other body recently on the World Court, it seems as if America must always provide in the future, as she has done in the past, for the adequate defense of our American Nation and our American people. I favor adequate national defense. One of the best methods to more adequately provide for our national defense will be the construction of this canal across the State of Florida. It will give the United States an unparalleled advantage and absolute supremacy in all of the Carribean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico. It will make quite impossible our attack by enemy from the south or by south Atlantic. It will make secure our position. During these times, when practically every nation of the world is in debt to America and defaulting and refusing to pay, America can very prudently look more to its national defense. I know of no project more important to our national defense and security than this ship canal.

STORM HAZARD LESSENED

With the opening of this canal practically all hazards of storm around the Florida Peninsula will be eliminated. This great benefit alone will almost justify construction.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. COLDEN. May I ask the gentleman whether he means this canal would save $36,000,000 annually in transportation costs?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; annually to the consumers, shippers, and producers of America. It is a huge amount, I may say to the gentleman from California.

In 4 years the American people will realize back in transportation-cost savings the full cost of construction of this great project. The American people are developing their natural resources and conserving them. We owe to the American people every possible advantage to be derived from reduced transportation costs.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CASTELLOW. I should like to know if the gentleman has any information as to how many bales of cotton are shipped annually from the Gulf ports, say from Galveston, New Orleans, Mobile, and other Gulf ports, to Europe which would naturally go around the south part of Florida and across the Atlantic Ocean?

Mr. GREEN. I have not the actual figures. However, New Orleans is the greatest cotton-shipping port in the world. You gentlemen know the high percentage of American cotton that is shipped abroad. You may get some idea of that from this map, prepared by Mr. Henry Buckman, one of the most eminent engineers in America. He has prepared this map, and it shows here the ships as they were stationed in 1932 on the day and hour this map was made. From that an estimate was made of the ships which would pass through this canal annually, which is 1 ship every 42 minutes, day and night, throughout the year, over 40,000,000 tons per year.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Will the gentleman supply information as to how much freight would be saved on a bale of cotton from New Orleans to Liverpool via the route through the canal as suggested?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to put that detail in the RECORD.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. CARTER. I presume from the gentleman's remarks that this will be a canal through which tolls will be charged?

Mr. GREEN. I rather think it will not be a toll canal. I think it will be a straight river and harbor project of the Army engineers for the benefit of the American people without toll. However, if tolls were to be charged, and I think they should not be, then it will retire its indebtedness in the form of 2- or 3-percent bonds in about 30 years.

Mr. CARTER. That is the question I was coming to, as to whether or not the gentleman had estimated the amount of tolls in the event tolls were to be charged?

Mr. GREEN. The tolls will be sufficient to retire the bonds in less than 30 years, and with a sea-level canal, 35 feet deep, there will hardly be any upkeep. We do not think that it should be a toll canal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been interrupted so much that I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman from Florida state how much is now being paid for the shipment of cotton from the Gulf ports by water to New England and by rail, and how much additional savings would be made by shipping through the proposed Florida canal?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to incorporate that.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. What is the gentleman's idea as to a proper toll charge for that canal?

Mr. GREEN. The Panama Canal paid this past year between sixteen and eighteen million dollars, net. This canal will carry one-third to one-half more tonnage than the Panama Canal. I would say on the average there would be more than $20,000,000 in tolls, if tolls should be charged.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman misunderstood me. What is the gentleman's idea of a proper toll for an average-sized freight-carrying ship passing through that canal?

Mr. GREEN. I have not estimated that; however, in justification for the project the Public Works engineers and the Army engineers considered the toll feature and in that regard, coupled with the unemployment feature, they all, I understand, practically agree it is justifiable and feasible.

Mr. MOTT. If a toll is charged, of course, the amount of the toll has to be taken into consideration in figuring the saving made in the freight.

Mr. GREEN. They have done that, and they found that the ships would pay the toll and use the canal rather than go around the Florida Peninsula. So it would be more economical even if they had to pay a toll. However, we are not building this, we hope, as a toll canal. It is to be a straight river and harbor project for the benefit of the American people.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman tell me how long it will take a ship to go through this canal?

Mr. GREEN. I shall come to that later.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman from California [Mr. COLDEN] asked with respect to the difference in rail and water rates on cotton from the Gulf to New England mills, we will say. The present rate on cotton by ship from Galveston is $1.75 a bale and by rail it is $7.70 a bale.

Mr. GREEN. That is quite a saving; about 75 percent, and represents the saving the people will realize generally after the canal is constructed.

Mr. MOTT. How long will it take a ship to go through that canal?

Mr. GREEN. It will save 3 days per round trip.

Mr. MOTT. But how long will it take to go through the canal itself?

Mr. GREEN. I have not the hours; but I shall be pleased to put that in the RECORD. Is the gentleman interested in the Columbia River Valley project?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; very much, indeed.

Mr. GREEN. So am I.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA of California. Referring to the income from the Panama Canal, did the gentleman refer to net or gross income?

Mr. GREEN. I understand it runs more than $16,000,000 net, or around $20,000,000 gross in 1933.

Mr. LEA of California. Yes; that is true, and this last year it was over $25,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. Nineteen hundred and thirty-three was a comparatively low year. During 1928 and 1929 it was much higher than in 1933 or 1934.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

TONNAGE OF MERCHANT FLEETS

The gross tonnage of merchant fleets of the world has shown a marvelous growth over the past 20 years; for instance, tonnage of the chief nations were as follows:

1913:	
United States	7,886,551
Great Britain	18,696,237
Germany	5,082,061
France	2,201,164
Japan	1,500,014
Norway	2,457,890
Holland	1,309,849
Italy	1,521,942
Belgium	304,386
1923:	
United States	16,952,018
Great Britain	19,281,549
Germany	2,590,073
France	3,737,244
Japan	3,604,147
Norway	2,551,912
Holland	2,625,741
Italy	3,033,742
Belgium	605,050
1934:	
United States	13,045,037
Great Britain	20,841,218
Germany	3,690,990
France	3,293,053
Japan	4,072,707
Norway	3,981,354
Holland	2,618,016
Italy	2,928,396
Belgium	414,655

During the peak years from 1922 to 1930 the tonnage was greater than at the present time on account, of course, of the general depression conditions throughout the world.

UNITED STATES EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

In the year 1840 the value of exports sent out from the United States was $132,000,000 and our imports were $107,000,000.

In 1915 our exports had increased to $2,768,000,000, while our imports were valued at $1,674,000,000.

In 1920 we exported $8,228,000,000 worth and imported $5,279,000,000. Owing to adverse conditions throughout the commercial world, our exports and imports are not now as great as they were in 1920.

The value of imports and exports in the South Atlantic States and Gulf Coast States has shown a healthy increase.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago, and I do not know whether the gentleman has indicated the difference in elevation or lift on the different routes and the estimated cost of each one of them.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be pleased to put that in the RECORD. We brought out a portion of the cost of the different routes, and I shall be pleased to go into that further in my extension of remarks.

Mr. COLDEN. Are all these routes sea-level canals?

Mr. GREEN. In the surveys of practically all the routes the engineers have considered both a sea-level canal and a lock canal. They considered one of them, which is marked here in yellow, first as a lock canal with two locks of 610 feet by 1,000 feet and having 40-foot clearance over the sills, but my belief now is that practically all engineers have come to the sea-level canal in the interest of upkeep in the future and speed in passage through the canal, general economy and efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the keen interest in this project because we realize the great benefit that will accrue to the American shippers after this project is completed.

I firmly believe that the President is going to see fit to allocate sufficient funds for the construction of this canal and will do so in the near future. As an unemployment-relief measure alone, it is fully justified, especially when we think about the manner in which we have spent money, we might say, with nothing at all in view except to keep people from begging for something to eat, cutting grass and raking leaves and various minor projects in order that American citizens may earn something rather than beg for something to eat or accept a direct dole.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the colloquy a while ago between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Florida, reference was made to foreign ships using this canal. The major portion of the commerce that will pass through the canal will be coastwise trade, and foreign ships are prohibited by law from engaging in such trade.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is an excellent contribution and, I think, answers the gentleman from Missouri.

I believe it is time that our Government should embark upon public-work projects for the American people that will mean a permanent investment and provide returns to our people in future generations. A canal across the State of Florida will not be for this generation alone. It will not be built for today, but it will be for all time in the future, and when we compare it with raking leaves and cutting weeds and various small projects which we have had to resort to in the past, I believe, as an unemployment measure alone, this canal is fully justified and should be built at this time in the public interest.

Of all the waterway-improvement projects which have been suggested, this is the outstanding one which has been considered by river and harbor engineers and by Public Works engineers, and where others stand 1 to 1 this stands 2 to 1. This project offers an opportunity to do something for the American people for all time to come. This Congress cannot fail to approve it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. For what distance does this proposed route follow the St. Johns River?

Mr. GREEN. One of the routes, the first one to Jacksonville, would follow it only some 20 miles. The one to Middleburg would be thirty-odd miles, and the one on down to Palatka and across to Ocala to the Withlacoochee and the Oklawaha and St. Johns, the route follows the river, 60 or 80 miles.

Mr. REED of New York. The depth in the St. Johns River now up as far as Jacksonville will take an ocean steamship?

Mr. GREEN. The river from Jacksonville to the Atlantic Ocean is adequate to carry most vessels that will use the canal.

Mr. REED of New York. Has the gentleman the geological survey of his State here?

Mr. GREEN. Not today.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman has undoubtedly examined it.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. That shows that all of this proposed route is simply a sandy soil that can be handled easily. There is no blasting.

Mr. GREEN. It is easy to dredge. It is a muck soil, a sandy-loam soil; and such rock as is under the soil is a soft porous lime rock, easy to dredge.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman will find that his State geological survey some years ago brought out the very point that he has as to the character of the rock and soil.

Mr. GREEN. It is easy to dredge.

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

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. In reply to my colleague from New York [Mr. REED], the gentleman will recall that the depth is 30 feet from the ocean to Jacksonville at present, and from Jacksonville to Palatka, 50 miles, it is about 18 feet all the

way, which will make a very short cut through. In reply to his other question, borings have been made by the War Department which show that this material does not require blasting. Also I remind my colleague that there was a greater fight put up against the Panama Canal than is made against this canal. It was contended at that time that the Panama Canal would be a failure. I am satisfied that the future will prove that this canal is just as meritorious and perhaps as well justified as was the Panama Canal.

Mr. GREEN. Some of the best engineering minds in the world, as has been said by my colleague from Florida, passed unfavorably upon the Panama Canal and said it was not feasible; that it was only a dream and was impossible of accomplishment. What Member of Congress or what shipping interest or what general American interest would say today, "Fill up the Panama Canal"? To the contrary, they are now advocating very seriously a canal across Mexico, many, many miles above the Panama Canal, to make a shorter route from the Lower California Gulf to the Gulf of Mexico and on to the cities of the East. That canal may sometime be realized.

Another reason why the Florida canal construction is imperative is this: The hope for American commerce, the hope for expansion of our trade, rests in Latin America. If you are going to expand, you must expand in a fertile field. Latin America is the most fertile field for trade and commerce, and the best market for manufactured products from the United States lies there. This canal will make accessible this Latin American trade, and we will find there an outlet for our manufactured products and for the products of the great Mississippi Valley, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Missouri.

My friends, you will remember something about the Monroe Doctrine. That was over a century ago, about 1823. The same thing that prompted the Monroe Doctrine prompted the action of the other body a few days ago—that is, America for Americans—and the American people, the people of the United States, owe to Latin American countries every possible bit of encouragement and every possible cooperation, and every possible benefit that can be carried to any foreign country should be carried to Latin America by the United States. There it will be reciprocated.

Mr. COLDEN. What is the proposed depth of these canals, and what vessels are they supposed to accommodate?

Mr. GREEN. The canal will be not less than 35 feet deep, 250 feet wide in the rock sections, and 400 feet wide in the soil sections.

Mr. MOTT. Has the Board of Army Engineers passed on this yet?

Mr. GREEN. The Board of Army Engineers' report has not been filed with the Congress. However, under the provisions of the bill the President is given full latitude to construct such canal and at such place as will take care of all vessels now afloat, using the waters of the Atlantic and the Gulf.

Mr. MOTT. What did the Board of Army Engineers say about it?

Mr. GREEN. Is the gentleman in favor of waterways and waterway development?

Mr. MOTT. I am; and I am very much interested in the gentleman's project, and that is one reason why I would like to know what the Board of Army Engineers thinks about it.

Mr. GREEN. Their report will be made in the near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Colorado). The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has again expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. May I just insert here in the RECORD one observation? The gentleman said that the tolls were $16,000,000, I believe?

Mr. GREEN. On the Panama Canal; net tolls between sixteen and eighteen millions in 1933, more in 1934.

Mr. SNYDER. The tolls were $24,660,000 for 1934, and the tonnage was 28,567,000 tons for 1934.

Mr. GREEN. There was a great increase. I am glad to have that contribution by the gentleman.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. I do not quite see why all of the shipments going to Latin America would have to pass through that canal. I should think they would go down south of it.

Mr. GREEN. Such trade as is utilized by the Mississippi Valley naturally will have access out to Latin America, and vice versa.

Mr. SNELL. But why would they not go right on down south to get to Latin America?

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman evidently has not made a thorough study of the situation.

Mr. SNELL. I am asking for information.

Mr. GREEN. Latin America is now available to the Mississippi Valley, exports and imports, and will utilize the benefits that are brought about by this canal.

Mr. SNELL. They would have to go out of their way to go through that canal, would they not?

Mr. GREEN. Is the gentleman in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway?

Mr. SNELL. It does not make any difference. I am asking the gentleman a question, and if he does not want to answer it, it is all right. I am asking the gentleman why they should go through that Canal instead of going straight on down south?

Mr. GREEN. Is the gentleman in favor of this waterway?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know anything about it and I am trying to get some information and the gentleman cannot give it to me.

Mr. GREEN. I shall go further into the Latin American matter.

LATIN AMERICAN TRADE

Our Latin American trade is showing an increase compared with trade in other countries and considering general world conditions. Take, for instance, our trade with Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. It has been as follows:

Exports

Argentina:	
1913	$52,895
1920	213,726
1929	210,288
1933	36,929
Brazil:	
1913	42,638
1920	156,740
1929	108,787
1933	29,725
Mexico:	
1913	54,383
1920	207,859
1929	133,863
1933	37,519

Imports

Argentina:	
1913	$26,864
1920	207,777
1929	117,581
1933	33,836
Brazil:	
1913	120,156
1920	227,588
1929	207,686
1933	82,618
Mexico:	
1913	77,544
1920	179,332
1929	117,738
1933	30,716

Our trade advantages in Latin America can, and should be, strengthened. There is no good reason why, with the proper development of our waterways and harbor facilities, and with proper trade agreements and negotiations, we

should not be able to obtain at least half of all Latin American trade.

The construction of this canal across north Florida will have a most wholesome effect upon our Latin American trade relations and will increase our tonnage, and in this connection this canal will enable our Mississippi Valley States to place their raw products on the European market at a far reduced transportation charge and thus enable us to compete with such Latin American raw products as are sent to Europe. It will make the products of the Mississippi Valley reach the European market from 1 to 2 days earlier than now and will reflect this saving in time in reduced transportation cost. Corn and corn products, livestock and meat products, cotton, wheat, and, in fact, all products of the Missouri and Mississippi Valley which are now sold abroad will be better enabled to compete on the European market with similar products from South America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the American Government is expending huge sums for waterway development. Let us take the figures, for instance, from 1802 down to 1933. The American Government, on the Mississippi River system alone, spent $482,000,000; on intercoastal canals, $123,000,000; lake harbors and channels, $205,000,000; seacoast harbors and channels, $648,000,000; operation and tariff canals, $126,000,000; on all projects, $1,619,500,000.

How about the Boulder Dam project with more than $100,000,000. How about the Conowingo project with its huge amount? How about the project down at Muscle Shoals and the Tennessee Valley, $150,000,000? And the Norris Dam and the Wheeler Dam will require another sixty or eighty million dollars to complete. Mr. Speaker, this is hardly a drop in the bucket compared to the other great developments which have been accomplished by the United States Army engineers and by the American people.

The Muscle Shoals and Tennessee Valley development projects can reach their full benefits and usefulness only through the construction of this canal. The development of the Tennessee Valley project will bring production of millions of tons of commerce. In order for this tonnage to meet competition on the world market, it will be necessary for it to utilize cheap water transportation. This tonnage to and from the Muscle Shoals and Tennessee Valley development will pass through the Florida Canal. Fertilizer produced at Muscle Shoals will by water be distributed to practically all ports of our country and from there distributed to the farmers of our Nation. They will receive the benefits of cheaper water transportation caused by the time and distance saving brought about through the construction of the Florida Canal.

Muscle Shoals as now being developed will be one of the greatest industrial centers of the world. Practically all products there manufactured will need cheap water transportation. The initiation of the Tennessee Valley project was the dawn of industrialization of the South and Southeast. With the construction of this canal, factories of practically all kinds will increase in this great heretofore undeveloped section of our country. The streams, and there are many, will be harnessed and offer cheap power for every section of this great area. Textile mills are already increasing, in fact, nearly half of the spindles now operating in the country are in this great area.

The iron and steel industry of Alabama; the phosphate industry of Tennessee and Florida; the timber and naval stores industry of the entire South; the pulpwood and paper industry and, in fact, practically all industries will expand here by leaps and bounds. A greater demand will accrue for all farm products of the Mississippi Valley in the South. The large saving and transportation charges will be beneficial to every State in the Union.

The vast resources of my own State will likewise be fully developed.

Thousands of acres of land will be brought into cultivation and noncompetitive production. The products of Florida are almost noncompetitive as far as any other State in the Union is concerned. Our citrus products compete very little with the citrus products of other States of the lower Mississippi Valley and of California. Ours, in the main, find their way to the eastern market—those of Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana find their way to the upper Mississippi Valley markets, and California citrus products supply the great western section of our country and the central section.

Our vegetables are produced principally in mid-winter, when vegetables from no other State in the Union are in any quantity on the American market. Our competitors for winter vegetables are foreign countries—Mexico and the islands to the south of Florida—therefore the additional lands in Florida which are brought under cultivation will be principally for the growth of winter vegetables and will indeed be noncompetitive with any existing arable lands in America. Some of my colleagues may not realize the large percentage of these winter vegetables that are grown in Florida. Take, for instance, in the year 1926:

Florida produced 81 percent of the entire Nation's production of grapefruit; eggplants, 59 percent; table cucumbers, 41 percent; snap beans, 38½ percent; peppers, 61 percent; celery, 32 percent; tomatoes, 24 percent; early Irish potatoes, 10 percent. Florida produces almost all of the other common vegetables but in a lesser percentage.

The citrus fruit is one of Florida's greatest industries. In 1928 Florida had 274 car-lot packing houses. She had 70,000 acres planted to grapefruit trees, 50,000 of which were bearing. She had 160,000 acres planted to orange trees, 95,000 of which were bearing, different varieties producing grapefruit and oranges for the market at different times of the year. For example, the early varieties of oranges placed on the market from November to January are such as Parsons, Temples, and Enterprise; midseason varieties, from January to March, seedlings and pineapples; later varieties, from March to January, Valencias, Lue Gim Gongs, and others.

Another of Florida's most lucrative products is strawberries. It furnishes the entire country with early strawberries. Plant City and other places in its vicinity begin shipping as early as November or December. My own city of Starke begins shipping a little later, and sends to cities north of Florida millions of dollars worth of strawberries annually. Sanford, Fla., is a great producer of celery. I shall not undertake to enumerate the other products of Florida which would augment the great volume of commerce which would pass through this canal.

The American people have expended huge sums in the construction of canals, dams, and other great and beneficial improvements. The initial cost of the Panama Canal was almost $400,000,000, which is about three times the cost of the canal across Florida.

The Conowingo, Maryland, cost some fifty-two million; the Keokuk, in Iowa, twenty-four million; the Ashokan, New York, thirty million; the Boulder Dam project, more than one hundred million; the Cape Cod Canal, many millions; and scores of other great improvements which are redounding great benefits to the economic life of America.

ROADS

Our Government has also contributed huge amounts toward the building of roads in America. We have now more than 358,000 miles of improved roads; some 275,000 of them hard surfaced. These roads have cost almost countless millions. Their further usefulness can be had only through the construction of a canal across north Florida. Our railroads and highways will act as feeders for tonnage traversing this canal.

MILLIONS LOANED TO RAILROADS AND INDUSTRY

During the past 3 years the Federal Government has loaned millions and millions of dollars to railroad companies in order that they may continue to operate. In this way they have carried an unprecedented assistance to this great industry in our Nation, and it is only fair to expect that the Government may well contribute to the fuller development of our waterways.

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. I wish to ask the gentleman if he will place in the RECORD how many foreign bottoms would pass through that canal. I take it it would be a seaway that would be open to the ships of all nations, except in time of war?

Mr. GREEN. It will be.

Mr. FIESINGER. I wanted to find out how many foreign bottoms, or what proportion of foreign bottoms, would pass through the canal.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to supply that, if obtainable. It is estimated that 10,000 ships a year will pass through it.

Employment will be given to some 30,000 people over each year of construction. It is estimated that some 4 to 6 years will be required for completion. Seventy-five percent to eighty percent of the funds expended for construction will go direct to labor, and as an unemployment-relief project it is thoroughly justified. It has also been suggested that C. C. C. camp forces may well be utilized in many phases of construction and thus eliminate a large item of cost. It is far better to expend relief and public-works money in a worth-while project of permanent investment for the American people than to lavish it upon minor and nonprofitable projects. This project when completed will represent a permanent investment for all future generations of America. It has been pointed out by best authorities as the outstanding and most worth while of all possible relief or public-works projects.

I earnestly request the cooperation and support of all my colleagues in this worthy project.

So I call upon my colleagues to give careful study to this project. See what effect it has upon 38 or 39 States in the Union. Thirty-eight of them will be directly affected. Every one of them will have an indirect benefit. It will develop every great basic industry in our land. I speak to you gentlemen from the great industrial States, as Pennsylvania with your iron factories, and you Members from the West with your copper factories and with your steel mills and your electric equipment manufacturing concerns. Every basic industry in the United States will be stimulated by the construction of this canal. [Applause.]

REPRESENTATIVE R. A. (LEX) GREEN ADVOCATES CANAL ACROSS NORTH FLORIDA

Following is a copy of an address over the Columbia Broadcasting System by Representative R. A. (LEX) GREEN, Democrat, of Florida, Saturday, February 9, from 7:45 to 8 p. m., eastern standard time. He spoke from the studios of WJSV, Columbia's station for the Nation's Capital.

About a century ago a great President, Andrew Jackson, realizing the vast importance of such a waterway, sent a special message to Congress recommending construction of a canal across Florida. Now, another great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, will, in my opinion, construct the canal. It has been enthusiastically advocated for the past 10 years.

It was my pleasure in 1925 to introduce a bill in the Congress for preliminary survey of proposed routes, and in 1930 for physical surveys. Surveys have been practically completed by the Board of United States Army Engineers and the Federal Public Works Engineers. In addition to these Boards, the President has appointed a special Commission, or Board, to go into this matter thoroughly and report to him, and I have reasons to believe that the findings of this Board fully justify the project. The results are that one or more feasible routes have been found for a steamship canal across northern Florida, connecting the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with those of the Gulf of Mexico. Some of the best engineering minds in the country have concluded that such a canal is not only feasible from an engineering point, but will pay for itself in the way of benefits to the American people within the course of 30 years. It has also been concluded that as a toll or self-liquidating proposition, it will retire the cost of construction within about 36 years. The cost of construction has been estimated at 110 to 143 million dollars.

The total benefits to commerce and the people of the United States from this project, as determined by the Army engineers and the Public Works engineers, are more than twice its cost, which is a higher ratio than can be borne for any project of comparable magnitude now being considered by the Government. These benefits would reduce the cost of operation of ships by more than $8,000,000 a year and will redound far greater benefits than this to the American public in the way of reduced cost in transportation. It is estimated that the producers and consumers of America would be saved $36,000,000 per year in transportation cost. This is a huge amount, and within 3 or 4 years the American public will receive in benefits the cost of construction.

With this in mind, I have introduced H. R. 2785, which is now before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, and upon which hearings will be held. The bill gives the President full authority to acquire right-of-way and proceed with the construction of this waterway, which will be adequate to provide for substantially all vessels now using the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean. He is authorized to use all surveys and data of the Board of United States Army Engineers and to utilize their splendid services for future surveys, if necessary, and to carry out the construction of the project. The Federal Government, through its Board of Army Engineers, is thoroughly equipped to promptly begin the construction of the project. Under the provisions of the bill, the President may utilize any existing or future Federal rivers and harbors or other improvement funds or may issue bonds. It has been estimated by competent engineers that the project can be completed in from 4 to 6 years and will employ 25,000 men continuously over the period of construction.

As an unemployment-relief project alone, the project is justified. Between 75 and 80 percent of money expended on the project will go to labor and to the relief of the unemployed. It will stimulate the great interest of industries of the country—the manufacture of steel, copper, electrical equipment, excavation equipment, cement, lumber, and all manner of heavy machinery in the basic industries which are so sorely in need of stimulation at the present time. These products will be drawn from every section of the country and relieve unemployment in practically every State of the Union. Likewise, the benefits to be derived by the American people will be realized in every nook and corner of the Nation, and will be directly felt in at least 37 States. The American people are awake to these benefits, as is evidenced by the large number of officials and organizations who have whole-heartedly and enthusiastically endorsed the project. Among these are Governors of many States, twoscore of United States Senators, dozens of Members of Congress, boards of trade, and chambers of commerce of many States, and many large cities in the Union, including practically all great seaport cities. Also such representative waterways and transportation developments associations as the Atlantic Deeper Waterway Association, the Mississippi Valley Association, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. This latter great national body, representing every section of the United States, has considered this project of such outstanding importance that it has recently endorsed it for prompt construction in the public interest. The Honorable Henry H. Buckman, who is vice chairman of the projects committee of that body, recently said:

"This project probably more truly deserves to be termed national in character than any other great public work now being contemplated by the Federal Government. Its commercial benefits to the Nation will be greater and more wide spread than those of the Panama Canal. Through it would pass more than 10,000 ships each year, representing the greatest flow of tonnage through any canal in the world, and carrying the water-borne commerce of all the territory between the Rockies and the Alleghanies to the Atlantic seaboard and overseas."

Mr. Buckman is an engineer of national reputation and authority. In comparison with the Panama Canal, the actual figures indicate that the tonnage available to the Florida Canal are more than one-third greater than that which passes through the Panama Canal and approximately double that which transits the Suez Canal. One ship every 45 minutes, night and day throughout the year, will pass through this canal. The actual cost of the Panama Canal was near $400,000,000, which is nearly three times the amount required to build the canal across Florida. The Florida Canal will increase the traffic through the Panama Canal and will have a stimulating effect upon the commerce of the Nation in general. Every possible effort should be now exercised by the American Government to increase our foreign and domestic trade. There are now in our harbors countless numbers of vessels which will find their place in trade and traffic as the result of the opening of a canal across northern Florida. This canal will save to shipping craft on the average of 3 days round trip from New Orleans to New York. It will eliminate storm hazards now incurred by vessels going around the Florida Peninsula and will be a great saving to American shippers. It will increase tonnage on every Atlantic and Gulf port of our Nation. The existing water-borne tonnage now available to this canal is upward of 90,000,000 dead-weight tons of ships per year.

It is imperative that America fully develop her natural arteries of commerce. The benefits derived from the full development of waterways was centuries ago realized by European countries. Europe, with some 3,584,000 square miles of land, has more than 28,000 miles of normally navigable waterways, while the United States, with some 3,028,000 square miles of land area, has probably less than 3,000 miles of developed waterways. Practically all these older nations have realized the general economic benefit of full development of their waterways and the result in economy and transportation. It is true that America has embarked upon many worthy public-improvement projects and has expended huge sums for improvements.

Take for instance the Cape Cod Canal, costing a huge sum; the Tennessee Valley project, $50,000,000; the Boulder Dam, about 150 million dollars; the Muscle Shoals project, $150,000,000; the Osage project, $30,000,000; the Conowingo project, $52,000,000; the Coolidge Dam project, $5,500,000; and a large number of other worth-while projects which are redounding great benefits to the citizens of one or more States of our Nation. The canal across northern Florida will greatly benefit the entire Mississippi Valley. The Mississippi River is more than 2,400 miles long and makes accessible one of the largest and most fertile regions in the world. The Congress is now considering the advisability of authorizing $130,000,000 for fuller development of the upper Mississippi waterway. The full development of the entire Mississippi Valley, and its resources, rests on the construction of a canal across Florida, which is the keystone in the arch of our waterways development program. With the proposed development of the upper Mississippi, and the construction of the canal across northern Florida,

every possible shipping advantage will be equally restored to all States of the valley. Any disadvantages heretofore existing to certain States on the account of the Panama Canal, will be fully offset by the construction of the canal across northern Florida. Vast natural resources in this great valley will be developed and realized. Millions of acres of available lands in the States of the lower Mississippi and the Southeast will be filled with people who are now living to a disadvantage in congested centers. The pulp and timber industries, the iron industry in Alabama and Tennessee, the oil industry in the entire Mississippi Valley, the naval stores, and cotton industries, the manufacturing industries of the East, in fact, 95 percent of the capital now invested in industries of America will redound great benefits from the construction of this waterway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Colorado). Under the special order the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is evident, I believe, on both sides of this House that there is a large group of both political parties sincerely disturbed by the unprecedented expansion of Executive powers and the apparent willingness of the House of Representatives to obey the wishes of the Executive. In addition to this group there is a far larger and noisier conglomeration, which talks volubly on the same subject, but very manifestly for political purposes. They are unterrified dispensers of political hokum, it would seem, chemically pure and unadulterated. They are obviously trying to marshal all of those forces of Treasury raiders who fattened out of the Public Treasury during the glorious and hectic twenties. This group profited when there was little Executive leadership and when 500 lobbies held the House of Representatives almost in complete helplessness. They are hungry, disappointed, and rebellious.

In their anguish they cry out: Dictatorship! Bolshevistic! Save the Constitution! Rubber-stamp Congress! And so forth. Nevertheless, the basic problem of uncontrolled extension of Executive power in a free government is unquestionably upon us; and it is a problem which those who are sincerely interested in the welfare and the future of this country must solve.

Appearing in this morning's Post was this editorial, headed by a quotation from Abraham Lincoln. It reads as follows:

"A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations," Lincoln once said, "is the only true sovereign of a free people."

There is no question today that the administration is acting with the approval of the majority. Where cause for apprehension lies is in the weakening of constitutional restraints. In times of emergency there is always danger that a majority of the people will approve expedients which, if followed to their logical conclusions, would undermine the whole political system.

Checks and limitations frequently appear unnecessarily onerous. In a crisis they may prevent or obstruct the application of quick remedies. But when thoughtful restraints are thoughtlessly eliminated, the very foundations of government are affected. Representatives of the people, becoming reckless because of temporarily critical conditions, have often been known to act in haste and repent at leisure.

It is not a new problem. It first appeared in the early history of our country and has become increasingly important with our industrial development. Not only in this country but all over the world the passage of tariff laws, profit taxes, and police-power regulations have so intertwined governments with industry that any country lacking the executive power to function with equal facility with industry is bound to fail. During this post-war period of readjustments the extension of executive power has become so vital to the life of all governments that wherever the people have voluntarily failed to provide for that expansion the government has fallen and a dictatorship been created.

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

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Does not the gentleman think it impossible for the executive of a government to have the same freedom of action as the executive of a private industry, because the executive of a government must act by statute?

Mr. HARLAN. England is one outstanding proof of the fact that it is not impossible. Where free peoples have failed to provide adequate executive power, those governments have set up dictatorship executives. These officials have become obviously necessary in such countries. I shall discuss the manner in which this problem has been met by other governments in a few minutes.

Of all the great countries on the globe, England alone seems to have devised a system by which her executive power has been broad enough to perform its duties, while at all times it is under legislative control and supervision. In the United States we could not at this time adopt the English system of government without important constitutional amendments. It is even doubtful that the temperament of our people would welcome the complete British program. However, under our Constitution as it now exists, there appears to be adequate power in Congress to restore our Government to health.

To accomplish this purpose we must devise a system that will give us, first, adequate executive power; second, continuing legislative control over the use and abuse of that power; third, congressional leadership in the national interest.

It would hardly seem to be necessary to argue the need of a more powerful executive department, in view of the occurrences that are taking place all over the civilized world. When our Government was first established, the ox team stood for overland transportation. The family was the unit of production. The general store handled all distribution. It is a far cry from that situation to the condition of today; and with that growth our Government has become inseparably entangled with industry. There is hardly a manufacturing business that has not now become more vested with a public use than were the stage coaches, warehouses, and inns when our Constitution was written.

Those Members who are lawyers will recall the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Oklahoma ice case, and will recall that it is within the power of a State now to declare almost any industry vested with a public use; and with that vesting of public use in industry, private office has become a public trust, and government cannot escape longer its responsibilities.

In looking back over our history it would seem that whenever a great crisis has come there has sprung up from the people a President with vision and with the power in his personality who could take substantially the same course as that taken by our present Executive. Such men were Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson. But a government which relies for its security on personalities and fortuitous circumstances is not on a firm foundation. It has also been most fortunate that when these great leaders have arisen they have found a patriotic Congress willing to sacrifice its prerogatives to save the life of the Republic.

But here again we are relying upon a government by individuals and not by law. It is the duty of the legislative body to legislate and it is not performing its functions by abdicating to any executive no matter how honest, how courageous, how able that executive may be. Our second requirement is to reestablish our legislative branch to a position of responsibility.

These remarks are not meant at all as critical of Congress. There has been no Member of this body more willing to vote for almost every grant of Executive power that has been required, and it is my intention to continue to do so, because I can see no other way out. It is practically impossible for a bulky legislative body to function with the facility that is necessary in times like these. But I do not feel that this attitude will produce a healthy government by which the legislative branch grants these powers and then releases itself of all responsibility.

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

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Then, what does the gentleman intend to do about it, and when does he intend to start?

Mr. HARLAN. If the gentleman will allow me to develop my thought, I think I can cover it satisfactorily to him.

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

Mr. HARLAN. For a brief question.

Mr. HOEPPEL. I should like to ask the gentleman if he was guilty of voting for that iniquitous rule which changed the number of signatures necessary on a discharge petition from 145 to 218?

Mr. HARLAN. I was.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Then the gentleman has no argument.

Mr. HARLAN. All right; if that is your opinion, a great majority of us felt otherwise. My regret is that I voted originally for the 145 discharge rule.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman from Ohio does not admit that it was iniquitous? It is the gentleman from California [Mr. HOEPPEL] who claims that making such salutary change was iniquitous. But a great majority of the House did not agree with him.

Mr. HARLAN. We have talked about the necessity for an extension of Executive power, the necessity for the extension of legislative power to cope with the growth of that Executive power. The third great need is the providing of legislative leadership in times of stress and practically all times.

The Seventy-second Congress of the United States, I believe, will stand out in history as an indication of the extent to which a legislative body composed of highly intelligent men may emulate a mob when there is no adequate leadership. History has given us similar examples, notably the Long Parliament just before Cromwell in England and the Constituent Assembly just before the French Revolution. During most of our history, however, great men have appeared in Congress commanding sufficient respect to afford leadership. Here, again, however, we are relying not upon law or a system of government, but upon the exigencies of politics.

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

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentleman cite to the House any time in the history of the English Parliament when they delegated the taxing power to the executive or delegated other legislative power to the executive?

Mr. HARLAN. I will discuss that in just a moment.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman is making a very interesting speech, and I want to compliment him on it.

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

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Do I understand the gentleman to be admitting that there is no leadership at the present time in the 3-to-1 Democratic majority in the House?

Mr. HARLAN. I am not discussing leadership now; unquestionably there is leadership now.

Mr. MOTT. I understood the gentleman to say there was not.

Mr. HARLAN. My point is that the leadership now is dependent upon fortuitous exigencies of politics and not upon a system. We had leadership when Andrew Jackson was President; we had leadership when Abraham Lincoln was President; we had leadership when Theodore Roosevelt was President; and when Woodrow Wilson was President. We would have had leadership many times if conditions had demanded, but it happened we were not in a crisis, so I am not limiting it to those men.

Mr. MOTT. Do you have leadership now?

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman referred to the Seventy-second Congress. Will the gentleman elaborate upon that statement just a little?

Mr. HARLAN. The Seventy-second Congress was composed of a group of men in which the political parties were evenly divided. We had a Speaker of the Democratic Party and a President of the Republican Party. We had a number of progressive Republicans and insurgent Democrats. We were unable, therefore, to get any place with a particular policy. The President of the United States, on the most critical issue that any President could act, the revenue bill, refused to lay down a policy to this House, and we went in about 435 different directions.

These weaknesses have been apparent to students of our Government for many years past. Woodrow Wilson discussed them fully in his book entitled "Congressional Government." Gamaliel Bradford, at the beginning of the present century, prophesied that unless the United States Government supplied a cure for the three evils above set forth, it would inevitably crash in the first half of this century.

During the forty-sixth session of the United States Congress a resolution was introduced into the Senate by Senator George H. Pendleton designed to strengthen our Government in the three respects just set forth. That resolution was referred to a committee consisting of Senator George H. Pendleton, at one time Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States; Hon. James G. Blaine, at one time Speaker of the House of Representatives, twice Secretary of State, and later a Republican candidate for President; Hon. W. B. Allison, for 35 years a Member of the United States Senate, and a former adjutant general for the State of Iowa; Gen. M. C. Butler, a Confederate veteran and a major general of the Spanish-American War; Hon. James T. Earley; Hon. John G. Ingalls, four times President pro tempore of the Senate; and Hon. Orville H. Platt—3 Democrats and 4 Republicans—a group of men whom it would be difficult to surpass for ability and statesmanship in any legislative body.

The resolution introduced provided, first, that members of the President's Cabinet should be entitled at all times to seats in the House and Senate, and that each Cabinet member should be privileged to partake in the debates on any bill affecting his particular executive department; second, it was provided that on certain days the attendance of these Cabinet members would be required for the purpose of answering questions of general welfare under the rules of the House and Senate concerning their particular department.

This resolution received a very thorough consideration at the hands of this special committee, both as to its advisability and as to its constitutionality, and also a unanimously favorable report. Obviously it would immediately bring about many changes for which the times were not propitious. It was very far in advance of the ideals of the people of that day.

For example, we were at that time on the verge of a great civil-service reform that came in 4 years afterward. We were on the verge of a tariff program that subsequently appealed to all sectional interests in the United States. We were on the verge of these pension raids on the Treasury of the United States later temporarily halted by Grover Cleveland. A great many interests did not want to see unified government by the House and Senate. Also at that time it was not always the custom to select the most able men in the Cabinet. A great many Cabinet members were then selected on account of their political power rather than for their ability, and it might be embarrassing to require such men to be constantly in the spotlight. At any rate, the bill did not get more than a favorable report, but it was a very thorough report from this able committee.

Since that time we have passed through this present panic. We have seen the inevitable growth of Executive power. We have seen the absolute necessity of creating legislative power capable of controlling and working with that growth of Executive power. We now know the need of unifying legislative leadership. The conditions now are very much different than they were at that time.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. There is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary H. R. 5493, which is entitled "A bill granting the members of the Cabinet the right of debate on the floor of Congress." Do I understand the gentleman to be in favor of this bill?

Mr. HARLAN. That is the bill I am discussing and advocating here. I hope to have a hearing before the Judiciary Committee on that problem.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. There are some members of the Cabinet we would not want on the floor of the House.

Mr. HARLAN. I will say to the gentleman that if that is so—which I would not care to admit—then this bill is the very best measure we could possibly devise to meet that situation, for the reason that if a man were in the spotlight and subject to public questioning, he could not hold down the job unless he were equipped for the office. He would have to know his business or he would soon appear to be so incompetent that his removal would be necessary.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman interpret the measure which he is proposing and advocating as a further extension of executive power?

Mr. HARLAN. I do not.

Mr. COX. Can it be construed as an encroachment of the executive branch upon the legislative branch? In theory, the legislative branch is the dominant branch of government, but in practice, is it? Is it to recapture some of the powers that the legislative branch has voted away, or will it mean a further encroachment upon the legislative branch by the executive branch? How is it going to work out?

Mr. HARLAN. I thank the gentleman for that question. Right at this point I shall read a brief part of the report of the committee on the former Senate bill, which gives the answer much clearer than anything I could say:

> It has been objected that the effect of this introduction of the heads of departments upon the floor would be largely to increase the influence of the Executive on legislation. Your committee does not share this apprehension. The information given to Congress would doubtless be more pertinent and exact; the recommendation would, perhaps, be presented with great effect; but on the other hand, the Members of Congress would also be put on the alert to see that the influence is in proportion only to the value of the information and the suggestions, and the public would be enabled to determine whether the influence is exerted by persuasion or by argument. No one who has occupied a seat on the floor of either House, no one of those who, year after year, so industriously and faithfully and correctly report the proceedings of the Houses, no frequenter of the lobby or the gallery, can have failed to discern the influence exerted upon legislation by the visits of the heads of departments to the floors of Congress and the visits of the Members of Congress to the offices in the departments. It is not necessary to say that the influence is dishonest or corrupt, but it is illegitimate; it is exercised in secret by means that are not public—by means which an honest public opinion cannot accurately discover and over which it can therefore exercise no just control. The open information and argument provided by the bill may not supplant these secret methods, but they will enable a discriminating public judgment to determine whether they are sufficient to exercise the influence which is actually exerted and thus disarm them.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from California, but I will not yield hereafter until I finish my statement.

Mr. HOEPPEL. It has been my observation that it would be of interest to the public if Cabinet officers were muzzled and prevented from sending to the Members of Congress and to the public of the United States every day a large amount of propaganda. I throw handfuls of that sort of mail in the wastebasket, which is sent to me by these Cabinet officers.

Mr. HARLAN. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech.

The Executive power has expanded with the needs of the time. It cannot and will not go any further than is necessary for Government, but it will expand that far. The purpose and intent of this bill is to put that power under the public spotlight and under public surveillance instead of, as suggested by the Senate committee, to keep it rather secret.

The adoption of the system which would have compelled the national administration at all times to assume leadership and to express disfavor on unmeritorious pension bills, logrolling tariffs, and harbor-improvement measures did not set well with Congress in that day. However, we have gone a long way since then. Our experiences from 1920 to 1932 have certainly prepared us for the need of honesty and efficiency in Government and especially in the Cabinet posts of the executive department. Our experiences from 1933 to 1935 have once more shown us that in times of stress, whether military or economic, executive leadership and expansion of executive powers are necessary to our salvation. We would need nothing more than our experiences with the Seventy-second Congress, which, by its utter futility, cast a pall of gloom and hopelessness over this country the like of which had never before existed, to convince us that leadership in legislation is a most important factor.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman mentioned several times about an emergency now existing.

Mr. HARLAN. Yes; I have mentioned that in my talk.

Mr. ALLEN. Highly paid publicity agents tell us that everything is booming; that after spending and sloughing away $15,000,000 everything is booming and we are on our way. Now, is there an emergency, or are they lying? Are things booming?

Mr. HARLAN. That has nothing to do with the subject I am discussing.

Mr. ALLEN. What does the gentleman think about that proposition? Is the country booming, or are we under an emergency?

Mr. HARLAN. I will talk to the gentleman privately on that matter. The question of the gentleman is clearly out of order.

The thing I have in mind, and which the Senate of the United States had in mind, and everyone who has thought about this seriously has in mind, is to devise some system that will work, emergency or no emergency. This has to do with system of government and not a government by individuals.

Our constitutional forefathers never showed any hesitancy at all about the intermingling of the three functions of government in order to make that government effective. They did not hesitate to obliterate the line between the executive, legislative, and judicial departments when that was necessary to accomplish an end. They knew about the needs of war and they made the President Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, with all necessary power. They could not foresee the needs of such a depression as the world is in at the present time, and therefore could not expressly grant the necessary power, but they have left it within the power of the legislature not only to grant that power but to control it if necessary. Under the powers granted to the legislature we have created administrative agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, that combine within themselves legislative, executive, and judicial functions.

The judicial branch of the Government has full and complete power to legislate and pass its rules of practice and then to execute those rules by providing penalties for their infraction. Congress alone seems to have very little judicial power and practically no executive power except the right to institute impeachment. It is true that the caucus, the Speaker of the House, and the Rules Committee together perform a number of executive functions vested in the British Cabinet, but this has never furnished a real executive drive for our legislative body. For the most part, we have drifted through the years in the hands of committees. Macauley once said in effect that victories had often been won by poor generals, but that no battle had ever been won by a debating society.

The manner in which England has ridden out the storms of the last century because its Parliament has constantly assumed its proper function of making laws and faithfully watching over their execution ought to furnish an example worthy of our emulation.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CULKIN. I simply wish to suggest to the gentleman at this point that he is proposing we adopt the English parliamentary system where the responsible Cabinet members are on the floor of the Parliament and subject to query by members of Parliament.

Mr. HARLAN. There are so many questions being asked me, may I at this time, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes?

Mr. HOEPPEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object if the gentleman will yield for a question which I shall propound in a moment.

Mr. HARLAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I trust the gentleman will not yield to any such proposition as that. The gentleman has evidently spent a great deal of time in the collection of the data he is now using. The gentleman is making a very informative and very interesting statement. I think to the gentleman is due the unanimous consent of the House for 15 additional minutes without attaching to his request any such half-way insulting proposition as the one made by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HARLAN. I shall yield to the gentleman for a brief question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. I asked the gentleman if his suggestion is that we adopt the present parliamentary system in England where, at the present time, the Parliament retains all its powers.

Mr. HARLAN. I will answer that question "no." The present parliamentary system in England has these features. The Cabinet frames all the laws. It is appointed ostensibly by the Crown but actually by Parliament. It controls these laws on the floor of Parliament and Parliament has no power at all to amend these laws. They either vote them up or down. The gentlemen in the Congress of the United States who object to gag rule, if in Parliament, would "burn up", I imagine.

Mr. CULKIN. If they vote them down, they have to go to the people immediately.

Mr. HARLAN. If these bills are voted down, then they have the choice of a new Cabinet, a reformed Cabinet, or they go to the people.

This measure which I am advocating, H. R. 5493, does not vest in the Cabinet the right to frame bills. This right stays with the Congress as it is at the present time. It does not provide for going to the people, because in the United States we go to the people every 2 years. It does not give the Cabinet the right to control the rules of consideration on the floor. It does not give Congress the right to demand the resignation of a Cabinet member, and, therefore, it is materially different from the British system.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Do I understand from the gentleman that this Congress has the inherent right to extend an invitation to a member of the Cabinet, or anyone else, to come here?

Mr. HARLAN. I may say that this Congress, under the Constitution, unquestionably has the right to pass such a bill. When our Government was organized in 1789 it was provided in a number of the bills with respect to Cabinet officers, especially the one establishing the office of Secretary of the Treasury, that he should appear before Congress and report on his office, and the same was true with respect to the Secretary of War. The fact of the matter is that in the early days of our Congress the members of the Cabinet did the very thing we are contemplating in this measure at the present time.

The early Journal of Congress shows that on Wednesday, July 22, 1789, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Jefferson, was attended agreeably to order and made the necessary explanations.

Saturday, August 22, 1789.—The Senate again entered on executive business. The President of the United States came into the Senate Chamber attended by General Knox, Secretary of War, and laid before the Senate the following statement of facts with the questions thereto annexed, for their advice and consent.

Friday, August 7, 1789.—The following message was received from the President of the United States by General Knox, the Secretary of War. * * *

Monday, August 10, 1789.—The following message was received from the President by General Knox, Secretary of War, who delivered in the same, together with statements of troops in the service of the United States.

The act of 1789, organizing the Treasury Department, provided—

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time digest and prepare plans for the improvement and management of the revenue and for the support of the public credit. * * * shall make report and give voice to every project of the Legislature in person or in writing as may be required.

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

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Does the gentleman believe that if we voted for this bill and put a crown on the heads of these tyrants in the Cabinet that they would condescend to see a mere Member of Congress when he endeavors to speak to them on public business.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, the gentleman from Ohio is making a nonpolitical statement——

Mr. HOEPPEL. I am speaking in the interest of the taxpayer.

Mr. COX. And I do wish our friends would desist from undertaking to convert it into a partisan, political exposition.

Mr. HOEPPEL. That is all the Cabinet officers are doing now—playing politics.

Mr. HARLAN. I will answer the gentleman from California.

The Congress has absolute power to pass this bill. There is no question about that; and if Congress has the power to enact this law, the Congress that controls the appropriation of money could compel these Cabinet members to come here if that question should ever arise. I do not think it would be politic for such a question to be raised.

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

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Under present law, the committees which have more to do with framing legislation than any other body have the power to subpena and to call Cabinet members before them and discuss the pending bills and get their opinion upon them.

Mr. HARLAN. I may say that that is done in secret committee meetings in which there is very limited publicity and in which the Congress, as a whole, does not have a chance to function.

Mr. MOTT. Is there any reason why the interrogation of Cabinet members by committees should not be done in an open meeting where all the Members of Congress could attend, if they desired to do so?

Mr. HARLAN. There is no reason for that except that this, as a matter of system, would make for publicity, whereas our present system makes for secrecy.

Mr. MOTT. But here is the point——

Mr. HARLAN. Oh, I want to go ahead with my address, and I wish the gentleman would not take up so much time.

Mr. MOTT. I shall not ask the gentleman any more questions, but I did want to get his idea on this. If we can have a free and full discussion by Cabinet members on legislation before committees, what would be the particular virtue of having them here on the floor of the House as well? What would we gain by it?

Mr. HARLAN. Two things would be gained. In the first place, it would tend to keep off the floor purely sectional and bloc bills for the reason that every one of those bills would affect some administrative branch, and having a member of the Cabinet in the House at necessary times and in the Senate, the Executive viewpoint on all of these local bills would become a matter of necessity, not a matter of chance. They would be here for examination. They would have to answer or else remain silent and ridiculous. If we have an Executive opinion on all these bills and publicity, we will go a great step toward removing local bloc bills from Congress much better than we do now. I ask now to proceed until I have finished, and then I shall answer any additional questions.

England during the last century has ridden through storms that have been just as perilous as any that we have gone through. In 1832 she had a potential civil war on her hands. There were riots and massacres in Manchester. The French Government fell, but because of the operation of the British system, very largely because of that, a civil war was averted, and their Government continued to function.

A few years later the Government of the United States was met by an internal problem no more serious than that confronted by England 20 years before. Yet in our Congress, neither in the Senate nor the House, was there anyone to speak effectively and with power of the desire of the people for peace. Sectionalism was rampant. A lot of fanatics in the North combined with some hotheads in the South and the Civil War was upon us. With a National Cabinet to speak on the floors of Congress for the sane good sense of the whole country concessions could easily have been made to avoid that conflict.

After the World War England alone of the large countries in Europe has been able to ride out the storm. We have blundered through relying on the genius of the world's greatest leader, Franklin Roosevelt, but forsaking legislative responsibilities. In the early part of this century, with labor troubles all over England, she handled all those questions, particularly around about 1909, 1910, with a minimum of disturbance, as compared to other European countries.

In speaking of this English system, John Stuart Mill said:

> When a popular body knows what it is fit for and what it is unfit for, it will more and more understand that it is not its business to administer, but that it is its business to see that the administration is done by proper persons, and to keep them to their duties.

That is the purpose of this bill. It gives the legislative branch of our Government a control they have never had before over this expansion of powers that we cannot get away from, no matter what we do. We would not, I believe, adopt the English system, but this part of it, combined with the system that we do have, would give us all of the benefits and the strengthening effect, it seems to me, of the British system. Under this bill members of the Cabinet would be constantly in the limelight. Their conduct under discretionary powers granted by the Legislature would always be subject to legislative surveillance. Just the other day we voted in the House $4,800,000,000 to the executive department to distribute in the next 2 years, and we have nothing whatever to say about its distribution. With this bill, while Congress is in session, the members of the Cabinet supervising the distribution would be constantly under inquiry as to what they intended to do, and this Congress, instead of lazily passing this distribution, would have some control over it.

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

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. Can the gentleman conceive of the British Parliament voting the Executive $4,800,000,000?

Mr. HARLAN. I can, if the cabinet wishes it.

Mr. CULKIN. But the Executive has not said where this money is going to be spent.

Mr. HARLAN. I cannot argue that at this time. The very presence of members of the Cabinet in the Legislature would make the passage of bills presented to appease purely sectional or bloc interests very difficult, because the national viewpoint on these bills would be constantly asked for. At the same time Congress would grant any enlargement of the Executive power necessary to handle any situation, even as our constitutional fathers provided that the President in time of war should be the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy.

Lord Bryce, in speaking of this power in the hands of Abraham Lincoln, said:

> President Lincoln wielded more power than any English-speaking ruler since Cromwell.

It is no less important in times of financial panic when our Government is fighting against forces of industrial destruction, that our President should also have full power to marshal our national strength.

Gladstone said:

> The office of Prime Minister as it is now exercised is a proof and a result of the necessity which now exists in our political system for the concentration of power and responsibility in the hands of one man in whom the sovereign and the nation can alike confide, and from whom they have a right to expect a definite policy and a vigorous administration.

That was many years ago in England when they were facing a crisis not as bad as we have now; but Gladstone, one of the greatest men of the English-speaking race, said that expansion of executive power to meet these problems is necessary.

In commenting on the absence of such power in the United States Government, Lord Bryce says:

> These observations may suffice to show why the fathers of the Constitution did not adopt the English parliamentary or cabinet system. They could not adopt it because they did not know of its existence. They did not know of it because it was still immature, because Englishmen themselves had not understood it, because the recognized authorities did not mention it.

I may say that the British system has been evolved since our system. The Federation of Switzerland has, of course, grown up since our Congress, and they have adopted almost everything else we had in our Constitution except the executive department. They provided an executive consisting of a cabinet of seven, but they provided exactly the thing that is provided here in H. R. 5493, namely, that those members of the executive cabinet shall sit in their legislative body, be subject to questioning, and privileged to debate. Switzerland did not provide for going to the people. If the cabinet is defeated, it is simply defeated and goes on with the next piece of business until the next election, just as we have to do in this country. But the Swiss people, having experience since the adoption of our Constitution, have seen the wisdom of a full legislative check.

I wish to introduce here some remarks of Hon. Hannis Taylor, at one time our Minister Plenipotentiary to Spain, who was later one of our representatives on the Alaska boundary dispute, and who was our legal adviser at the Spanish-American Treaty, and a very great man. After stating that the President of the United States is elected on a political platform and is responsible for carrying it out, he shows that there is no way whereby the President can express himself on legislation or in debate. I shall put his remarks in at this point:

> The difficulties arising out of this system of organized confusion reveal two weak spots in our system of Federal Government.
>
> The first difficulty consists of the want of power in the President and his Cabinet (a power universally conceded elsewhere) to sit as a political supreme court, and to interpret the party platform by reducing its general statements to the concrete forms of proposed acts of Congress. The second difficulty consists of the want of power in the Cabinet to offer such proposed acts in the Houses as the official expressions of the party which it represents, to insist under the rules upon their early consideration, and to take part in the debates upon them.
>
> Under every parliamentary system in the world except our own these two fundamental rights are secured to the executive as practical expedients absolutely necessary for the prompt and orderly consideration of great national measures, which have a natural precedence over all other business. All existing cabinet systems except our own are modeled after the English, and that, we should not fail to remember, has been developed since the making of our Federal Constitution, in order to enable the reorganized English democracy to transact the vast business of an empire upon business principles and in accordance with the will of the majority.
>
> The fathers therefore had no opportunity to see the workings of the English Constitution in its modern form; they had no knowledge of the advantages of cabinet government as now understood, and consequently it cannot be assumed that they rejected it as unsuitable to our conditions. For the want of something better they equipped the two houses with the legislative machinery known as the "committee system"; and in the early days, when the volume of legislative work was very small, that system was adequate. * * *

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. It is true that the President is elected on a platform, but all of the legislative members of the different States and the national legislative body are also elected at the same time on the same platform.

Mr. HARLAN. But the people look to the Executive to carry out that responsibility.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I cannot yield any further. I have yielded four times to the gentleman.

Now, I wish to read further from the committee report in this connection:

This bill will not change the Cabinet's legal relations either to the President or to the Congress. It will not make their tenure of office in anywise dependent on the favor of congressional majorities or on adverse votes of either or both of the Houses. They cannot assume undue leadership in Congress, because success will not prolong, as defeat will not terminate their tenure of office. They may be removed by the President at any moment, notwithstanding their success.

But here in the closing paragraph of that report is one of the most elementary reasons why that bill was not passed by the Congress. It says:

Your committee believes that the adoption of this bill and the effective execution of its provisions will be the first step toward sound civil-service reform, which will secure a larger wisdom in the adoption of policies, and a better system in their execution.

This system will require the selection of the strongest men to be heads of departments and will require them to be well equipped with the knowledge of their offices. It will also require the strongest men to be the leaders of Congress and participate in debate. It will bring those strong men in contact, perhaps into conflict, to advance the public weal, and thus stimulate their abilities and their efforts, and will thus assuredly result to the good of the country.

Now, for us to bewail the growth of Executive power is just like crying over the snows of last winter, or to bewail the happiness of yesteryear.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. A few moments ago I understood you to have said that the President-elect was the one man in whom the people of the United States placed confidence. Where does the minority come in? Where is their representation? It does not mean that because a man is elected President he meets with the approval of the entire population of the United States.

Mr. HARLAN. I am sorry if I said that the President was the only person in whom the people placed confidence.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I think the gentleman was quoting someone when he made that statement.

Mr. HARLAN. I am told by my colleagues sitting here in the front row that I did not make that statement.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman does believe there ought to be a place for the minority in any administration?

Mr. HARLAN. The minority now has its representation in the legislative body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] has again expired.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FIESINGER. My good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] asked as to whether the gentleman was arguing for an expansion of executive power or a recapture of legislative power. I think the gentleman from Ohio, in a very able argument, has answered the question. There are, however, one or two thoughts in my mind. We have in this country, under our very complicated social relationships, executive departments of the Government preparing legislation and sending it down to the Congress and to the committees of Congress. Sometimes the committees do not even hear the legislation, or, if so, very briefly, and then the legislation comes before the House.

If it is an administration measure, or if it has the approval of the President, I have observed that it is passed here with little question. I think it might be well to have Cabinet officers come into the House that we could interrogate and find out where some of this legislation arises. As a matter of fact, I think in the last Congress we had several bills brought in under gag rules, bills that were of the utmost importance to the people of the United States and, in fact, to the entire world, yet we passed those bills and could never even find out who wrote them. I think it would be very interesting to have Cabinet members come before the House so we could interrogate them to find out if back of the legislation they sponsor there might not be sometimes sinister influences. Of course, in this statement I do not involve the President or his Cabinet officers; but it may be possible in their numerous and exacting duties that at times even they may have the wool pulled over their eyes. If the Congress could interrogate responsible Government officials upon the floor of the Senate or House, these situations might be detected. But, as I say, I think the gentleman has answered the question very well.

Mr. HARLAN. I mean to say that the expansion of Executive power, no matter what we do, is here. If the executive department now has the power to draft legislation, it would still have the power to draft legislation under this scheme; but the gentleman is quite right in saying that we in this body, as John Stuart Mills said, have the responsibility to legislate; but we have the additional responsibility of knowing first all about these bills, and this we cannot do now. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HARLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman says, does he not, that we do have the responsibility to legislate?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FORMULATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Joint Resolution 148, providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States, and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "commission") for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution, and to be composed of 18 commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States; the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex officio; 5 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States; 5 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and 5 Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The commissioners shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be paid their actual and necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties out of any moneys contributed.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall select a chairman and appoint a director, who shall appoint, with the approval of the Commission, such assistants and subordinates as he deems necessary.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the commissioners, after promulgating to the American people an address relative to the reason of its creation and of its purpose, to prepare a plan or plans and a program for the adequate celebration of the sesquicentennial anniversary, and to give due and proper consideration to any plan or plans which may be submitted to them; and to take such steps as may be necessary in the coordination and correlation of plans prepared by States' commissions, or by bodies created under appointment by the Governors of the respective States, and by representative civic bodies.

SEC. 5. That the Commission shall, on or before the 20th day of May 1935, make a report to the Congress, in order that enabling legislation may be enacted.

SEC. 6. That the Commission hereby created shall expire December 31, 1939.

SEC. 7. That the Commission may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purpose of this resolution, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] desire any time on the resolution?

Mr. RANSLEY. On this side of the aisle we ask for a division of the time, 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania; and yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is practically identical with a resolution presented to the last Congress by our former colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Beck.

This resolution merely calls for the appointment of a commission of 18 to formulate plans for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution. The celebration will take place in 1937. The principal reason for bringing up this resolution at this time is to give this commission time to function. The membership of the commission will number 18. Three of the members will be the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the remaining 15 members, 5 are to be appointed by the President, 5 by the Senate, and 5 by the House of Representatives, the Speaker making the appointments for the House.

This commission is to report to the Congress on or before the 20th day of May 1935 with suggestions as to how best to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain to the House what will be the initial cost to the Government of this undertaking?

Mr. BLOOM. The present purpose of the appointment of the commission is to find out how the celebration should take place. It is to be principally educational in character.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will come next, of course.

Mr. BLOOM. I call the gentleman's attention to section 2, which provides that other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties shall be paid out of any moneys contributed.

I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that practically all the State bar associations, city bar associations, and other bar associations of the country have been circularized and are in favor of holding this celebration.

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

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Does the gentleman believe that the passage of this resolution and the appointment of this commission will give the Constitution a stronger vogue than it now has? Will it help in that direction?

Mr. BLOOM. I shall pass that right back to the gentleman's own mind. He can answer it either way he sees fit; and I think he will be satisfied.

Mr. CULKIN. I was interested in the gentleman's opinion, for I know him to be a great lover of the Constitution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In answer to the distinguished gentleman from New York, I may say that in the last Congress the chief proponent of this resolution was that distinguished constitutional lawyer, Mr. James M. Beck, of Pennsylvania. He introduced an independent resolution.

Mr. CULKIN. And I might add he was a distinguished coworker of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

I would further call attention to the historic fact that the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Beck, did not run for Congress this time because he did not wish to be one four-hundred-and-thirty-fifth part of a rubber stamp.

Mr. BLOOM. I will say for that and a great many other reasons.

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

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, while a Member of the House, in addition to sponsoring this particular resolution, was very anxious that the principle of personal liberty adopted by the founding fathers be restored. He took, therefore, a leading part in the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, which some of our friends who have quoted the gentleman from Pennsylvania, were in favor of leaving as it was, thus depriving the people of their personal liberties.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I may say to the gentleman, the fact that Mr. Beck favors this proposition would incline me to vote for the resolution, but before voting for it, I should like to know what sort of a party this is to be? Is this to be a birthday party or a funeral?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentlemen on that side of the aisle are starting in to get some interest in this resolution. It looks forward to being a great celebration.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. I notice that it states in section 2, "After all necessary traveling, hotel, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties, to be paid out of any moneys contributed", and so forth. Is it the purpose to ask for an appropriation from the Congress to pay the necessary expenses involved in this bill?

Mr. BLOOM. At the present time, no.

Mr. McFARLANE. Later?

Mr. BLOOM. It depends upon what the commission decides to do. If the commission decides to hold a certain kind of celebration, why, they naturally will have to come back to Congress; and if they ask for an appropriation, that can be taken up at that time.

Mr. McFARLANE. Would this be an authorization for such an appropriation later?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. MEAD. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that his questions are answered in sections 5 and 7. Section 5 will later permit the commission to ask for an appropriation if they deem it expedient, and section 7 will authorize the commission to accept contributions which may eliminate the necessity of asking for an appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the use of taking up an hour on a resolution like this when virtually it is brought up by unanimous consent? If there had been anyone against it, he could have stopped it in a twinkling of an eye by making a point of order, because it is not privileged; and by not making a point of order, they let it come up by unanimous consent. So what is the use of wasting an hour over such a proposition?

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, this is laying the cornerstone for a celebration which will equal, if not excel, the George Washington celebration through which we have just passed. As a matter of fact, there is no question but that this commission will return with a well thought-out plan of celebration, which I understand has already been partially agreed upon. The Congress will then be asked to provide the machinery and the money with which to carry out the report of the commission which we are setting up today. Those who were here and went through the George Washington proceedings understand exactly what this means. I am not criticizing the George Washington proceedings, because I believe that we commenced and we should finish; but yesterday or the day before we were asked again to authorize an appropriation of around $100,000 additional in order to complete that work, and I understand the $100,000 will not complete it, and we will be asked for still more money in addition to all the other sums which were expended in that behalf.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman realizes that in the conduct of the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, rather than it costing the Government one cent, the United States made a profit of from a half million to a million dollars in the conduct of it. That is a well-established fact, and has appeared before the committees, and, as a matter of fact, that has been one of the impelling factors which caused us to bring out this rule.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

I regret very much that the gentleman from Michigan compels me to answer his statement. The gentleman from Michigan called me up yesterday and said he had received a letter from a constituent of his who was very much concerned about the report that the Bicentennial Commission was not going to finish the publication of the definite writings. I told him that as far as the Commission was concerned, and as far as I am concerned, I had nothing at all to do with that. That was a special act of Congress asking for the publication of 25 volumes, more or less, of the definitive writings of Washington, which books are to be sold.

So the gentleman should not try to have the Congress believe that the money we asked for in that appropriation is going to be spent without return. Those books sold for from $50 to $75 a set, and the gentleman's constituent seemed to be more concerned over the fact that the publication of the books was not going to be continued, and I believe he stated it would be a disgrace if the Congress should at this time refuse to grant the appropriation for the publication of these books.

As far as the bicentennial celebration is concerned, the Government, according to reports from various departments, made a clear profit of 33⅓ percent on the celebration. However, if it did not make a cent, but really expended every dollar that it received, it would have cost each person in the United States about 1 cent for the celebration. So when the gentleman refers to the definitive writings, that is one thing. If he wants to refer to anything of which I have charge or that came up during the time I was honored with the position of director, that is another thing. As far as the Commission, of which I was director is concerned, I do not believe there is a Member of either branch of Congress, and I do not believe there is a person in the United States, who can utter one word of criticism against that Commission. We treated everyone fairly, irrespective of religion, politics, or anything else. [Applause.]

Mr. MICHENER. I did not mean to criticize the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]. I think the gentleman has done splendid work. But I was wondering if the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] should die, and there should be no one to carry on this new commission as capably as he carried on the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, what it might cost? I cannot compliment the gentleman from New York too highly for his handling of the George Washington celebration. His work should be completed.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Michigan flatters me too much.

I should like to read what my former colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Beck, said 1 year ago on the floor of this House with reference to this same bill. I quote:

> Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill in which I have been interested from the time I first became a Member of Congress. When I entered the Congress 7 years ago I introduced a resolution substantially the same as that now before the House for its consideration. I introduced it in each successive Congress, but the time of the proposed celebration was then so far distant that it seemed inopportune to bring it up at that time, and therefore I have waited until the present Congress, when, in association with the gentleman from New York, Mr. BLOOM, we introduced the same resolution, but, naturally, under a different number because of a rule of this House that there cannot be two sponsors for any one resolution.

So this is nothing new. On the fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution similar educational celebrations were had. I do not mean Ferris wheels or any such thing, but an educational celebration. This is going to be such a celebration, and I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] will agree with me that it is about time we started to educate the youth of this country not only in the Constitution but in the other fundamental principles of our Government, and this is the only way we can do it.

I do not believe the people generally realize what this means. There have been resolutions introduced in this Congress asking for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution in 1837. It is about time we educated the people with respect to the difference between the formulation and the adoption of the Constitution.

I may say that in Los Angeles a short while ago they had a great performance with respect to the making of the Constitution, and even Will Rogers referred to it in his squib column, saying what a wonderful thing it was. So I thought I would write and find out what a wonderful thing it was. This is the booklet, The Making of the Constitution of the United States—An Historic Pageant. I thought I would go through this description of the pageant. I only found 62 errors—that is all. There were 62 mistakes in this wonderful pageant which the gentleman from California knows was a great success out there.

I know, and every Member of this House knows, that we should do practically the same thing with respect to research on the Constitution as we did on the history of our country on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Washington; and let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that until this celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Washington it was never recorded in any library that at one time in the history of our country 3 months were dropped from the calendar and at the time of Washington's birth February was the eleventh month and not the second month of the year. The facts were brought out in connection with our research work at that time, and the facts that will be brought out at this time with respect to the Constitution will well repay the Government of the United States in the education of our people on the Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I think our distinguished and beloved colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has brought before us a most important issue. Under his genius he was able to rescue George Washington from the mists of forgetfulness and enshrine him afresh in the consciousness of his country.

I feel like supporting this resolution because, God knows, we need to rediscover our Constitution; but I would like to know whether this celebration is going to be in the form of a memorial service or a resurrection of the dead. I will be strong for the latter.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take very much time, but I want to call attention to a form of celebration that this House ought to be interested in, that we need tremendously, and that the country is waiting for us to begin, and that is to celebrate the Constitution of the United States by having this House assume the functions that are placed upon it by the Constitution, and begin once more to discharge our obligations to our country under the Constitution.

The fact is, we in this House have exhibited in the last few years the most amazing side-stepping of grave responsibilities that I believe can be found in the history of this country. I have grieved over it as a Member of this House, I have felt ashamed of my participation in it; but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, if this House will celebrate the Constitution of the United States and its origin by returning to its constitutional place and discharging its constitutional duties, with honor and with courage and with the complete intelligence we possess, then we will have a celebration that will be worth while.

What are the facts? The fact is that over and over again we have delegated to the Executive of this Nation powers that the Constitution placed upon us. We have side-stepped our obligations. Over and over again legislation is brought up here, written by some inexperienced youth, not yet dry behind the ears, of whom we have never heard, who could not do anything more about running a private business than a child could reconstruct a Swiss watch with a cross-cut saw and a sledge hammer. Such legislation is brought here, and our great committee system, which is the very foundation and expression of the intelligence and efficiency of this House, is laid aside without question or protest.

We have at this moment our Public Buildings Committee and the great Rivers and Harbors Committee cooling their heels with nothing to do. They have been denuded of their powers and responsibilities, because this House has been recreant to its sacred trust under the Constitution. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that we as Members of this House are summoned by this resolution, although I have no doubt that our friend BLOOM did not have that in his mind, to a resurrection of our sense of duty to a courageous facing of our obligations, to a reassertion of our position in the machinery of this Government, as provided in the Constitution.

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

Mr. EATON. With pleasure.

Mr. WEARIN. Does the gentleman know that the average age of the members of the Constitutional Convention of the United States was approximately 40 years?

Mr. EATON. I do not lay that up against them. They died, just the same as if they had been 10 months old. Young or old, they did not side-step their responsibilities. But I do not see what that has to do with this proposal. I take off my hat to a wise man regardless of his age. I have known some fools with whiskers a yard long and I have known some wise men 18 years old. That has nothing to do with this case.

For instance, the Constitution lays it down that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as outlined by Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, are the right of the American people. The Constitution may not do that in exact terms, but that is the fact. I have on my desk two letters that reached me a day or two ago, one from a widow who has been knitting at home for a nearby industry. She is now informed that under this administration after the 1st of April she cannot be permitted to do that. She cannot longer enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. She is denied her constitutional right to make a living. I have in my district great roofing industries. A man used to sell seconds from these industries and made an honorable living for himself and his family. Over night they cut that man out of his business, an honorable, useful, lawful business, and he is now on relief with his family. I could go on ad infinitum, ad nauseam, describing these conditions, but, Mr. Speaker, every Member here is too familiar with them already.

Take a great fundamental proposition like the relief bill. It comes in here with a few minutes' discussion, grudgingly permitted under a drastic gag rule. We could have voted on it as intelligently as we did if every Member had been blind, deaf, and dumb. No one knows who wrote it, where it came from, and we pass it on to the body at the other end of the Capitol, expecting them to discharge the obligations that the Constitution and our oath of office place upon us.

I hope under this resolution we will have a great education in the Constitution. It is needed in this body. It is needed in the White House. It is needed among the people everywhere. I think I am going to vote for brother BLOOM's resolution. I am very fond of him. My only hope is that he is to take charge of the program, because, having resurrected George Washington, if he cannot resurrect the Constitution, nobody can do it. But while he is doing that, I beseech you all to pay some attention to the great responsibilities your people have placed upon you in sending you here as their Representatives. In New Jersey a man was running for Congress. And what was his platform? His platform was:

> I want to be a rubber stamp for Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I hope he stamps me plenty.

Would he not have been an ornament to this House? A man with that mentality and moral infirmity ought not to wear pants.

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

Mr. EATON. Wait until I get through. I am paying my respects to one of the gentleman's new-deal colleagues. Such a man ought not to wear pants. He ought not to wear a petticoat. He ought to be put in rompers and furnished with a rattle and nipple. And certainly he ought not to be elected to this great body which was supposed, in days gone by, to be the greatest deliberative body on earth, although now, alas, it is neither great nor deliberative, since it has abandoned the honorable and responsible place assigned it under the Constitution.

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

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Deviating from any party discussion, I feel there is ample precedent for legislation of this kind to be found in the actions taken by the other great nations of the world. They are spending huge sums of money to instill a spirit of loyalty and nationalism into the citizenship of their countries. We recognize in this country that we are encountering the difficulties of these foreign "isms" and a restatement of the principles of the Constitution, as provided for by this legislation, would have a good effect on all political parties that are in conformity with the American form of Government. Does not the gentleman think that is so?

Mr. EATON. I certainly do; and if the gentleman will continue making my speech, I shall be glad to let him do it.

Mr. MEAD. And then we will both vote for SOL BLOOM.

Mr. EATON. Yes. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished proponent of this resolution, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], was rather unwilling to yield to me when on the floor. Why, I do not understand.

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

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. I yielded to the gentleman. I think the gentleman will admit that. There were other people standing and I yielded to them, but I do not believe the gentleman will say that I refused to yield to him, because I did yield to him.

Mr. CULKIN. The gentleman was somewhat cavalier in his expression if not in his words. What I rise to say is that I am heartily for the resolution. I think the achievements of Washington and his hold on the American people was enriched by the handling which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] gave his memory in connection with the bicentennial celebration. I think it is a wholesome if belated propostion to arouse in the minds of the people of America a study of the Constitution. The necessity for this was signally instanced twice this afternoon. In a very scholarly address on a proposed change in our legislative procedure, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] in a splendid speech lamented the passing of the prestige of Congress; that we had, without earmarking, delegated to the President the power to expend $4,800,000,000 without any information as to how the money was to be disbursed. The gentleman admitted on the floor that that was not conceivable in connection with the English Parliament or with the English scheme of government, where today the English Parliament is supreme and legislative government obtains. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, in our country the American Congress is at its lowest ebb in power and prestige.

Immediately following the gentleman from Ohio, the learned and able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FIESINGER] stated, and stated truly, that the responsible members of the Banking Committee in the last session of Congress brought legislation to this floor which was written by some anonymous individual, some erstwhile "brain truster"; legislation which they did not understand; they brought it in under gag rule and passed it. In view of the purpose of this resolution those are timely utterances coming from the other side of the aisle. So I think it is seemly in this day and age to give the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] full power to bring the Constitution, with its division of power, legislative, executive, and judicial, fully before the American people. This should be done before this Congress itself passes out of existence, by its own abject surrender of constitutional power. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is before the House by unanimous consent. While our friends on the Republican side demanded 30 minutes in which to oppose it——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, they demanded 30 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has said that several times. I do not understand what the gentleman means by it.

Mr. BLANTON. It means this, that if there had been any Member of the House opposed to this resolution, he could have stopped it coming up by making a point of order against it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish the great parliamentarian would tell us how.

Mr. BLANTON. Because the Rules Committee has no authority to report as a privileged resolution such a resolution as this.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish again the great parliamentarian would tell us why?

Mr. BLANTON. Because it provides for an appropriation, and deals with a subject that will call for an appropriation hereafter. I do not yield further. Of course, I know the gentleman from New York wants to protect action taken by his committee. It could have made in order such a resolution, but the Rules Committee does not have any authority to report such a resolution itself. It was subject to a point of order. I know if I had made the point of order, the Speaker would have sustained it.

I know the Parliamentarian would have held it out of order. Hence it is here by unanimous consent, so why waste a lot of time on it?

We all know what SOL BLOOM did with the George Washington Bicentennial Celebration. He did more than any 20 of us put together could have done. He put information about George Washington in the hands of every single individual in the United States, and they did not have some of that information before. I imagine that before SOL BLOOM gets through with this proposal he will have a copy of the Constitution in the hands of every school child in the United States. That is what we ought to have. If you want to get rid of communism and all the other "isms", put that Constitution in the hands of the school children of the country and let them understand it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of that?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman and I are together then. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'MALLEY. I hope the gentleman from New York will put a copy of the Constitution in the hands of every Member of Congress before he gets through. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the Members of Congress have it. They swore here that they would support and defend it without any evasion, but sometimes some constituents in parts of the United States try to abolish it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I do not want to take up the time.

I am in favor of this resolution because I think it is going to be productive of good. I think what little money the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] will spend on it will come back to us a hundredfold. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALIFORNIA PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 101.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 101

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 94, a joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition, etc. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this resolution comes from the Rules Committee and makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution No. 94, providing for the participation of the United States Government in an exposition at San Diego, Calif., which I understand is to open the latter part of May of this year.

Because of the urgency of the situation we are bringing in this resolution. The resolution reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee provides for a contribution by the Federal Government of $350,000 that it may join with other nations in the celebration of this event.

I do not believe there is any need to discuss the rule, because the resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire any time on the rule?

Mr. RANSLEY. On this side of the aisle we will not ask for a division of time. Everyone to whom I have talked is in favor of the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the amount authorized by this resolution ought to be reduced by at least $100,000. Before year after next you are going to be called upon to appropriate a large sum of money for another celebration out in Los Angeles.

Mrs. KAHN. Los Angeles?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; both for Los Angeles and San Francisco; both are to have one. I understand they are attempting to consolidate them. I hope they will; they ought to do it; but you are not likely going to get Los Angeles and San Francisco to agree to it.

Mr. KRAMER. They agree on everything.

Mr. BLANTON. But not on expositions. We will be called upon to appropriate money for them. I guess Congress will help them; it always does. Congress is very liberal about such things. But we ought to cut down the amount asked for in this resolution; it is too much; get the report and read it. There are just two persons who have said anything about this before the committee. One is the author of the bill, the gentleman who comes from San Diego, who told the committee how he wanted to spend the money—and he told it in a very eloquent manner to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCREYNOLDS]. Then they produced a statement from the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull. In his statement Mr. Hull says that he has nothing to do with the amount. He makes the recommendation that the amount should be fixed by Congress.

Now, I want to ask you Members of Congress who are called upon to vote for so many appropriations, why we should spend $350,000 for this celebration at San Diego. They had one there 20 years ago. Why should we spend $350,000 at this time for another exposition? They ought to agree now to cut down this amount by at least $100,000. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to this effect. They have raised quite a lot of money by subscription. They are asking California to appropriate $250,000. You can give them $250,000 to match that given by the State of California, and that should be ample. That will give them $500,000 in addition to the subscriptions. Do you not think

that would be generous? You should reduce the amount by at least $100,000.

I am going to offer an amendment at the proper time to reduce this amount from $350,000 to $250,000, and I hope the Members of the House, in the interest of the taxpayers of the country, will support it, and help us to save $100,000. Mr. Speaker, this is all I have to say.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, answering the gentleman from Texas, of course, the House joint resolution does not appropriate any money; it only authorizes the appropriation of money not to exceed $350,000. The matter has to come before the Appropriations Committee and be approved.

Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars is a very modest sum compared to amounts we have authorized for other expositions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman remember that the record shows that the people of California, through private gifts, have actually subscribed $6,000,000 toward this exposition?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is what the people of California have done already.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; and this $350,000 is a very modest amount compared with other authorizations we have made for expositions.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat loath to take the floor on this proposition, but I was at the exposition held in 1915 at San Diego. It was an exquisite exposition in an exquisite setting. It seems to me that in connection with the forthcoming exposition, which will represent all of the country and all of the world, the Federal Government should not be niggardly. The pending resolution is simply in the nature of an authorization. If the Appropriations Committee wishes to cut this authorization from $350,000 to $250,000 they may do so; but let us give the Representatives of the State of California an opportunity to present all their facts.

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

Mr. CULKIN. I yield.

Mr. HARLAN. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the exposition held at San Diego 20 years ago the Federal Government did not contribute a dime; and that this is the first amount that has been asked?

Mr. CULKIN. It was all the more remarkable. I was at San Francisco in 1915, and went down to San Diego. It seems to me this great international exposition requires liberal treatment in the interests of the cultural growths and material development of the Nation. I am for the resolution and the rule. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. J. Res. 94) providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. J. Res. 94, with Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 94

Providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor; and for other purposes

Whereas there is to be held at San Diego, Calif., beginning in May 1935, the California Pacific International Exposition for the purpose of inspiring national confidence and a higher appreciation of American institutions, stimulating business and industry, assisting the Government in bringing a more abundant life to its people, creating understanding among nations, and in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Southwest by Francisco Vasquez de Coronado; and

Whereas said exposition is worthy and deserving of the support and encouragement of the Government of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and respectfully requested by proclamation or in such manner as he may deem proper to invite all foreign countries and nations to such proposed exposition with a request that they participate therein.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a commission to be known as "The California Pacific International Exposition Commission" and to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce; which Commission shall serve without additional compensation and shall represent the United States in connection with the holding of an international exposition known as "The California Pacific International Exposition" in San Diego, Calif., in the year 1935, and continuing into the year 1936.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Federal commissioner for the California Pacific International Exposition, such commissioner to be appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall select for this purpose an official of his Department who has had experience in, and is familiar with, the preparation and management of exhibitions, and who will serve in this capacity without additional salary. That the expenses of the Federal commissioner and such staff as he may require will be met out of the funds provided for the purposes of the Government participation in the exposition.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall prescribe the duties of the Federal commissioner and shall delegate such powers and functions to him as it shall deem advisable, in order that there may be exhibited at the California Pacific International Exposition by the Government of the United States, its executive departments, independent offices, and establishments such articles and materials as illustrate the function and administrative faculty of the Government in the advancement of industry, the arts, and peace, demonstrating the nature of our institutions, particularly as regards their adaptation to the wants of the people.

SEC. 5. The commissioner may employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary and fix their reasonable compensation within the grades and rates of compensation fixed by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase such material, contract for such labor and other services, and exercise such powers as are delegated to him by the Commission as hereinbefore provided, and in order to facilitate the functioning of his office may subdelegate such powers (authorized or delegated) to officers and employees as may be deemed advisable by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The heads of the various executive departments and independent offices and establishments of the Government are authorized to cooperate with the commissioner in the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits; to lend to the California Pacific International Exposition, with the knowledge and consent of the commissioner, such articles, specimens, and exhibits which the commissioner shall deem to be in the interest of the United States to place with the science or other exhibits to be shown under the auspices of that corporation; to contract for such labor or other services as shall be deemed necessary, and to designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner. At the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, the commissioner shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken, and any expenses incident to the restoration, modification, and revision of such property to a condition which will permit its use at subsequent expositions and fairs, and for the continued employment of personnel necessary to close out the fiscal and other records and prepare the required reports of the participating organizations, may be paid from the appropriation provided; and if the return of such property is not practicable, he may, with the consent of the department or branch from which it was taken, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

SEC. 7. The sum of $350,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, of which sum not to exceed the sum of $125,000 may be expended for the erection of such building or group of buildings and/or for the rental of such space as the Commission may deem adequate to carry out effectively the provisions of this resolution; for the decoration of such structure or structures; for the proper maintenance of such buildings, site, and grounds during the period of the exposition. The Commission may contract with the California Pacific International Exposition for the designing and erection of such building or buildings and/or for the rental of such space as shall be deemed proper.

The remaining portion of the appropriation authorized under this resolution shall be available for the selection, purchase, preparation, assembling, transportation, installation, arrangement, safekeeping, exhibition, demonstration, and return of such articles and materials as the Commission may decide shall be included in such Government exhibit and in the exhibits of the California Pacific International Exposition; for the compensation of the employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Government, employed by or detailed for duty with the Commission, and for their actual traveling expenses and subsistence at not to exceed $6 per day: *Provided*, That no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed plus such reasonable allowance for subsistence expenses as may be deemed proper by the commissioner; for telephone service, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, duplicating, and computing machines, their accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, uniforms, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers and all other publications, ice and drinking water for office purposes: *Provided*, That payment for telephone service, rents, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and other similar purposes may be made in advance, for the hire of a passenger-carrying automobile, its maintenance, repair, and operation, for the official use of the commissioner, for printing and binding; for entertainment of distinguished visitors, and all other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Commission to fulfill properly the purposes of this resolution. All purchases, expenditures, and disbursements, under any appropriations which may be provided by authority of this resolution, shall be made under the direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission, as hereinbefore stipulated, may delegate these powers and functions to the commissioner, and the commissioner, with the consent of the Commission, may subdelegate them: *And provided further*, That the Commission or its delegated representative may authorize the allotment of funds to any executive department, independent office, or establishment of the Government with the consent of the heads thereof for direct expenditure by said executive department, independent office, or establishment for the purpose of defraying any expenditure which may be incurred by said executive department, independent office, or establishment in executing the duties and functions delegated to said office by the Commission; and all accounts and vouchers covering expenditures under these appropriations shall be approved by the commissioner or such assistants as he may delegate, except for such allotments as may be made to the various executive departments and establishments for direct expenditure; but these provisions shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or permit any obligations to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated: *Provided*, That in the construction of buildings or exhibits requiring skilled and unskilled labor, the prevailing rate of wages, as provided in the Act of March 3, 1931, shall be paid.

SEC. 8. The commissioner, with the approval of the Commission, may receive from any source contributions to aid in carrying out the general purposes of this resolution, but the same shall be expended and accounted for in the same manner as any appropriation which may be made under authority of this resolution. The commissioner is also authorized to receive contributions of material, or borrow material or exhibits, to aid in carrying out the general purposes of this resolution; and at the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, shall dispose of any such portion of the material contributed as may be unused, and return such borrowed property; and, under the direction of the Commission, dispose of any buildings which may have been constructed and account therefor: *Provided*, That all disposition of materials, property, buildings, etc., shall be at public sale to the highest bidder and the proceeds thereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 9. It shall be the duty of the Commission to transmit to Congress, within 6 months after the close of the exposition, a detailed statement of all expenditures and such other reports as may be deemed proper, which reports shall be prepared and arranged with a view to concise statement and convenient reference.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, this resolution provides merely for participation by the Government in the California-Pacific International Exposition, proposed to be held at San Diego, Calif., beginning on May 29 of the present year. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs because of the international character of the exposition. It is expected that a number of foreign countries will participate and already 29 foreign countries have signified their intention of taking part in this exposition.

It was not necessary for the exposition that the preparation be made suddenly. In the year 1915 the people of southern California, and especially the citizens of San Diego, the great city of southern California, held an exposition at the same time that an exposition was being held in the city of San Francisco. At that time San Diego did not ask the Government of the United States for a single dollar to enable them to carry on the exposition. In the city of San Diego they raised, by popular subscription, in 1915, $1,000,000 to pay the expenses of the enterprise. They invested and built in a public park known as Balboa Park in the heart of the city, buildings and equipment at a cost of $5,000,000. These buildings are permanent structures. So that this exposition is practically ready and prepared.

When they undertook this plan or enterprise for an exposition during the present year, they started out in San Diego with the hope and expectation of raising by popular subscription the sum of $500,000 in that city alone for the purpose of paying the expenses of the exposition. Even in these times of depression and hardship those people were so earnest and so patriotic that they exceeded the amount they hoped to raise and succeeded in raising for this purpose by popular subscription, in the city of San Diego alone, $700,000. They now come to the Government of the United States and ask that this Government of ours participate in and join them in their plans. I think their request is extremely moderate when they ask for only $350,000.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG. Granting that this exposition at San Diego will be a very exquisite affair and granting also that after $350,000 has been authorized for this one, within the near future the proponents and backers of the exposition at San Francisco will ask an authorization of taxpayers' money for a similar exposition, may I say to the gentleman that in my State of Ohio I represent a constituency more than a million of whom at the present time are on relief. Representing so many people on relief because of the dire circumstances of this depression, I cannot in good conscience vote for this appropriation.

Mr. KEE. I do not recognize a question in the gentleman's statement. It is merely an argument.

Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, these people in San Diego have invested this amount of money, and at the present time there is upon the exposition grounds at San Diego, either built or in contemplation of being built, an investment in buildings of over $13,000,000, and yet the request before us is for merely $350,000 for the Government exhibit, of which $125,000 will be invested in the construction of a building to house the exhibits of the United States Government. The residue will be used for taking care of the building and for the preparation and shipment of the exhibits to the exposition from Washington or from wherever they are gathered.

Mr. McFARLANE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McFARLANE. The gentleman is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee?

Mr. KEE. Yes.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there not a bill before that committee now for an authorization which will call for a similar appropriation for an exposition to be held in San Francisco in 1938?

Mr. KEE. Not that I know of.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there not a bill to that effect?

Mr. KEE. Not that I know of. No bill of that character has been referred to our committee.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. There is a bill before our committee merely giving the President the right to invite foreign nations to participate in an exposition, not only in San Francisco in 1938, but in Los Angeles as well, and I understand there will soon be another bill coming in from the gentleman's State for the same purpose.

Mr. McFARLANE. I want to know where this thing is going to stop. They are not asking for $350,000.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. There is nothing in this bill asking for an appropriation.

Mr. McFARLANE. That will come up later.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. And the gentleman's State is coming in last.

Mr. McFARLANE. We are having an honest-to-goodness celebration down there in Texas, and we are entitled to it.

Mr. LEA of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA of California. Referring to the statement with reference to unemployment, may I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that 4,000 men are now employed in the preparation of this exposition?

Mr. KEE. Yes; and have been for many months.

Mr. LEA of California. Hundreds of them have been employed for over a year and many of them for a year and a half, and the new construction will amount to at least two and a half and probably over three million dollars.

Mr. KEE. In fact, more than that I am informed.

As to the benefits to be derived by the people of this country, it has been shown as a geographical fact that the international line between Mexico and the United States is only 16 miles from San Diego.

It is a matter of record and of fact that from four and a half to five and a half million people cross the international boundary line at San Diego into Mexico or from Mexico into the United States in 1 year. At the 1915 exposition at San Diego there was an attendance of five and a half million people. It is expected that this exposition will draw an attendance of over seven and a half million people.

By the participation of the Government of the United States in this exposition we are sending something out to the West for the education of the people out there, something that they otherwise would possibly never have the privilege or opportunity of seeing. We who are fortunate enough to live near the city of Washington are familiar with these historic objects that we expect the Government to send to the West for this exposition. There will be millions of people who will visit the exposition and will see and appreciate these interesting things about their own Government, and this will be an education to a large body of citizens who otherwise would not have such opportunity.

I hope it will be the pleasure of this House to adopt the resolution.

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

Mr. KEE. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. I notice the total authorization is $350,000. Does the gentleman think, in view of the history of these enterprises, this will be the total and final charge on the Federal Treasury?

Mr. KEE. I anticipate it will. I am advised that a great number of these exhibits that the Government is expected to send out have not yet been unpacked from the Chicago Exposition and can be sent out West with perfect ease.

Mr. LUDLOW. Let me make a prediction: If precedent is followed, San Diego can be depended on to come back here several times for further appropriations. I hope I am not a good prophet in this instance, but I would bet on that prediction. I greatly admire the loyalty of California's Congressmen to their State, but I cannot go along with them. In this period of unprecedented depression, with the country laboring beneath a burden of debt and taxation as never before, with millions on relief rolls and more millions not knowing where their next meal is coming from, I am not going to waste any of the taxpayers' money on expositions. Furthermore, I am going to predict that more appropriations will be sought later.

Mr. KEE. I think the gentleman is anticipating unduly. Let those questions be settled when they arise.

Mr. LUDLOW. The usual history of such matters is that the camel's nose gets into the Treasury, and the body of the camel generally follows.

Mr. KEE. I am hopeful this will be an exception to the gentleman's rule.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURNHAM].

Mr. BURNHAM. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has so completely and ably described and explained this resolution that there is very little left for me to say. I should, however, like to make a brief statement, having been one of the organizers of the exposition held in San Diego in 1915 and its active vice president.

Twenty years ago the city of San Diego, then a comparatively small community, held an international exposition to celebrate the completion of the Panama Canal. She did it without one dollar of Federal aid. She acted as host to the world—with credit to herself, the State, and the Nation.

That exposition was held in beautiful Balboa Park—a 1,400-acre tract in the very heart of the city. In consequence, that enterprising community was left a wonderful legacy, a glorious heritage of luxuriant trees and shrubs and palms, and tropical foliage—many rare specimens now grown to majestic proportions—a riot of exotic beauty. There is probably no setting in all the world quite so beautiful and adaptable for an international exposition.

Another feature of that legacy, of which the city is justly proud, is a group of internationally renowned buildings of Spanish colonial architecture designed by the late Bertram Goodhue—a magnificent nucleus, costing millions of dollars, around which is being built a second and far greater enterprise—the California-Pacific International Exposition.

The original buildings, many of which are of concrete construction, have been completely restored. More than a score of new buildings are now being erected, and the whole exposition ensemble is 75 percent complete. Some 2,000 men have been at work for nearly a year—many of them taken from the relief rolls. It has been a boon to the unemployed, a godsend to our citizens.

I mention this in connection with the statement made by our friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that there is so much unemployment in the country and so much being spent on relief, we can ill afford to spend a dollar for exposition purposes. As I have said, we have had more than 2,000 men employed for nearly 1 year and many of them were taken off of the relief rolls. It has been a boon to the unemployed, a godsend to the citizens of not only California but of the entire Pacific coast.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question with reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BURNHAM. Yes; I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not a fact that the purpose of this exposition is to develop additional trade, locally, nationally, and internationally, which will put people to work throughout the country?

Mr. BURNHAM. We are hopeful this will help to restore confidence not only on the Pacific coast but in the entire United States.

A pictorial story of men working on the exposition project was made in December by the major news-reel companies, which many of you no doubt have seen upon the screen.

An article appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner under date of January 28, 1935, stated in part as follows:

> The initial funds for the fair were raised by citizens of San Diego in the largest per capita subscription ever made for an exposition. Leading citizens of Los Angeles have cooperated in assuring the success of the inspiring project, which already has given employment to thousands and which is expected to attract a record number of visitors to southern California next summer.

In this connection I might state that the Government survey shows five and one-half million people cross the Mexican border at San Diego each year. I mention this to show the possibilities for attendance. From 11 Western States alone San Diego can bid for approximately 15,000,000 visitors to the forthcoming exposition, which will open on the 29th of May this year and continue for a period of 10 months.

Mr. LUDLOW. What is to be the admission charge?

Mr. BURNHAM. I cannot tell the gentleman what the admission charge is or will be, but I do hope and believe that the Members of Congress will be supplied with term passes. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUDLOW. If you have 15,000,000 visitors, with a very moderate admission charge, could not this project go on its own steam without a Federal appropriation?

Mr. BURNHAM. It is going on its own steam, and we are not asking for a Federal appropriation for the operation of this exposition.

Ponder this fact: Twenty years ago San Diego's exposition attendance was close to 5,000,000, with comparatively poor means of transportation and a much smaller population, not

more than one-fourth the present population; whereas today we have excellent paved highways, improved train service, overland motor coaches, airplanes, and steamship lines calling at San Diego, which is the first port of call on the Pacific coast of the United States north of the Panama Canal. Therefore I contend it requires no great stretch of the imagination to assume that the attendance will be sufficient to insure the success of the enterprise. Visitors will come not alone from the territory west of the Rockies but from all parts of the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

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

Mr. BURNHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. If this bill is passed by the House and the Senate and becomes law, the first section of it will authorize the President of the United States to invite foreign countries to participate. Our friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] has stated that 29 countries have already signified their intention of coming here. Have they done this before they were invited?

Mr. BURNHAM. I may say to my friend that they have been invited unofficially, and they have signified their intention in the matter. I will show the gentleman letters and telegrams from Secretry Hull and from our good friend Josephus Daniels, at the city of Mexico, who is our Ambassador in that country.

Mr. BLANTON. Surely no official of the Government would invite them before they had been authorized by Congress to do so.

Mr. BURNHAM. Unofficially, yes; and our exposition officials have invited them, and many foreign countries have had their consuls there.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit one further observation, he will notice that Secretary Hull's statement in the report said that—

> Of course, only those countries nearby could be invited in the short length of time.

Mr. BURNHAM. I will be pleased to read his letter later.

I received a copy of the San Diego Union last evening, dated February 9, wherein it was mentioned that Mr. and Mrs. George H. Lorimer, Sam Blythe, and Harry Condon, associated with Mr. Lorimer on the Saturday Evening Post, were spending a week in San Diego. The article quoted Mr. Lorimer as follows:

> This morning we motored through Balboa Park to see what you are doing in building the coming exposition. It looks like real business out there, and I am sure that you are going to have a show that will attract world-wide interest. I have said many times that your first exposition was one of the world's finest. Don't try to make it too big. Your charming Balboa Park is in itself a thing of beauty, unexcelled anywhere.

It will interest you to know something of the financial structure of the California-Pacific International Exposition. The company was incorporated under the laws of the State of California, without capital stock and on a nonprofit basis. No bonds or stock have been nor will be issued. The funds necessary for operation were secured by popular subscription and were oversubscribed 40 percent. The new construction is being financed by commercial and industrial exhibitors, States, and foreign countries. The enterprise is fully financed, both as to promotion and operation, and will represent an investment of twelve and one-half million dollars.

The California-Pacific International Exposition is not designed to celebrate, or commemorate, some event of the dim and moldy past, but it is for the more practical purpose, as stated in the resolution now under consideration, of inspiring national confidence and a higher appreciation of American institutions, stimulating business and industry, assisting the Government in bringing a more abundant life to its people, creating understanding among nations, and, incidentally, commemorating the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Southwest by Francisco Vasquez de Coronado.

It will depict the progress of mankind up through the four centuries since Cabrillo sailed into the Bay of San Diego in 1542. It will show the great progress achieved in the arts, sciences, culture, and education; it will stimulate recovery on the Pacific coast and encourage good will among the nations of the world.

From all parts of the globe will be assembled the strange and picturesque wonders of far-away scenes, peoples, homes, industries, quaint customs—all phases of life at home and abroad—from the Plaza of Pacific Relations will fly the flags of 29 nations.

Many of America's great industrial and commercial enterprises will be represented. For instance, the Ford Motor Co. is erecting a building to cost $300,000. Business of all kinds and character are contributing most liberally to this spectacle of man's versatility. Displays of art, science, commerce, industry, agriculture, horticulture, aviation, and the Navy—in fact, all phases of human endeavor will be presented in new life and motion. It will afford millions of persons an opportunity to observe, in a new, dramatic, vital, and understandable way, the marvels of 1935.

We are now asking the Federal Government—the United States of America—to participate. I refrained from introducing this resolution until I had had an opportunity to confer with the President and to ascertain whether it tied in to his recovery program. I know that I am betraying no confidence when I tell you that he said, "Fine; go ahead." He even voluntarily called the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and voiced his approval. He attended our exposition in 1915 and hopes to come out this summer.

This resolution provides for a commission of three, composed of the Secretaries of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, all of whom also have shown great interest and real enthusiasm. They are very desirous of cooperating.

The resolution also authorizes an appropriation of $350,000, of which amount not to exceed $125,000 may be expended for the erection of such a building as the commission may deem adequate and proper. The remainder of the $350,000 is to be used for the installation and maintenance of a governmental exhibit.

I urge you in the interest of recovery to support this resolution and help to make possible one of the most beautiful expositions that this country or the world has ever seen.

And we want you to come to San Diego during the period of the exposition. You will enjoy the beauty and charm of its surroundings. You will find much to interest you. And the good people of San Diego will exert every effort to make you feel that you are among friends. [Applause.]

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

Mr. BURNHAM. Yes.

Mr. EATON. To ask the gentleman to clear up one point for the benefit of the Members of the House. This appropriation asked for is to be used entirely by the Government of the United States in the preparation and exhibition of its own exhibit in its own building, is it not, and not a dollar of it is to be used to advance the institution itself?

Mr. BURNHAM. The gentleman is absolutely right. The exposition proper is fully financed.

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

Mr. BURNHAM. Yes.

Mr. KRAMER. How much of this money is going directly into this Government building to be constructed?

Mr. BURNHAM. The resolution provides not to exceed $125,000 is to be used in the construction of the building. The plans have been drawn. The building can be constructed for that. It will be a building of reinforced concrete.

Mr. KRAMER. Then, if it costs $100,000, the other $50,000 would revert to the Treasury, or will that be expended for some other purpose?

Mr. BURNHAM. That is up to the Commission, which is to be composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. Our exposition officials would have absolutely no control over that fund.

Mr. KRAMER. Who is going to have control of it?

Mr. BURNHAM. The Commission.

Mr. KRAMER. What is going to become of the other money being appropriated?

Mr. BURNHAM. What other money?

Mr. KRAMER. The other $150,000 or $125,000?

Mr. BURNHAM. The resolution authorizes an appropriation of $350,000, of which not to exceed $125,000 is to be used in the construction of a building, the balance to be used for the installation and maintenance of the exhibit.

Mr. KRAMER. I understand there is some language in the resolution which provides for some expenditure in the District of Columbia. To what does that refer?

Mr. BURNHAM. That is the customary phraseology in all resolutions pertaining to expositions, as I understand it.

Mr. KRAMER. It does not mean that any railroad fare is going to be paid for anyone, or the expenses of anyone while here?

Mr. BURNHAM. Positively it does not.

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

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here for several minutes listening to my colleagues and the proponents of House Joint Resolution No. 94 paint a beautiful picture of what a wonderful time we will have out in San Diego, Calif., at the California-Pacific International Exposition if we will only appropriate $350,000 of the taxpayers' money so that the United States may participate in such an exposition. We are reminded of the wonderful educational opportunities that will flow from this celebration. I, for one, am interested in all educational opportunities; but I am unable to see the wonderful opportunities that may be had from the expenditure of this sum of money on the part of our Government. We are reminded that 29 foreign countries have signified their willingness to attend this exposition and that it will mean much to us in bringing about good will among the foreign nations. The greatest good will that could possibly come to this country would be in the payment of the debts which the foreign countries now owe us. It seems that a great number of the foreign nations are already well acquainted with us and that we are so fond of them we tell them they can pay us when it is convenient, and that in the meantime if they need any more funds America will furnish it to them. I do not think they should be invited to come to this country until they realize their just obligations to us and make some effort to discharge them. It is urged by my good friends that $350,000 is a small sum of money, that the United States has made a practice in the past of appropriating money to expositions of this kind, and that no one should object to this authorization. It is true that this sum of money may seem small to the majority of the Members of this House, but to me it is a large sum. When we think about the number of unemployed people in America, the men, women, and children suffering because of hunger and the disabled veterans who have been denied their disability and pension allowance because of economy, and with the taxes so high until our citizens are unable to save their homes, I think it high time that the Congress put an end to appropriating the taxpayers' money for expositions. The sooner we stop this practice the better off we will be. I do not object just because the exposition will be held in the beautiful city of San Diego, because I know that they have beautiful cities in the State of California; but if we vote this appropriation it will not be long until we will be asked to appropriate a like or greater sum for another exposition in Texas, Illinois, and a great many other States, with the result that there will be no end to the spending of the taxpayers' money. My first thought is of America and her distressed citizens, and I must register my protest against the appropriation of this money, and the offer from the gentleman from California to furnish the Members of Congress with free tickets to the exposition does not change my position. Let us first provide employment to our people who are out of employment, care for the ones who are unable to work, provide a reasonable sum of money as a pension for the old people, pay the adjusted-service certificates of the veterans, provide compensation for the disabled veterans of our wars, and then we can appropriate money for an international exposition, provided we can find any money to appropriate for that purpose. If you are determined to authorize the expenditure of any money for this exposition, I do hope that you will agree to cut it down to the sum suggested by the gentleman from Texas. [Applause.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts yields 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Federal commissioner for the California-Pacific International Exposition, such commissioner to be appointed by the President upon the nomination of the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall select for this purpose an official of his Department who has had experience in, and is familiar with, the preparation and management of exhibitions, and who will serve in this capacity without additional salary. That the expenses of the Federal commissioner and such staff as he may require will be met out of the funds provided for the purposes of the Government participation in the exposition.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In view of the fact that we are on the subject of expenditures connected with this resolution. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not true that this exposition is being financed locally, that the money has been arranged for, that the exposition is international in aspect, and that foreign countries are to be invited; and would it not be a reflection if the United States should not participate in the exposition?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

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

Mr. SHANNON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the gentleman not think that at the present juncture in this country, in view of the fact that there are so many million people in America unemployed and on relief, that it would be far better for us to give attention to our own people than to worry about the feelings of the people of some 29 nations of the world? Does the gentleman not think that we should recess this Congress now unless we have something more important to take up than a $350,000 appropriation for this exposition?

Mr. SHANNON. Now the gentleman has made his second speech, by the interrogation method, in opposition to this resolution. I think an effort is being made by the administration to do everything mentioned by the gentleman; and I think the exposition would aid in furnishing the relief of which the gentleman speaks.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. The heads of the various executive departments and independent offices and establishments of the Government are authorized to cooperate with the commissioner in the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits; to lend to the California-Pacific International Exposition, with the knowledge and consent of the commissioner, such articles, specimens, and exhibits which the commissioner shall deem to be in the interest of the United States to place with the science or other exhibits to be shown under the auspices of that corporation; to contract for such labor or other services as shall be deemed necessary, and to designate officials or employees of their departments or branches to assist the commissioner. At the close of the exposition, or when the connection of the Government of the United States therewith ceases, the commissioner shall cause all such property to be returned to the respective departments and branches from which taken, and any expenses incident to the restoration, of such property to a condition which will permit its use at subsequent expositions and fairs, and for the continued employment of personnel necessary to close out the fiscal and other records and prepare the required reports of the participating organizations, may be paid from the appropriation provided; and if the return of such property is not practicable, he may, with the consent of the department or branch from which it was taken, make such disposition thereof as he may deem advisable and account therefor.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, line 18, after the word "restoration", insert the words "modification, and revision."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. The sum of $350,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, of which sum not to

exceed the sum of $125,000 may be expended for the erection of such building or group of buildings, and/or for the rental of such space, as the Commission may deem adequate to carry out effectively the provisions of this resolution; for the decoration of such structure or structures; for the proper maintenance of such buildings, site, and grounds during the period of the exposition. The Commission may contract with the California-Pacific International Exposition for the designing and erection of such building or buildings and/or for the rental of such space as shall be deemed proper. The remaining portion of the appropriation authorized under this resolution shall be available for the selection, purchase, preparation, assembling, transportation, installation, arrangement, safe-keeping, exhibition, demonstration, and return of such articles and materials as the Commission may decide shall be included in such Government exhibit and in the exhibits of the California-Pacific International Exposition; for the compensation of the employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Government, employed by or detailed for duty with the Commission, and for their actual traveling expenses and subsistence at not to exceed $6 per day: *Provided*, That no such official or employee so designated shall receive a salary in excess of the amount which he has been receiving in the department or branch where employed plus such reasonable allowance for subsistence expenses as may be deemed proper by the commissioner; for telephone service, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, duplicating, and computing machines, their accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, uniforms, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers and all other publications, ice and drinking water for office purposes: *Provided*, That payment for telephone service, rents, subscriptions to newspapers and periodicals, and other similar purposes may be made in advance, for the hire of a passenger-carrying automobile, its maintenance, repair, and operation, for the official use of the commissioner, for printing and binding; for entertainment of distinguished visitors, and all other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Commission to fulfill properly the purposes of this resolution. All purchases, expenditures, and disbursements, under any appropriations which may be provided by authority of this resolution, shall be made under the direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That the Commission, as hereinbefore stipulated, may delegate these powers and functions to the commissioner, and the commissioner, with the consent of the Commission, may subdelegate them: *And provided further*, That the Commission or its delegated representative may authorize the allotment of funds to any executive department, independent office, or establishment of the Government with the consent of the heads thereof for direct expenditure by said executive department, independent office, or establishment for the purpose of defraying any expenditure which may be incurred by said executive department, independent office, or establishment in executing the duties and functions delegated to said office by the Commission; and all accounts and vouchers covering expenditures under these appropriations shall be approved by the commissioner or such assistants as he may delegate, except for such allotments as may be made to the various executive departments and establishments for direct expenditure; but these provisions shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or permit any obligations to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated: *Provided*, That in the construction of buildings or exhibits requiring skilled and unskilled labor, the prevailing rate of wages, as provided in the act of March 3, 1931, shall be paid.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 5, line 3, after the word "of", strike out "$350,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$250,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the observation has been made that, after all, the Committee on Appropriations has control of the amount. You ought not put on that committee the duty to curtail improper expenditures. The Committee on Appropriations is nothing in the world but the servant of this House. If you authorize it to appropriate $350,000, it carries out your wishes, because you are directing what you want it to do.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does the gentleman know of an instance when it has ever failed to do so?

Mr. BLANTON. Very seldom; only in very rare instances. If you want to appropriate only $250,000, now is the time to save $100,000 and to tell the committee that you want to save $100,000, because if you limit it the committee cannot appropriate more.

This $350,000 is going to come out of the Treasury. It is tax money that comes out of the pockets of our constituents back home. They are sorely distressed already. Notice what you are providing for in this resolution. I read from section 5:

The commissioner may employ such clerks, stenographers, and other assistants as may be necessary, and fix their reasonable compensation within the grades and rates of compensation fixed by the Classification Act of 1923.

That provides and authorizes salaries up to ten or twelve thousand dollars a year in certain instances because some such are paid under the Classification Act of 1923.

Then, further, I quote from this resolution:

Of this $350,000, of which sum not to exceed the sum of $125,000 "may" be expended for the erection of such building or group of buildings, and/or the rental of such space as the Commission may deem adequate.

That is, this $125,000 does not have to be spent for a building. They do not have to spend a single dollar of it for a building unless they want to. It says they "may" do it within their discretion. Then notice this further—and I read from the bottom of page 5:

For the compensation of the employees of the Commission in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the payment of salaries of officers and employees of the Government employed by or detailed for duty with the Commission, and for their actual traveling expenses and subsistence at not to exceed $6 per day.

Here, with people on relief, with people back home who have not had jobs for two and a half years, with their wives and little children hungry, you are providing for this $350,000 gala event out there and providing that these fellows who are sent from Washington shall draw, in addition to their pay, $6 a day for expenses. I wish all of the good people in my district back home could get $6 a day.

Mr. HOEPPEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment.

Now, I know a great majority of you colleagues feel that these expositions have to be provided for, notwithstanding depressions and hard times. I know you are going to have this one at San Diego and give money for it. Why do they not do as they did 20 years ago, have their splendid exposition and not call on the Government? Why do they not do as the gentleman from California said Mr. Lorimer advised they should do: "It is fine, but don't make it too big." That is what Mr. Lorimer said: "Don't make it too big."

Now, they are asking for $250,000 from the State of California. Why is it not enough just to match it by the Federal Government? That is what I am asking you to do with this amendment. Let us keep that other $100,000 in the pockets of the taxpayers back home and save $100,000 for them.

Do you know where we are heading for? We are headed for national bankruptcy just as sure as you are listening to the sound of my voice, if we do not stop this eternal needless expenditure of public funds out of the Public Treasury. If we do not stop it, you are going into national bankruptcy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. EATON. Under this administration only bankruptcy can follow.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it started way back yonder in the Harding administration, went through the Coolidge administration with some brakes on, but the brakes were taken off entirely during the Hoover administration, and if we do not stop it we are going right straight into bankruptcy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I cannot yield; I am sorry. I cannot yield. Naturally we have to vote for needed funds that the administration asks for, and we do it because we have confidence in the President; I know that he has got to furnish some relief; I know that he must provide work if we are to get rid of this dole—and that is what he is trying to do. I vote for the necessary administration propositions, but this

is not an administration matter. The President has not asked us to appropriate this $350,000. Mr. Secretary Hull is the only man in the administration who has spoken, and he says as to the amount, "That is a matter for Congress to determine."

Why, they do not even have authority to invite a foreign country to participate until you pass this resolution. It is section 1 of this resolution which gives them authority to invite foreign countries, and Mr. Secretary Hull says that if you do pass it you can invite only those close by.

Now, we would be in a ridiculous situation to invite, for instance, France, to come over here, a nation which owes us money she will not pay, which owes us a solemn debt of honor but will not pay it. Think of inviting her to come here and have a good time. Or England who has not paid us what she owes. I do not want to invite them over here until they pay their honest debts. [Applause.] I want to see them pay this country. If they have not got the money, I want to see them come up like men and say, "We have not got it, but we owe it and we are going to pay it as soon as we can." Then I would feel like inviting them. I do not want to invite a single foreign country over here for anything until they acknowledge the lawful debts they owe.

I have done my duty; I have offered this amendment. I have tried to save $100,000. I realize full well that I am making a futile fight. There are in all about 16 such proposals to appropriate Federal money for different expositions. Every Member here interested in an exposition will feel that if he does not vote for all of them, he will not be able to get money for the one he is interested in, hence I am afraid there will be very few votes for my amendment. I believe that all of them should rest on their own merit. And I am going to vote accordingly. I am going to vote to save this $100,000.

Just when are we going to stop needless spending of public money? Just when are we going to begin to take care of the United States Treasury? We must make a start some time. I am in dead earnest about it. I feel that it is of such great importance that I am going to make a motion to recommit this bill, to reduce it $100,000, and have a record vote on it, and see just how many Members there are here who are willing to vote to save $100,000. The only way to get a record vote is on a motion to recommit.

Mr. LEA of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is in accordance with the usual practice for the Federal Government to be represented at expositions of this kind. Every citizen of the Republic should desire that when we participate in these enterprises a showing should be made worthy of the Federal Government.

I sympathize with the gentleman from Texas in suggesting that proper regard for economy should be manifested in authorizing appropriations, but I entirely disagree with him as to the wisdom of cutting down this authorization of $350,000.

What is the businesslike method of securing a proper representation of the Federal Government at this exposition? There is no proposal here that the Federal Government shall make any contribution for the general purposes of the fair. The only appropriation is for money to erect the building and provide for and maintain the exhibit of the Federal Government during the exposition. When this matter comes before the members of the Appropriations Committee they should, I think, apply to the Commission appointed to represent the Federal Government and listen to the advice of that Commission as to the amount that is required. That is the sane and businesslike method of deciding the question as to the proper amount to be provided.

In opposing the authorization of money for the participation of the Federal Government in this exposition one gentleman this afternoon referred to neglect or disregard of "suffering humanity." Let us think for a moment. We are just about to appropriate over $4,000,000,000 for the purpose of aiding suffering humanity. One of the general policies that has been followed by this administration is to provide grants of 30 percent of certain classes of large appropriations, to give that much as a free gift by the Government, to provide relief, encourage restoration, and provide employment. Here it is proposed the Federal Government shall appropriate only a fraction of that amount.

The appropriation of this money will contribute to the expenditure of between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000. All we ask is $350,000 that the Federal Government may provide and maintain its own exhibit. If we wanted, therefore, to measure the worth of this appropriation from the standpoint of relief alone it would be just as defensible as any relief measure that has been passed by this House in the last 2 years.

The gentleman from Texas, to whom I referred, I think, in a way, misled or misinterpreted this proposal to the House. There is no suggestion here of any $10,000 jobs. The $6-a-day expense allowance is only what men are paid every day for expenses, and no part thereof is to be paid in excess of their necessary and actual traveling expenses in any case. The commissioners are to be men who are already paid regular salaries by the Government and are to be allowed no additional salaries.

Now, as to the question of San Diego being back here for another appropriation. That will not occur. When San Diego gave the former exposition she received not one dollar for the exposition from the Federal Government. She did not come to the Federal Government asking for any contribution. That exposition paid its own way, outside of the contributions the local people made. Large contributions have already been made for this exposition by the San Diego people. The coming exposition is headed by the experienced and able gentleman who conducted the former exposition, which will insure its success. California is willing for it to be understood that there is no proposal to come back here for any additional appropriation.

This exposition will help the whole country. The gentleman from Texas represents, I should say, one of the States that will benefit most through the passage of this authorization. Why? Because there is a great paved highway that leads from the State of New York to San Diego through the South and the Southwest, and there will be thousands, and perhaps hundreds of thousands of people traveling by machines through the State of Texas which has a broader expanse of territory than any other State of the Union can boast. Outside of California no other State will profit to so marked a degree.

This exposition will prove to be a stimulus to the business of the country. This is a sensible measure to afford relief and recovery.

So whether we judge this bill as providing a proper participation of the Federal Government in a splendid exposition, or as a measure of relief and recovery, it is worthy of the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas wishes by his amendment to reduce the possible appropriation that would be given to this exposition from $350,000 to $250,000.

The city of San Diego has not in its conduct to the Government been at all niggardly with our Government. In years past the city of San Diego has given more than one-third of its water front to governmental establishments and has asked nothing in return. The city of San Diego has given to the Government a piece of property upon which they built its naval hospital in the same Balboa Park where this exposition will be erected. The city of San Diego has given one of its most valuable pieces of property on Broadway to the Government for a tremendous warehouse, and there are many other items of value that the city of San Diego has given to our Government and has asked not a dollar in return.

I do not understand the logic of the argument that because the State of California has been asked to contribute $250,000, this Nation should not contribute any more than an equal sum. Why, the State of California is nothing more than a one forty-eighth segment of this great Nation. Should not

this Federal Government contribute more than a State to an exposition of this character?

Mr. Chairman, if you deny this contribution on the part of the Federal Government to an international exposition to be held, we will create a precedent the like of which has never occurred in this House where our Government has refused to participate in an exposition of an international character.

It has been suggested that during a time of depression, of want and woe, we should not make expenditures of this character. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has gone the limit and will continue to go the limit to do everything possible for those needy souls who have been mentioned here on the floor of the House. Because we are in a depression, should we close up the Museum down here on the Avenue? Because we are in a depression, should we close up the great libraries and institutions of culture? Why, this is the very time that we need these places of mental rest and recreation. We have most need of them during the time of depression, and, if I understand the words of our great President in his several messages to the people of the United States, this is one of the very things that will carry out the purpose of our future plan for a great Nation. One of these purposes is that we shall have spots of recreation, because we expect to have more time of leisure.

So I beseech you not to cut down this appropriation by the adoption of this amendment, because I am reminded of the story of one of my friends, who tried to borrow a small sum of money from a bank. The bank said, "Yes, Mister; you can have all that you ask for except $1,000." The man said, "It does not do me any good to borrow anything, if I cannot borrow the sum I first requested." Of course not.

Do not be niggardly, because the city of San Diego has never been niggardly to this Government or to the State of California. We will never come back and ask for a further contribution, and I consider this one of the great cultural assets of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. J. Res. 94) providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936, authorizing an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes, under the rule, reported the same back to the House with an amendment.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is there any Member opposed to the bill who desires to offer a motion to recommit? If not, the Clerk will report the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit this resolution to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions that said committee shall report the same back forthwith with the following amendment, to wit:

"On page 5, in line 3, after the word 'of', strike out '$350,000' and insert in lieu thereof '$250,000.'"

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 5, noes 102.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote because there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-eight Members present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 39, nays 307, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—39

Binderup	Fulmer	McFarlane	Terry
Blanton	Halleck	Mitchell, Tenn.	Thom
Carpenter	Hancock, N. C.	O'Malley	Truax
Colmer	Hoffman	Patterson	Turner
Crawford	Hull	Pearson	Vinson, Ky.
Doxey	Jenkins, Ohio	Peterson, Ga.	Whittington
Eagle	Lamneck	Polk	Wolcott
Eicher	Luckey	Sanders, Tex.	Woodruff
Fletcher	Ludlow	Secrest	Young
Ford, Miss.	McClellan	Tarver	

NAYS—307

Adair	Dockweiler	Kniffin	Rich
Allen	Dorsey	Kocialkowski	Richards
Amlie	Doughton	Kopplemann	Richardson
Andresen	Drewry	Kramer	Robertson
Andrew, Mass.	Driscoll	Kvale	Robinson, Utah
Andrews, N. Y.	Driver	Lambertson	Rogers, Mass.
Arends	Duffey, Ohio	Lambeth	Rogers, N. H.
Arnold	Duffy, N. Y.	Lanham	Romjue
Ashbrook	Duncan	Larrabee	Rudd
Ayers	Dunn, Miss.	Lea, Calif.	Russell
Bacharach	Dunn, Pa.	Lemke	Ryan
Bacon	Eaton	Lewis, Colo.	Sabath
Barden	Eckert	Lewis, Md.	Sadowski
Beiter	Edmiston	Lloyd	Sanders, La.
Bell	Ekwall	Lord	Sandlin
Blackney	Ellenbogen	Lucas	Schaefer
Bland	Engel	Lundeen	Schneider
Bloom	Englebright	McCormack	Schuetz
Boehne	Fenerty	McGehee	Schulte
Boileau	Fernandez	McGrath	Scott
Boland	Fiesinger	McGroarty	Sears
Bolton	Fitzpatrick	McKeough	Seger
Brennan	Flannagan	McLaughlin	Shanley
Brewster	Focht	McLean	Shannon
Brooks	Ford, Calif.	McMillan	Short
Brown, Ga.	Frey	McReynolds	Sirovich
Brunner	Fuller	McSwain	Sisson
Buchanan	Gavagan	Maas	Smith, Conn.
Buck	Gehrmann	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Buckbee	Gifford	Maloney	Smith, Wash.
Buckler, Minn.	Gilchrist	Mapes	Smith, W. Va.
Bulwinkle	Gildea	Marcantonio	Snyder
Burch	Gillette	Marshall	Somers, N. Y.
Burnham	Gingery	Martin, Colo.	South
Caldwell	Granfield	Martin, Mass.	Spence
Cannon, Mo.	Gray, Pa.	Maverick	Stack
Cannon, Wis.	Green	May	Starnes
Carden	Greenway	Mead	Steagall
Carlson	Greever	Meeks	Stefan
Carmichael	Gregory	Merritt, Conn.	Stewart
Carter	Griswold	Merritt, N. Y.	Stubbs
Cary	Guyer	Michener	Sullivan
Castellow	Gwynne	Mitchell, Ill.	Sutphin
Cavicchia	Hancock, N. Y.	Monaghan	Sweeney
Christianson	Harlan	Montet	Taber
Church	Hart	Moran	Taylor, Colo.
Citron	Harter	Moritz	Thomas
Clark, Idaho	Healey	Mott	Thomason
Clark, N. C.	Hennings	Murdock	Thompson
Cochran	Hess	Nelson	Thurston
Coffee	Hildebrandt	Nichols	Tinkham
Colden	Hill, Ala.	O'Brien	Tolan
Cole, Md.	Hill, Knute	O'Connell	Tonry
Cole, N. Y.	Hill, Samuel B.	O'Connor	Turpin
Collins	Hoeppel	O'Day	Umstead
Connery	Hollister	O'Leary	Underwood
Cooper, Ohio	Holmes	O'Neal	Utterback
Cooper, Tenn.	Hook	Owen	Vinson, Ga.
Corning	Hope	Palmisano	Wallgren
Costello	Houston	Parks	Walter
Cox	Huddleston	Parsons	Warren
Cravens	Igoe	Patman	Wearin
Crosby	Imhoff	Perkins	Weaver
Cross, Tex.	Jenckes, Ind.	Pfeifer	Welch
Crosser, Ohio	Johnson, Tex.	Pittenger	Werner
Crowe	Jones	Plumley	West
Crowther	Kahn	Powers	Wigglesworth
Culkin	Kee	Quinn	Williams
Cullen	Keller	Rabaut	Wilson, La.
Darden	Kennedy, Md.	Ramsay	Wilson, Pa.
Dear	Kennedy, N. Y.	Ramspeck	Withrow
Deen	Kenney	Randolph	Wolverton
Delaney	Kerr	Rankin	Wood
Dietrich	Kimball	Ransley	Woodrum
Dingell	Kinzer	Reed, Ill.	Zimmerman
Ditter	Kleberg	Reed, N. Y.	Zioncheck
Dobbins	Kloeb	Reilly	

NOT VOTING—86

Bankhead	Dirksen	Hobbs	Pettengill
Beam	Disney	Jacobsen	Peyser
Berlin	Dondero	Johnson, Okla.	Pierce
Biermann	Doutrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Rayburn
Boylan	Evans	Kelly	Reece
Brown, Mich.	Faddis	Knutson	Robsion, Ky.
Buckley, N. Y.	Farley	Lee, Okla.	Rogers, Okla.
Burdick	Ferguson	Lehlbach	Sauthoff
Cartwright	Fish	Lesinski	Scrugham
Casey	Gambrill	McAndrews	Snell
Celler	Gasque	McDuffie	Sumners, Tex.
Chandler	Gassaway	McLeod	Taylor, S. C.
Chapman	Gearhart	Mansfield	Taylor, Tenn.
Claiborne	Goldsborough	Mason	Tobey
Cooley	Goodwin	Massingale	Treadway
Cummings	Gray, Ind.	Millard	Wadsworth
Daly	Greenwood	Miller	Whelchel
Darrow	Haines	Montague	White
Dempsey	Hamlin	Norton	Wilcox
DeRouen	Hartley	Oliver	Wolfenden
Dickstein	Higgins, Conn.	Patton	
Dies	Higgins, Mass.	Peterson, Fla.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Higgins of Massachusetts with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Biermann with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. McAndrews with Mr. Millard.
Mr. Boylan with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Dondero.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Reece.
Mr. Rayburn with Mr. McLeod.
Mr. Gasque with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Tobey.
Mr. Miller with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Patton.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Evans.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Wilcox.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Jacobsen.
Mr. Gray of Indiana with Mr. White.
Mr. Pierce with Mr. Cummings.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Pettengill.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Berlin with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. McDuffie with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Gassaway.
Mr. Peyser with Mr. Massingale.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Chandler.
Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr. Whelchel.
Mr. Hamlin with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Daly with Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. BLAND changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ] had unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes after the disposition of the measure just passed. I now desire to ask unanimous consent that instead of proceeding for 10 minutes at this time the gentleman may address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader tell us what the program is to be for tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. My hope is we will take up the Private Calendar and finish its consideration tomorrow. There are 55 bills on the calendar, and there will probably be some other bills on the calendar by tomorrow. The rule requiring bills to be on the calendar for 3 days prior to their consideration does not apply to this calendar, and therefore any bill on the calendar tomorrow will be entitled to consideration. I hope all the Members who have bills on this calendar will be present tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think we should restrict the making of speeches until we finish the Private Calendar tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think that would be entirely proper.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman from Pennsylvania had permission to address the House for 10 minutes this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I shall not object to this particular request.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the majority leader if there is any possibility of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill coming up tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have heard no suggestion about that at all.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE WEAKENS WITH UNEMPLOYMENT—UNEMPLOYMENT NEUROSIS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks the other end of the Capitol has been debating the $4,800,000,000 work relief bill. It is only natural that there should be every safeguard thrown around the spending of this money. It is only natural that the Members of Congress should be interested in the wise expenditure of this apparent large sum of money.

However, it is so easy for all of us to get our attention centered on one item and overlook other items bearing on the same fundamental issues. The other item I have in mind at this time is the item of $12,000,000,000 spent in this Nation every 12 months in the ramification of crime.

In other words, Senator WAGNER reports that the Nation spent this huge sum in 1933 in dealing with crime. That means that every day in the year 1933 we spent $33,000,000 looking after the different avenues of crime. Another way of putting it is that every hour in every day in 1933 the taxpayers of the Nation spent $1,400,000 to care for crime activities.

Still another way of putting it is that the $4,800,000,000 we are going to use to put men back to work is only a little more than one-third of what we will spend the coming year in taking care of the Nation's crime bill. Is it possible that we will halt between these two opinions? Is there any question as to the advisability of using $1 to put men and boys back to work so as to save their health as against spending $3 to cuddle and care for crime activities?

We are spending these millions to control crime because those who have managed and manipulated our municipal, county, State, and National Government for the past 40 or 50 years failed to build a social and economic structure that functions. It is apparent on every side that we slowly drifted toward economic chaos, and in November 1929 we bumped into the Gibraltar that put our economic ship of state on the rocks.

We must admit that those who piloted the ship of state during the last 40 or 50 years failed to vision or see the rock of financial and economic destruction ahead of them. It is said that, like Shylock, the glitter of gold dimmed their vision, and where there is no vision the people perish.

It is easy for us to now see the bad workmanship and the flaws in the old machine that ran amuck in 1929. It is easy to look back and see where the defects were. It is easy to see that during the fat years from 1922 to 1929 how we failed to build our economic structure sufficiently strong to stand the storm. Like the *Macon*, when the cross winds beat upon her structure she crumbled and fell into the briny deep.

Our mission, my friends, is not to consume our energy in complaining about the past, but to build for the future, to build a social and economic fabric that will function in such a way that every man and woman will have an opportunity to work. That must be the mission of every State legislature, that must be the mission of the United States Congress, that must be the mission of all those entrusted with the reins of Government if we hope to perpetuate our sacred institutions.

To fulfill this mission we must enrich our citizenship-building institutions—the home, the church, and the school. We must ever remember that one of two things a nation must always do—pay small sums for the enrichment and upkeep of these institutions or pay large sums to battle crime and build prison walls.

The most alarming situation we have with us in the United States today has just been fully pictured by Dr. Majera, a noted physician. Dr. Majera finds that the unemployment has brought about a plague or a disease known as "neurosis." This disease has gripped millions of our population. He finds that the first phases of the illness resemble neurosenthia and include definite inorganic inferiority, and that treatment just strengthens the patients physically and that they remain mentally depressed and full of self worry. Also those suffering from unemployment neurosis become easy recruits of extremeness, communistic organizations, and gangster bands. Later on a certain percent of this group become murderers and robbers.

It has been observed that dole relief plunges hundreds of thousands of our people into the first stages of this dreadful disease, unemployment neurosis. It has further been found that the largest percent of those affected are young people. Friends, the only way we can keep this dreadful unemployment neurosis from destroying millions of our people physically and mentally is to create immediately a set-up that will put them back to work.

Mr. Speaker, Nero fiddled while Rome burned. We must not sit idly by and watch our fellow men be made victims of a malady that may permanently unfit them for life work. No one who is interested in the future generations wants to see dole relief continued. No one interested in our citizenship-building institutions wants to see dole relief extended to those who are physically able to do a day's work. The story of dole relief down through the ages in every nation, where it has been tried, teaches us that it always brings about disease, plagues, crime, and murder. I mean that those who are physically able to work should be given the opportunity to work, and those who are not physically able should be pensioned or put on charity. No red-blooded man is ready to admit that we cannot create an economic set-up that will give our people an opportunity to work.

If we had thought twice 2 years ago, we would have put 2,000,000 boys and men in the C. C. C. camps instead of 300,000. This dreadful disease of neurosis is not found among the C. C. C boys, neither is it found among those older who have daily work. If we had put 2,000,000 men and boys to work on expanded C. C. C projects, we would not only have saved the Nation billions of dollars in money during the past 2 years but we would have saved the next generation from being victims of the results of the aftermath of this unemployment disease.

Two million men and boys at work means 10,000,000 happy and contented people, because these men and boys come from unemployed homes and come from the ranks of the unemployed, and when they get the $30 a month and send $25 of it back home there is an independence and an attitude of mind present that makes for better citizenship and greater respect for law and order.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the big task before the Congress this very hour is to create a worth-while work program in the Nation that will put our unemployed back to work. Again, I wish to say that I am not in favor of the Government taking over any of the avenues of private business, but rather that the Government should encourage private business, so as to be able to absorb the unemployed men and women in their respective fields of industrial activity. However, until such time it behooves the Government to create a work program, put these boys and men to work, and thus save the millions of unemployed from falling victims of this plague, unemployment neurosis.

OLD-AGE PENSION

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill I introduced today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I do not wish to cast too great an unfavorable light upon the labors of the apparently well-qualified gentlemen who drafted the economic security bill now in committee. However, I feel that title I of this measure, providing for voluntary, noncontributory old-age pensions, is inadequate to meet the need for which it is designed. My reasons for so thinking are based largely upon the following data submitted by the President's Committee on Social and Economic Security:

First. There are about 700,000 people over 65 years of age on F. E. R. A. relief lists. In addition, there is an undetermined number in receipt of public charity, but not on F. E. R. A. lists. All told, the committee states, the number of old people in receipt of public charity is probably in excess of 1,000,000.

Second. Approximately 180,000 old people, most of them over 70 years of age, are now receiving pensions under State laws, the average pension last year being $19.74 per month—over $40,000,000 per year.

Third. Approximately 150,000 aged people are in receipt of industrial and trade-union pensions, the cost of which exceeds $100,000,000 per year—or a little over $60 per month.

Fourth. A conservative estimate is that at least one-half of the approximately 7,500,000 people over 65 years of age are dependent.

These four points have been the subject of much discussion, and it is with each of them in mind that I wish to explain my purpose in introducing H. R. 5700.

First, I believe that the prime object of voluntary, noncontributory old-age pensions should be the elimination insofar as possible of almshouses and the transfer of those aged on relief rolls to pension rolls. This would mean, according to the President's committee, a pension roll which would include over 1,000,000 persons.

In approaching this situation it might be wise to consider that in some sections of the country it may be found desirable to grant pensions as high as $50 per month while less than half of this figure would be considered adequate in other sections. If we strike an average between the present low average of approximately $20 per month paid by States and the maximum of $50 per month which I propose, we arrive at the figure of $35 per month. With 1,000,000 persons receiving such an amount per month the total cost would be $400,000,000 per year, or, on the proposed basis of equal sharing of the burden by State and Federal Governments, $200,000,000 annually for the latter.

Inasmuch as it is quite evident that many State legislatures are in favor of immediate action on old-age pensions, a large proportion of those now on F. E. R. A. relief lists will be transferred to pension rolls shortly following the enactment of Federal legislation, providing such legislation permits quick action. If this be true—and I am convinced that it is true—the immediate appropriation of $50,000,000 provided in title I of H. R. 4142, the administration bill—and the later authorized appropriation of $125,000 annually will be inadequate.

In suggesting the inadequacy of the proposed appropriations I have no desire to see the expenditure in this instance of more Federal funds than is necessary to provide decent housing and subsistence for the destitute aged. With the exception of the much-touted but economically impossible Townsend plan offered by my distinguished colleagues from the utopian land of California, I do not know of any

proposal which contemplates supporting old age in idle luxury. But let us, by all means, do what we can to eliminate the poorhouse and in its place provide a dependable and systematic method allowing those who cannot help themselves and who can turn to no other place but to a humane government, find moderate comfort and happiness in their declining years.

On the other hand, let us not provide pensions of this sort without also evolving means of paying for them without further borrowing on the public credit. A voluntary noncontributory-pension system should not and cannot depend for revenue upon a compulsory, contributary system which is based upon sound actuarial standards. No, we must make this thing pay its own way. Permanent revenues must be found to establish a permanent pension system.

It is natural that we all hesitate to suggest new taxation, but someone, at some time, must pay the bills—and I believe that if the burdens carried by present generations are lightened by social legislation, future generations should not be forced to carry additional burdens for which they will not be responsible and of which they cannot divest themselves.

Despite the objections with which my revenue-raising proposal will inevitably be greeted, I believe that the manufacturers' excise tax provided for in H. R. 5700 is also inevitable. Although I favor the use of nuisance taxes of diverse kinds in an emergency, favor equitable income taxes of all kinds, including income from the at present tax-exempt securities, and am in accord with increasing of inheritance and gift taxes, I could not conscientiously propose that an additional $200,000,000 per year be derived from increasing any of these.

The manufacturers' excise tax should be in addition to any other tax now imposed and should be levied against any and all manufactured articles of whatever shape, size, or description, with the industry classifications for the census of manufactures, 1933, as a guide for assessments.

It is impossible to accurately determine the ultimate dollar volume of sales of all manufactured products. The f. o. b. factory value of all such articles in 1933 was about $31,000,000,000. A 1-percent tax, therefore, could reasonably be expected to produce upward of $350,000,000 per year, allowing little more than a 4-percent increase in dollar volume between producer and ultimate consumer.

Under the provisions of H. R. 5700, the President may change the rate of taxation so as to secure revenue in as near as possible the exact amount needed to provide funds for pensions. The bill calls for a 1-percent tax, but this amount could be reduced immediately to one-half of 1 percent and graduated upward as the need arose. Provision is also made for the exemption of very low-priced articles.

The proposed means for collecting this tax is, I believe, the most simple and effective which could be devised. It would not require an army of inspectors and the amount of the tax is so low for the average unit sale that collusion between seller and purchaser is unlikely.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest desire that adequate revenue be provided for whatever expenditures are to be made under a permanent plan of this character. This is not emergency legislation.

AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a statement made by myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, in 1917 the international bankers, alien interests, and alien-minded Americans forced the United States to enter the World War, thereby abandoning its tradition of neutrality, which was its fundamental protection and immunity from war. Since then the United States has lost the character of its political institutions and has become an impoverished Nation.

The roots of nearly all of the present troubles of the United States go back to this abandonment of the American traditions of neutrality and of nonparticipation in the political affairs of Europe.

During the last 19 months the United States more than the rest of the world has suffered catastrophic fluctuations and further protracted impoverishment.

Some idea of this further protracted impoverishment may be obtained from the following tabulation.

Country	Increase in national debt since 1929	August 1934 industrial activity compared with 1929 monthly averages
	Percent	*Percent*
Sweden	27.2	101.8
Great Britain	2.6	98.7
Germany	38.8	86.2
Canada	22.6	78.3
France	10.3	69.8
Belgium	11.6	68.7
Poland	3.8	62.2
United States	60.0	62.0

This tabulation shows that by comparison with other important countries the United States, since 1929, has shown the greatest increase in its Federal debt and has made the least progress toward recovery. The data on debt are obtained from official sources and the indices of industrial activity are those recently compiled by the League of Nations.

The discrepancy between the United States and other important nations is made more apparent by the following data of increase in industrial production from the low point in each country, as reported by the League of Nations:

Industrial production

Country:	*Percent increase*
Canada	63.8
Sweden	51.2
Germany	49.4
Belgium	37.8
Poland	33.3
Great Britain	26.4
United States	25.8
France	5.5

As additional evidence of the further impoverishment of the United States are the two following impressive facts recently reported by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration: (1) That there were approximately 17,000,000 persons "on relief" in September of 1934 as compared with 13,338,000 persons in September of 1933, an increase of 3,662,000 persons, and (2) that during September of 1934, $143,000,000 of public funds were spent to support those "on relief", as compared with $59,000,000 in September of 1933, an increase of $84,000,000.

Another evidence of this further impoverishment of the United States are the unemployment figures for October of 1934, as compared with the unemployment figures for October of 1933. According to a report of the American Federation of Labor, in October of 1933 there were 10,122,000 unemployed; in October of 1934, 10,671,000, an increase of 549,000 persons.

These figures would seem to indicate a distribution of poverty rather than a redistribution of wealth.

Thus, the United States, having abandoned its neutrality and mingled in the political affairs of Europe, is becoming, like the countries of Europe, a pauperized nation.

A MOMENTOUS DECISION OF THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, as a newspaper man, consecrated to my profession through more than 40 years of service, jealous of all encroachments on its legitimate activities, I feel a genuine thrill of pride when I refer to a decision handed down recently by the Supreme Court of Indiana which in sum and substance is an epochal vindication of the freedom of the press.

Through the gracious kindness of my colleagues of the House of Representatives, I am conceded the privilege of inserting this decision in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where posterity may behold it and time will not efface it.

Don M. Nixon, of Wabash, Ind., was a fighting Hoosier editor. He was a Republican in politics but when it came to the hard but dutiful task of exposing errors, misconduct, and corruption in the public service his spear knew no brother. He upheld what he believed to be right and condemned what he conceived to be wrong, always standing for what he thought was the public interest. He was aggressive, dynamic, militant, and absolutely fearless, a colorful crusader for righteousness.

A judge appointed a village garage mechanic as receiver for a million dollar trust company. Editor Nixon did not think it was a fit appointment. In trenchant language he criticized the judge's act. He was cited for contempt. On the morning he was sentenced a crowd of townspeople and farmers overflowed the courthouse and corridors, including many who had lost their savings in the trust company and who showed by mutterings and sullen silence that they were on the side of the editor. He was fined $100 and sentenced to 10 days in jail.

There was nothing malicious about Don Nixon, but he never quit fighting when convinced that his cause was righteous. He appealed his case to the Indiana Appellate Court. By this time the Nixon contempt case had become a casus celebre. The issue of freedom of the press had become identified with it in a big way. Metropolitan newspapers sent their correspondents to Indianapolis to report the proceedings before the appellate court. John Boettinger, who has since become the President's son-in-law, went down from Chicago to report the trial for the Tribune. The appellate court sustained the contempt decree of the lower court.

Don Nixon, still fighting, appealed his case to the Supreme Court of Indiana and carried to that highest of all tribunals in our State his plea for the liberty of the press that is the very bulwark of free government.

On January 9 last, James P. Hughes, the dignified, able chief justice, handed down the unanimous decision of the Indiana Supreme Court. That decision already has taken its place among the imperishable documents of a free people. In these times, when the newspapers are having their battles with N. R. A., and when administrative and judicial officials are none too mindful of the constitutional guaranty of free speech, the decision of the Indiana Supreme Court looms forth as a magna carta of the press. In clarity, force, and conciseness, the court's decree is without a parallel.

It says:

> The right to comment freely and criticize the action, opinions, and judgment of courts is of primary importance to the public generally. Not only is it good for the public but it has a salutary effect on courts and judges as well.
>
> Courts and judges are not, and should not be, above criticism, and as long as they are not impeded in the conduct of judicial business by publications having the effect of obstructing enforcement of their orders and judgments, or of impairing the justice and impartiality of verdicts, there is no right to enforce a contempt proceeding.

That decision has been praised from ocean to ocean by all the distinguished men of journalism, by the outstanding exponents of our ancient philosophy which we inherited from the founding fathers, and by the paladins of American ideals in every walk of life.

The tragedy of it all is that Editor Nixon did not live to witness the vindication that came to him so generously. Exactly 70 days before the court handed down its decision he died as the result of an auto-truck crash that fractured his skull.

Throughout the years to come every encroachment on the right of newspapers to criticize public officials will awaken reverberations of the gallant fight Don Nixon made in Indiana for freedom of the press, and the decision of the Indiana Supreme Court will be the restraining voice that will say to the courts:

> Thus far mayest thou go, but no farther.

There has been in modern times only one other piece of judicial literature that in any way resembles the decree of the Indiana Supreme Court in this case, and that was the dissenting opinion of Oliver Wendell Holmes, of the United States Supreme Court, in the case of Rosika Schwimmer, when the venerable jurist said:

> Some of her answers might excite public prejudice, but if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate.

LINCOLN-DAY TRIBUTE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by myself at a Lincoln Day banquet in Portland, Maine, on Lincoln's Birthday.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

> We are met here tonight to do honor to the first Republican President, and to revivify our belief in the principles of the Republican Party, a party conceived of liberty and freedom, and born of the principle that every man, regardless of race, color, or creed, is imbued with a God-given, inalienable right of freedom of thought and action in his lawful pursuits with freedom of the right to think, act, and live normally and without any more restraint by Government than is necessary to compel respect of the rights of others to live in like manner.
>
> The Republican Party was organized primarily as a protest against the oppression of a race of people who had been retained in subjugation by the policies adhered to by the forbears of the present Democratic Party. This was recognized to be against all moral law. Great reforms were necessary not only to free these people from enslavement, but to rid the Union of certain other correlated but no less pernicious institutions which if allowed to continue would have nullified the pure intent of the founders of the Nation " to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."
>
> Under the leadership of Abraham Lincoln the Republican Party saved the Union; it emancipated, not only the colored race from physical enslavement, but all of our people from the constant threat of disintegration of the Nation contained in the insidious policies of the Democratic Party.
>
> We are again called upon to safeguard the American people against similar pernicious policies of the present administration. American business, industry, agriculture, and finance must be freed from economic bondage, and it is only through a readoption by the people of the policies of the Republican Party that this can be brought about. After every Democratic administration the Republican Party has been called back into power to rebuild the Nation upon the ruins resulting from the devastating and destructive experiments of a party which has proven itself incapable, in at least three instances, of maintaining a Government " of the people, by the people, and for the people."
>
> It was intended by the framers of our Constitution that the Federal Government should be made up of three distinct but related branches—the executive, legislative, and judicial. Although it is always expected that the prerogatives of these departments will overlap in some respects, it was never intended that the definitely established constitutional functions of these departments should be delegated.
>
> We have seldom seen an attempt on the part of the judiciary to usurp the prerogatives of the legislative or executive branches of the Government. There has never been any attempt on the part of the legislative branch of the Government to usurp any of the prerogatives or powers of the judiciary or executive branches, but in the last 2 years we have been visited with the paradox of the executive branch of the country, although disclaiming any attempt at usurpation of power and prerogatives of the legislative branch, doing so with the utmost disregard of the rights of citizens to be secured in a representative form of government. Lincoln met the Nation's greatest emergency by holding fast to the Constitution; the present administration is attempting to meet an economic emergency by ignoring the Constitution and has suffered rebuke from the Supreme Court in doing so.
>
> How different the administrations of Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt! During the Lincoln administration this great progenitor of the Republican Party sought the advice of his political enemies as well as his personal and political friends. He surrounded himself with men of divergent interests and opinions, in order that he might be apprised at all times of the cross currents of public opinion and thought. He felt it his duty as a Chief Executive to coordinate these opinions, and when he enunciated a policy or made a recommendation to Congress it was done after careful consideration had been given to the reaction on the public mind and whether in keeping with the Constitution.

In this manner he gave full credence to the debates in Congress, because he realized that to do otherwise would deprive our citizens of the right to true representative government. As a consequence, he enjoyed the respect of his political enemies as well as his political friends.

In order that a republican form of government may be maintained under a Constitution such as ours, it is essential that the Chief Executive always maintain himself in a position of neutrality until complete information on the subject is obtained, and when he once comes to a conclusion it must be so definite in character as to leave no doubt in the minds of the people as to what his policy will henceforth be on that particular question. Lincoln did this.

Unlike Lincoln, the present Chief Executive has insisted that he be surrounded by "brain trusters" and bureaucrats who would divest themselves of all personal initiative in the advocacy of policies and the expression of personal opinions. He has insisted that the Congress of the United States, instead of being useful to him in the promulgation of his policies, follow the letter of his personal unbalanced conclusions without regard to the integrity of the Constitution and without regard to the people of the Nation who can be heard, as a result, only through the voice of Congress. He has flexed the Constitution to bring it within the scope of his own endeavors instead of subserviating his personal will to the Constitution, as Lincoln and all his predecessors have done. When criticized for it, the answer of administration leaders has been, "We cannot eat the Constitution." The rebuttal of Republicans has been, "True, but we have eaten under the Constitution for 146 years." While on one hand he has preached the doctrine of relief for the forgotten man, for the small merchant, and the farmer, he has insisted that the Congress scuttle its right to give consideration to legislation in behalf of these same individuals whom he has been so vociferous in protecting, and, with autocracy as his watchword, has destroyed representative government. There has been set up in its stead an autocratic oligarchy of supermen not responsible to any constituency, but responsible only to the will of the Executive.

This administration has taken advantage of the plight in which the American people found themselves due to a world-wide depression to foist upon them the same pernicious policies from which the Republican Party has protected our people since its origin in 1854. Our fight has just started. In substantiation of the charges which I have made and the necessity for continuing the fight for a restoration of a Republican form of government, let us, as Al Smith would say, "Look at the record." During the last 2 years this has been a record of destruction of American tenets and principles; it has been a record of inconsistencies; it has been a record of paradoxes the like of which has been unknown in the history of any organized government. Let us review some of these paradoxes:

While we are spending millions to effect crop reduction, we are, at the same time, appropriating other millions to irrigate land and make it available for the production of new farm surpluses; while we are paying the farmer to produce less, we are encouraging larger production by the circulation of Government periodicals advising the farmer how he may grow two stalks of grain where only one grew before. While private employers were importuned to raise salaries to increase purchasing power, the Government was decreasing wages paid the large army of Government employees and was making slashing reductions in the amounts paid to veterans to compensate them for loss of earning power due to service-connected disabilities.

While attacking the Republican tariff policy, which was designed to maintain the American market for Americans, and while they contended that the reduction in our foreign trade resulted from the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, they have put tariffs on coal, copper, and oil, not included in that act, and they have adopted such an elastic foreign policy that much antagonism has arisen on the part of foreign countries, which has caused a steady decrease in the value and volume of our exports. While boasting that under the policies of the "new deal" millions have been put back to work, at the same time giving recognition to the fact that the need for relief is greater now than at any time during the 2 years of the Roosevelt depression, by the insistence that $4,800,000,000 be appropriated to carry this load. While the administration has been most vociferous in its advocacy of a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards, it cannot resist the temptation to follow its natural bent of constantly experimenting with monetary panaceas, even to the extent of adopting a sort of bimetallic base for our currency, without recognition of the fact that no major country in the world has had a bimetallic standard for the past 70 years.

While they have been dramatic in their insistence that the national credit be maintained by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within revenues, they have by the reckless expenditure of taxpayers' money built up the largest Government debt in the history of the United States, from a sum of about $21,000,000,000 when the administration took office, to a sum now exceeding $30,000,000,000, and with an anticipated increase of another $7,000,000,000 within the next 2 years.

While dealing with the subject of paradoxes, I charge, without any equivocation, that the Democratic Party has broken faith with the people of the Nation. If further proof of this is required, let us turn for a moment to the platform of the Democratic Party adopted at Chicago in 1932. It is interesting to read the platform of the party now in power, in the light of what has happened since the inauguration of 2 years ago. In that platform the Democratic Party solemnly state:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when intrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

And then follows,

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government * * *."

In his acceptance speech at Chicago, following his nomination, President Roosevelt said that he stood four-square on the Democratic platform in this and all other respects. In further confirmation of his stand with respect to this particular part of the Democratic platform, President Roosevelt, at Topeka, Kans., on September 14, 1932, said, as follows:

"I propose to exert through the Presidency, as I have done through the governorship, every bit of influence I can in favor of a national movement to reorganize local government in the direction of eliminating a large part of the tax burden that now bears so heavily on the farmers of the Nation."

And again, in the same respect, he is quoted by the press as saying:

"By our example at Washington itself we shall have the opportunity of pointing the way of economy to local government * * *."

He then goes on to distribute tax dollars between the local, State, and Federal Governments, and concludes by saying:

"I propose to you, my friends, and through you, that government of all kinds, big and little, be made solvent, and that the example be set by the President of the United States and his Cabinet."

Instead of this, as I have pointed out, the costs of Government have arisen to the extent that we find ourselves in the position where there are only two alternatives, that of liquidation of our debt by pernicious and destructive inflation of the currency or by confiscatory taxation, which is equally destructive of business and property.

In his speeches before the election Mr. Roosevelt laments the fact that the tax burden is equivalent to $125 per year per person. The per capita burden of Federal taxes has increased during the 2 years of his administration from about $170 to about $250. Using Mr. Roosevelt's own words:

"This is an impossible economic condition. Quite apart from every man's own tax assessment, that burden is a brake on any return to normal business activity. Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and hence in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain."

And again:

"Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continued deficits. Stop the deficits. And let us also have the courage to reverse the policies of Republican leaders and insist on a sound currency."

The inconsistency of the stand taken by the administration in reduction of governmental taxes is noted in the adoption of a 3-point program given by the administration to the press last Saturday, February 9, 1935, which includes among other things a high tax system, clothed in the garb of another experiment on the part of the administration to increase the velocity of money turned over in this manner. I presume this to be a concession to the "leftists" of the Democratic Party, who advocate a redistribution of the wealth of the country. If so, it is truly a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Let us turn again to the covenant of the Democratic Party, in which they contract with the American people further, as follows:

"We advocate a competitive tariff for revenue with a fact-finding Tariff Commission free from Executive interference."

It is a long way from this covenant to the Democratic tariff act passed at the last session of Congress, which enables the President of the United States to raise or lower the tariffs 50 percent without even a hearing before himself or any other fact-finding body. The Republican Party has always kept its covenant with the American people to protect its agriculture and industry by a tariff high enough to prevent foreign competition resulting in the destruction of our home markets. Mr. Roosevelt recognizes in a speech at Baltimore on October 25, 1932, the necessity for a protective tariff on agricultural commodities, wherein he says:

"Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm products. I declared that all prosperity, in the broader sense, springs from the soil. I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farm dollar by making the tariff effective for agriculture, and raising the price of farm products. I know of no excessive duties on farm products. I do not intend that any duties necessary to protect the farmer shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program, and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived."

It was undoubtedly because of this covenant that many of the farmers of the United States voted for this administration in 1932.

What has happened since? By the contrary policies adopted by the administration in the Democratic-controlled Congress our foreign markets are being lost to the American farmer. The administration has not kept this covenant with the American farmer. With respect to tariffs, let us cite one example: The President,

by Executive order under the authority of the tariff act, has increased the preferential on sugar coming in from Cuba by 1.1 cents per pound. He has reduced the world tariff rate on sugar one-half cent per pound. This sugar comes in direct competition with a sugar industry worth many millions of dollars to the American farmer. It will enable the owners of the Cuban sugar industry to market their quota of sugar for the year 1935, $59,424,672 less than the year 1933. The action of the President was predicated upon a desire to increase the purchasing power of the Cuban people. The Cuban sugar industry is not owned by the Cuban people and has resulted in benefit to no one but those United States bankers who have large investments in Cuba, and it has increased by a like amount the money which the taxpayers of the Nation must raise to pay the operating expenses of the Federal Government.

And again the Democratic Party provides for "the removal of Government from all fields of private enterprise except where necessary to develop public works and natural resources in the common interest." It is not necessary to dwell at length upon the different activities of the present administration to bring the Government into direct competition with private enterprise. There has been such a socialization of American business as to make the followers of Marxism green with envy.

By again referring to the platform of the Democratic Party, we learn with amazement that they condemn the improper and excessive use of money in political activities. You Republicans here in Maine do not need to be reminded of the effective use made of the Federal Treasury in garnering votes at the last election for the Democratic Party. And in Washington today a movement is on foot to augment the resources of the Federal Treasury by the sum of $4,800,000,000 which may be used as a political war chest for the 1936 elections. These breaches of faith and demagogeries on the part of the Democratic Party may be justified by the advocates of socialism, facisism, Hitlerism, or communism. There is no place for them in Americanism. Let us take heed, and in revivifying our faith in Republican doctrines and policies, not lose sight of the fact that it is our duty to prevent the use of Federal funds for the destruction of an American form of government.

The present Democratic administration is indicted at the bar of popular opinion because it has not kept the covenant; because it has broken faith; because of its manipulation of the currency; because by a sectional attitude it has given to some sections of the country the advantages of cheap power not enjoyed by others; because it has launched upon a continuing program of experimentation and trial-and-error prescription for our economic ills; because it has not established a definite policy with respect to its attitude toward business and agriculture and maintained it long enough for business and agriculture to readjust itself to the new order of things; because of its failure to make an honest endeavor to approach a balancing of the Budget; because of its attempts at the centralization of governmental power and functions, reaching out, as it does, to control agriculture, business, industry, finance, and credit. It is charged with impairing the confidence of our people, not only in the policies of the administration, but in government itself. The Democrats cannot answer the charge that this lack of confidence is the result of difficulties except of their own making. "Lack of confidence is not the result of difficulties; difficulties come from lack of confidence." Shades of Lincoln! He is with us tonight and his spirit is telling us that as Republicans, ever solicitous of the Government for which he died, we must take up the torch of patriotism, of honesty, and intelligence, and warn the American people that unless we keep the faith, unless we again are put in a position where we can pilot the destinies of the Nation to a safe and sane port, the Union will disintegrate—in truth, crumble—its people will again return to a bondage and economic enslavement 10 times worse than physical servitude. This will result in another and even greater civil conflict, fought this time for the purpose of regaining the virtues of a republican form of government, of which we are fast becoming divested.

Is this an exaggeration? Then study the history of the French inflation preceding the French Revolution. Seek for the parallels of that era with those which we are now experiencing. First, deflation; next, unemployment; then charges of inadequate cash currency circulation; then artificial means of producing credit resulting in a topheavy credit structure controlled by the Government; then fear and panic; then further demands for more currency and the issuance of assignats; then seeming prosperity—everybody buying and buying—further flights from the franc, everybody turning their francs into commodities, shortage of labor, finally, saturation point, fear, unemployment in a high commodity market, and then revolution.

We do not need more cash currency to bring us out of this depression. The volume of cash currency does not control our economic life. It has little or no relationship to the price or turnover of commodities until it is issued in such huge quantities as to cause the people to become afraid of it, with a resultant desire to get rid of it, and then it is turned into commodities which usually causes the first reaction in the price index.

We do need in times like these an acceleration of the velocity of credit and credit currency. Agriculture and business improve only as our credit currency increases in velocity. Credit currency turns over only when there is a demand for expansion of business enterprise and farm commodities. There is a demand for expansion of business enterprise and farm commodities only when there is a market with the ability to buy. There is an expansion of all enterprise and attending market for the products of those enterprises only when there is confidence in the stability of the currency upon which the credit structure is built. A wheel within a wheel you say. True, no doubt; but an economic wheel which is at present on dead center and which can be put in motion only by overbalancing one side or the other; most effectively put in motion by creating a demand for credit which is now available. This demand depends chiefly upon the assurance which business and agriculture have that their profits will not be confiscated by the Government by wild monetary policies or by confiscatory taxation resulting from an unbalanced Budget and the charges attendant upon the carrying or retirement of a tremendously huge Government debt. There is little demand for loans against the more than $1,800,000,000 of excess reserves in the Federal Reserve System, due to lack of confidence; out of $300,000,000 made available as loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation a year ago (an act designed by Congress to increase the velocity of credit) less than $37,000,000 has been taken up by business because of the uncertainty which prevails as to the future economic policies of the administration.

Assure business and agriculture against these destructive forces, protect the American market against the importation of cheaply manufactured products and farm produce, a market which consumes more than 93 percent of the output of our plants and farms; assure the American merchant, manufacturer, and farmer that he will not have to meet the competition of government in business, and we will have a surprisingly rapid recovery. Allow business to meet business in open and fair competition, devoid of monopolies created by the Government, and business will create its own markets as it has always done with the help, but not in spite, of the Government. Remove from the President the power to put any business out of business by the reduction of the tariff on things which that business makes or grows, and we remove that fear of cheap foreign competition from business and agriculture and allow that business to normally expand. People are put back to work. They can buy the products of our farms. Our farmers can then buy the products of our factories, and shortly we find that by the application of sound, good, old-fashioned commonsense principles to business and agriculture the welfare load has been lifted, our people are no longer in want for the necessities and luxuries of life, and America is the place Lincoln would have it be.

A land of contented, well-educated, well-nourished, happy people. In summary, to bring this about we must insist with all the power at our command, as a party representing 46 percent of the voters of this Nation, that the administration remove the uncertainty and lack of confidence which now exists by enunciating and adhering to definite and honest-intentioned policies which will result in, first, the stabilization of our currency; second, the withdrawal by the Government from the competitive field of honestly conducted private business and industry; third, the reduction of its bureaucratic expenditures, and insistence upon an honestly balanced Budget; and lastly, that it safeguard, by adequate tariffs and embargoes, if necessary, our domestic market.

REFINANCING OF FARM MORTGAGES

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following resolution relating to remedial legislation for refinancing farm mortgages, passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska:

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Lincoln, February 9, 1935.

Hon. C. G. BINDERUP,
United States Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Find enclosed a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Nebraska House of Representatives memorializing Congress to issue $3,500,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes to lift the mortgage on the old homestead. Nebraska has ever taken the lead during the past half century for currency reform in this Nation; nearly 5 decades has passed down through the corridors of time since William Jennings Bryan unfurled the banner of free silver.

Twenty-three years ago Senator Hitchcock led the fight in the United States Senate for the creation of the Federal Reserve bank, out of which we now ask the issuance of this currency to pay the mortgages on the farms of America. I believe that this program would be sound, for the reason that this currency is backed by the best security in the world, the food-producing farm lands of America.

Federal Reserve Bank System was used to finance the World War, billions of which has gone to Europe—never to return. It was used by the gamblers to drive the stock markets up in the days when we kept cool with "Cal"; and if the administration of Mr. Harding had not deflated this currency in 1921 to the detriment of the agricultural West, the farmer of today would not be in the predicament he is in. The real farmers of America want this Democratic administration now in power at Washington to forget about the N. R. A., A. A. A., and the rest of the alphabetical

bureaucracy now undermining the very foundation stones of our Government, and lead on for real currency reform. May we hope that Nebraska will again take this lead?

As a Democrat I represent Colfax County in the Nebraska House and trying to do my part to lead on for a good old Jefferson and Jacksonian democracy.

Yours very truly,

OTTO C. WEBER,
Forty-third District, Colfax County.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages

Whereas the farmers of the agricultural regions of the United States are financially disabled; and

Whereas many farm lands are heavily mortgaged and the farmers are hopelessly in debt and many will eventually lose their farms unless relief is given; and

Whereas the prosperity of the United States and its people are dependent upon the well-being of the farmer and his ability to purchase; and

Whereas the gateway to prosperity is the gateway leading from the golden fields of the great agricultural region of the Middle West; and

Whereas the farmer and his dependents cannot and will not spend while attempting to carry a heavy load of indebtedness; and

Whereas the prosperity of the agricultural regions of this country means the prosperity of the whole country, since the purchase of any machinery and any equipment as well as clothing and food will create such a demand that factories would reopen and employ more people; and

Whereas inflation would tend to enable the debtors to get out of debt and to make the whole country more prosperous, as it has done many times before in this country and is now doing in England and other countries; and

Whereas a mild inflation has helped the United States regain its properity on numerous occasions and is now helping England and other countries to regain prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska in fiftieth legislative session assembled—

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such remedial legislation as will provide for refinancing through the Federal farm-loan banks of the whole farm-mortgage debt at an annual interest rate of 1½ percent and an annual amortization charge of 1½ percent of the principal, with balance to be paid in not less than 10 nor more than 20 years; that the funds for this operation shall be obtained through issuance of some $3,500,000,000 in Federal Reserve notes.

2. That a copy of this resolution, properly authenticated and suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to each of the Congressmen elected in the State of Nebraska, and that our Congressmen and Senators be urged to use their best offices to prosecute the enactment of such legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

THE NEW HOMESTEADER

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter addressed to a constituent of mine.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who is the letter from?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is a letter to a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday afternoon of this week the first family moved into one of the recently constructed houses on the Tygart Valley subsistence homestead. This Federal project is located in my home county of Randolph.

Frank J. Swecker, with his wife and one daughter, occupied for the first time their new home on that date. Mr. Swecker formerly was a woodsman, being at one time employed by the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co.

His case is typical of hundreds of timber workers who have been taken out of an industry which once flourished in the mountains of West Virginia, but is now almost finished. Throughout the hills there are scores upon scores of deserted lumber villages. Such stranded populations have become a serious economic problem, and I commend the attention of all Members of Congress to the possibilities for rehabilitation under the homestead movement.

At this project other families are preparing to move in their houses as speedily as possible. I believe that this administration should do everything possible to hasten the decentralization of industry and population.

Herewith is a copy of the letter written to Mr. Swecker upon the occasion of his moving in:

FEBRUARY 14, 1935.

Mr. FRANK J. SWECKER,
Tygart Valley Homestead, Elkins, W. Va.

MY DEAR MR. SWECKER: It has been brought to my attention today that you and your family are now occupying your new home at the Tygart Valley Homestead. I wish to congratulate you as the first of these new homesteaders who will become the residents of this project in Randolph County.

You and your fellow homesteaders have not only a splendid opportunity for a life of new usefulness, but as workers in a new movement you have a responsibility as well. As you till the soil, rear your family, and receive part-time work in industry, may rich blessings attend you. This entire homestead program, I hope, will be filled with far-reaching beneficial results.

Faithfully yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Representative HAMILTON FISH, Jr., at the annual Lincoln Day banquet of the Republican organizations of the State of Missouri, Colonial Hotel, Springfield, Mo., Tuesday evening, February 12, 1935:

I know of no issue that is more appropriate to discuss on Lincoln's birthday than the betrayal of representative and constitutional government by the Congress at the arrogant demands of Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States. It is the most important issue before the American people, and will probably be, together with unemployment and the destruction of business confidence, the main issue in the next Presidential campaign.

The House of Representatives voted practically to abdicate its legislative powers by granting the President $4,880,000,000 without qualification or limitation. The control of the purse strings is the main reason for the existence of the Congress, and when the Congress voted to strip itself naked of its legislative powers it left its Members with no more clothing than Ghandi. The President of the United States, the Democrats admit, was the author of this disgraceful bill, and it was only on his urgent request that the very lifeblood of Congress—the control of appropriations—was turned over to him, and the constitutional liberties of the people entrusted to Congress by the founders of the Republic, and representative government itself was smashed.

The autocrat in the White House sponsored this vicious and un-American action, backed by the "brain trust" and others who do not believe in our representative form of government. They cannot dodge the responsibility for forcing through Congress, under a gag rule and by whip and spur, this legislation—an abomination of desolation. The American people were mesmerized by the Hauptmann trial and do not yet know the facts. I call upon the Republican Party to fight this infamous and unconstitutional surrender of the legislative powers of Congress to an alleged superman in the White House. I call upon the Republicans not to cease in their efforts to restore representative and constitutional government to the American people. I call upon the Republicans to present a united front to oppose every attempt to weaken or destroy representative government and to establish a dictatorial government similar to fascism, Hitlerism, communism, and every other alien "ism" except Americanism.

The shades of the famous Americans who lived in or came from the great pioneer State of Missouri, Thomas H. Benton, Frank Blair, close friend of Lincoln, Edward Bates, Attorney General in Lincoln's Cabinet, General Grant, General Sherman, and Speaker Champ Clark. The voice of former Senator James Reed is still a clarion call on fundamental Americanism. The shades of men famous in history who fought for the principles of parliamentary control over the purse strings, of John Hampden in England, Mirabeau in France, and James Otis and Patrick Henry in our own country. Why the principle of taxation without representation was the cause of the Revolutionary War.

A representative government divided against itself cannot exist. The government of our Nation cannot endure half autocratic and dictatorial and half free and constitutional. I do not expect the Government of the United States to fall, but I do expect that government by Executive orders subversive of the Constitution will be ended and that representative government under the Constitution will be restored and that constitutional government will cease to be divided.

It was a dark and evil day when the Democrats, driven like a lot of sheep in Congress, voted to destroy the foundation stones of the separate powers of the Federal Government, and helped set up some new form of government, whether fascism or Hitlerism of the right, or socialism or communism of the left—whatever it is, it is not Americanism. It is the duty of the Congress to legislate and of the President to execute the laws.

Has the flame of liberty burned so low that Members of Congress will sacrifice and betray their own constitutional rights and those of their constituents at the bidding of the White House? The new dealers must assume the responsibility for deliberately changing our form of government and giving uncontrolled power into

the hands of a superman or a benevolent despot. We Republicans and followers of Abraham Lincoln do not believe that our free institutions have failed and that it is necessary to set up an autocratic and dictatorial government. The Democrats in Congress have by their votes acted like rubber stamps and shown an incapacity and incompetence to legislate intelligently and within the bounds of reason and moderation. Every Jeffersonian Democrat who voted for this legislative monstrosity, hamstringing Congress, should be opposed in his own primaries.

The people back home never gave their approval or consent to a change in our form of government. Senator COUZENS said that the man or men who wrote the bill as it reached the House ought to be shot. This is pretty harsh treatment, but I submit that at least they should be deported to Italy, Germany, or Soviet Russia, where free institutions and democratic governments have been abolished.

No administration in the history of our country has done more in the short space of 2 years to undermine our representative system of government, impair constitutional authority, and change our form of government without the consent of the governed. A subservient, cowardly, and partisan Congress has placed vast autocratic powers in the hands of President Roosevelt and his "brain trust."

No Republican has a better right than I to denounce the usurpation of legislative powers by the President, and the gradual creation of an autocratic and dictatorial form of government without the approval of the American people, but upon the advice and instigation of the "brain trust." In the early days of the administration I not only voted in Congress to give the President temporary emergency powers to help solve the unemployment situation but actually defended the President from the charge of wishing dictatorial authority. I voted for the N. R. A. as a temporary and voluntary measure. I had no idea that it would become permanent and compulsory, or that the Blue Eagle would become a Soviet vulture backed by coercion, spies, enforcement agents, and jail sentences. The N. R. A. has hampered and harassed industry by its drastic regulations and ukases and all but strangled the small business man. Business confidence has steadily evaporated.

The time has come to scrap the unworkable codes, if not the entire N. R. A., and retain only the minimum wages and maximum hours and the child-labor provisions.

Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad. President Roosevelt is obsessed with the idea of power—no longer emergency or temporary power, but permanent, autocratic, and dictatorial. It is a tragic development in his character and imperils not only his administration but the well-being of the people and the stability of the country. He is apparently guided by the maxim that "He shall take who has the power, and he shall keep who can." Already overburdened with work and garbed with vast autocratic powers which he has to delegate to his favorites or radical appointees, often not even Democrats, he is ever grasping for more.

The party of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, standing for popular government, however, cannot and will not be silent while fundamental American principles and the very framework of our representative system of government are being undermined and gradually destroyed by the President, the "brain trust", and other near socialists at Washington.

There has been a great deal of talk to the effect that the Republican Party should liberalize and humanize its policies. Some people have said that this should be done by the national committee. The record of the Republican Party will be formulated, shaped, and made by the votes of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Republican Senators, and not by the Republican National Committee.

The Democratic Members of the House, at the opening day of the session, destroyed the rule to discharge committees of legislation which was the very essence and cornerstone of liberalism. Liberalism in Congress means the right to govern yourself, to think, to act, and to vote for yourself as an elected representative of the people back home. Liberalism is the extension of democracy, the right of the people to govern themselves, which was the fundamental political faith of Abraham Lincoln.

The Democrats' discharge rule is an utterly reactionary, fraudulent, unworkable gag rule and a political trick aimed to prevent consideration on the floor of legislation in the interest of the plain people, who Lincoln said God must have loved, because he made so many of them, which does not have the consent or blessing of the President and the "brain trust." All but a handful of Republicans voted against the obnoxious and reactionary gag rule.

Let us stop all the reactionary propaganda within the Republican Party about repealing direct primary laws, blocking child-labor measures, and opposing social-security legislation. The unmistakable mandate of the last election is that the Republican Party must humanize and liberalize its policies and leadership and make a direct appeal to the younger element by giving them real representation in our party councils.

The old guard, reactionary, ultra-conservative element of our party, met their Waterloo on November 6. A liberalized Republican Party is a political necessity forced by events, economic conditions, and the times, and not a meaningless death-bed repentance. The only chance for the Republican Party is to come out openly for progressive and liberal principles within the compass of the Federal Constitution, steering clear of socialism, communism, Government ownership, regimentation, collectivism, and a huge superbureaucracy at Washington. Our appeal must be made equally to Jeffersonian Democrats and Abraham Lincoln Republicans to uphold and defend popular government and the fundamental American principles of government advocated by both Jefferson and Lincoln.

There is no party today to speak for Jeffersonian principles except a liberalized Republican Party that will not compromise with the unsound, socialistic, and other destructive features of the new deal.

For well over a hundred years Jeffersonian Democrats have battled for their principles until the advent of this administration. Jeffersonian Democrats for all these years have boldly proclaimed their political creed, which stood for the rights and liberties of the individual citizen under the Constitution, for economy, for State rights, and against the concentration of powers in the Federal Government to interfere with either the rights of private business or the liberties of the individual. Abraham Lincoln once said he had obtained all of his political principles from Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence. The first two Republican platforms quote the Declaration of Independence.

Let us reaffirm our faith in the early principles of the Republican Party when it stood squarely for human rights as being superior to property rights and, as Lincoln said, "Labor is prior to capital." Let us build a bridge so that millions of deceived, disgruntled, and disgusted Jeffersonian Democrats may cross over to a liberalized Republican Party and help elect a Republican President in 1936 and restore representative government to the people.

The Republican Party was founded as a progressive party, and lip loyalty will be of no avail at the present time. What is needed is the loyalty of heart by application of the principles of Abraham Lincoln to the living issues of today. Lincoln was a progressive as compared to Buchanan but compared to John Brown and Wendell Phillips, a conservative.

The Republican Party today must be progressive as compared to the reactionary and ultra-conservative viewpoint of the recent past, but as compared to Franklin D. Roosevelt, the "brain trust", and Marxism it must be conservative, particularly on the fundamental principles of government and the Constitution.

The Republican Party must come out squarely for a parity for farm prices, which is impossible under the N. R. A., and insist on an equilibrium between the products of the farm, the factory, and the mines. We cannot have a prosperous America without fair prices for our agricultural products, and prosperous American farms depend on the cost of production plus a reasonable profit to the farmer.

There can be no prosperity for the farmer or wage earner until sound principles and common sense prevail in Government. The way the Democratic Party is proceeding to squander the resources of the Nation and trying to borrow its way out of the depression, there will be no return to prosperity until a Republican President is elected. And that will be in 1936, just as soon as the people wake up to the facts and have an opportunity to register their will regardless of relief work or the governmental pay rolls.

The Democratic administration has no policy except borrowing, more borrowing, and still more borrowing, leading straight to chaos, ruinous inflation, and bankruptcy. In another year the interest charges alone on the national debt will amount to well over a billion dollars and will consume over one-third of our revenue. The day of reckoning is inevitable, and approaching rapidly. The President, however, continues to smile, even if the ship of state is headed for the financial and economic rocks, and, like the French King, Louis XIV, says, "I am the state. After me the deluge."

That is small satisfaction for the American people and for the oncoming generations that must carry the burden of taxation and pay the bill for the devastating failures and experiments of the all-ambitious President and his "brain trust."

We have entered into an era of nostrums and cure-alls, enlivened by governmental day dreamers, economic magicians, business wand waivers, industrial snake charmers, agricultural rabbit producers, and free-trade crystal gazers. This new development is the natural consequence of an administration that has brought to Washington inexperienced and visionary professors and radicals of all kinds and description who care nothing for the experience and wisdom of the past that has made for the greatness of our country, but seek to perform new experiments and operations regardless of the cost to the Federal Treasury, the economic stability of the country, and the gigantic burden to the Federal taxpayers. This is what the "brain trust" has done to us. Now every quack doctor in the country, counting billions like millions, rushes in to outdo the "brain trust" to solve the depression by spending more money and lifting the American people up by their bootstraps.

There never was a time when the sound policies of the Republican Party were more needed in America than today before the "brain trust" and quack medicines have destroyed the economic lifeblood of the American people and caused a collapse of credit, ruinous inflation, governmental bankruptcy, and thrown millions more of industrious and loyal Americans out of work.

The tragedy of the present economic situation is that every day since last May unemployment has been increasing, so that today there are 12,000,000 unemployed, or more than 2,000,000 more unemployed, according to the American Federation of Labor, than there were a year ago. The fact is that after 2 years of socialistic experiments and unsound new-deal measures, business confidence has been destroyed and 12,000,000 American wage earners are walking the streets or depending on charity or doles.

I indict the Democratic administration on its record for the past year as the greatest failure in American history. I charge it with having destroyed business confidence, squandered American resources, and with impairment of the national credit. I accuse it

of having imposed unsound, unworkable, and socialistic measures upon the Nation that have increased the cost of living, impoverished the American people, and increased unemployment. I denounce it for undermining our free institutions, turning the Constitution into a scrap of paper, and changing our representative form of government, without the approval or consent of the American people, into an autocratic and dictatorial form of government.

I condemn it as having no economic policy except to pile debt upon debt by borrowing, more borrowing, and still more borrowing, without any thought of balancing the Budget or of the inevitable day of reckoning and collapse of credit and bankruptcy of the Government.

New-deal prosperity apparently means the country out of business and both the Democratic Party and the Government in business. It means debts, deficits, taxation, borrowing, unbalanced Budget, confidence destroyed, and American labor unemployed. The various departments of the new deal are honeycombed with radicals, Socialists, and near-Communists, and contributors to communism for the purpose of instigating strikes, riots, sabotage, industrial unrest, and to promote class hatred and teach hatred of the American flag.

Excessive taxation, Government competition, an unstable currency, and harrassing legislation has put a stop to industrial progress and private enterprise. Ask the man on the street, the worker in the shop, the mechanic, the clerk, or the physician if he has more money in the bank than he had 3 years ago. The hospitals, the public libraries, the art galleries, and educational institutions, most of which have been largely built by the generosity of private individuals, are becoming things of the past. The stream cannot rise higher than its source, so it is with the financial stream when the Government dries it up.

I believe in the American industrial system, based on private initiative and reasonable profit, which has made for the wealth and the greatness of our country and for the well-being of our wage earners, which are the freest on earth.

The Republican Party believes in the sanctity of private contracts and private property and is opposed to the extension of Government ownership. The attitude of the Republicans toward private property is the same today as it was in 1864, when Lincoln wrote the following words before the Workingman's Association in New York:

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another but let him work diligently and build one for himself, and thus for example assure that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

The Democratic Party, President Roosevelt, and Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a free trader and an advocate of the League of Nations, are determined and obsessed with the idea of forcing the United States to become involved and entangled in foreign intrigues and controversies. The Republican Party believes that America should avoid all foreign entanglements, stop passing moral judgments on other nations, keep out of all foreign boundary disputes and ancient blood feuds, refuse to police the world and, above all, mind its own business.

We have plenty of problems to solve at home, which require our best efforts and undivided attention.

Secretary Hull has only one economic policy, and that is to break down the protective principle that has made our wage earners the best paid, the best housed, the best clothed, the best fed and most contented in the world. The American standard of wages and of living are of little consequence to this confirmed free trader, provided he can put into effect his visionary ideas to break down world economic barriers. All that he can possibly accomplish will be to permit competition from the underpaid labor of Europe and Japan, particularly the latter, paid less than 20 cents a day, to the detriment of free American labor.

The Democratic Party proposes, by Executive order, to enter into bargaining tariffs which will soon result in the destruction of the economic supremacy of the United States and in putting millions of more loyal Americans out of work for the benefit of European and Japanese labor. The protective-tariff system, since the days of Lincoln, has built up our industries in all our western cities, such as St. Louis, Chicago, and Kansas City. The attitude of the President imperils the welfare of our workingmen. American labor declines to compete with the poorly paid and cheap labor of Europe or Asia or the forced labor of Soviet Russia.

Senator NYE, a Republican Senator from North Dakota, is to be commended for his investigation of the traffic in munitions of war. The United States must not become the potential slaughterhouse of the world or the symbol for arms and munitions, backed by the dollar sign. I am in favor of taking the profit out of war by control of all munitions plants and through the drafting of wealth, industry, labor, and man power in event of war. If we must ever have another war, it must be in defense of America and not in defense of war profiteers and munitions makers.

Speaking in the great State of Missouri, I would be derelict if I did not refer to the Americans of German origin who are among our most industrious and loyal citizens and have done so much to build up our country. Under Sigel and Carl Schurz they supported Lincoln and fought for the preservation of the Union. The greatness and prosperity of St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul is due in large measure to the thrift and honest industry of the German population. Americans of German descent all over the United States are forces for good citizenship and a bulwark against communism and those who would destroy our American institutions.

The Republican Party for 80 years has stood for equal opportunity and equal rights for all, and, with Lincoln, that no man should be discriminated against on account of race, color, or creed. It was Lincoln the Emancipator who, by a stroke of his pen, made effective that essential principle of the Declaration of Independence which reads: "All men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, namely, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." He found the colored men and women chattels and he left them with human souls as free American citizens.

Having served as an officer in a colored volunteer regiment, from New York, on the battlefields of France, and as one who is proud of their valor, I call on the colored citizens of Missouri and the Middle West not to desert the party of Lincoln for a mess of pottage or doles to the Democratic Party that stood for slavery, the auction block, the chain gang, and that does nothing now to prevent lynching and disfranchisement in the South.

The Republicans must oppose all unsound legislation, wild experiments, and advocates of Marxism. I have an abiding faith in the future and destiny of America. I have an abiding faith in the intelligence, judgment, and patriotism of the American people. They may be temporarily led astray by false leaders, but they will never depart for long from the principles upon which our Government was established by Washington, preserved by Lincoln and the Republican Party, and under its leadership and such courageous Americans as Theodore Roosevelt has become the greatest Nation on earth.

I did not come out here to outline a party platform, but I suggest the return to responsible party government on a sound, liberal, constructive Republican platform, conservative on the fundamentals of government such as the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and legislative powers of Congress, and forward looking in its treatment of new economic conditions in the interest of both the American farmer and laborer. Both the farmer and laborer should receive a greater share in the profits of their labor under a modified system of capitalism.

The Republican Party can well afford, when in doubt, to go back to the plain people of Abraham Lincoln and learn from them. The common sense of the American people, who in peace create wealth and in war carry the muskets of the Republic, is an infallible guide. It was the source of Abraham Lincoln's wisdom. He said, "I have faith in the people. Let them know the truth and the country is safe."

Abraham Lincoln belongs to the Nation, and to the world, as one of its greatest characters, but we must not forget the indisputable fact that he was part and parcel of the Republican Party and the foremost expounder of its principles and doctrines. He was the undisputed leader of the party as he is the soul of the Republican Party today. The name of Lincoln signifies to every American schoolboy that the humblest in origin and wealth can rise to the heights of earthly power and renown through his own efforts.

The Republican Party today needs leadership of the type, character, and ideals of Abraham Lincoln. Let us infuse the spirit of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt into a liberalized and humanized Republican Party. Let us invoke the faith in the people that Lincoln loved and the faith of Theodore Roosevelt in popular government, and a square deal for the American people as the guide and cornerstone for the rebirth of a militant Republican Party. Let us refuse to compromise with false doctrines, unsound socialistic measures, or with any form of alien dictatorship, or the undermining of the Constitution of the United States, which Lincoln believed was the whole law and the prophet of free government.

Let the Republicans, in the words of Lincoln, have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us dare to do our duty as we understand it and to highly resolve that a nation conceived in liberty and a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth. Let us neither ask for any quarter nor give any quarter, but go forward without fear or favor for the preservation of American institutions on a sound, liberal, and militant Republican platform to victory in 1936, and the election of a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOBBS, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, for 1 day, on account of important business.

To Mr. OLIVER, at the request of Mr. HILL of Alabama, for 1 day, on account of death of a friend.

To Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, for 5 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, at the request of Mr. KEE, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2030. An act authorizing the States of Washington and Idaho to construct, maintain, and operate a free high-

way bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho;

H. R. 2874. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Eleven Points River in section 17, township 23 north, range 2 west, approximately 12 miles east of Alton, on route no. 42, Oregon County, Mo.;

H. R. 3018. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.;

H. R. 3057. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Oklahoma to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Arkansas River south of the town of Sallisaw in Sequoyah and Le Flore Counties at a point approximately 15 miles north of Keota in the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 3891. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Waccamaw River at Conway, S. C.;

H. R. 3983. An act to legalize a bridge (known as "Union Street Bridge") across the Dan River at Danville, Va.; and

H. R. 4018. An act to provide for the investigation, control, and eradication of marine organisms injurious to shellfish in the Atlantic and Gulf States;

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 15, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

217. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

218. A letter from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the second annual report of the Board covering operations for the year 1934, (a) of the Federal Home Loan banks, (b) the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, (c) the Federal Savings and Loan Division, and (d) the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from organization to December 31, 1934 (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

219. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1935, for the Department of Agriculture, for salaries and expenses (fighting and preventing forest fires), Forest Service, amounting to $2,348,000 (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

220. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, under the Architect of the Capitol, for the fiscal year 1936 in the sum of $121,940 (H. Doc. No. 99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

221. A letter from the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a preliminary report covering the charges for electricity to domestic and residential consumers in cities having a population of 50,000 or more; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

222. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report of an accumulation of documents and files of papers in the Department of Commerce which are not needed nor useful in the transaction of current business; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 135. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate and report on the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and on all other companies engaged directly or indirectly in telephone communication in interstate commerce, including all companies related to any of these companies through a holding-company structure, or otherwise; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5444. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special statistical studies upon payment of the cost thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3982. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between Rockport, Ind., and Owensboro, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4527. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cairo, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLE of Maryland: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1190. An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 607. A bill for the relief of Florence Overly; with amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 760. A bill for the relief of John L. Hoffman; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 805. A bill for the relief of Luther M. Turpin and Amanda Turpin; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 918. A bill for the relief of Flensburger Dampfercompagnie; with amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Theresa M. Shea; with amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 928. A bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the George A. Fuller Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of General Warehousing Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 968. A bill for the relief of James P. Spelman: with

amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1030. A bill for the relief of Arthur Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1032. A bill for the relief of Joe G. Baker; with amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1291. A bill for the relief of the Muncy Valley Private Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of H. A. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Rose Burke; with amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Harbor Springs, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1550. A bill for the relief of Douglas B. Espy; with amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1609. A bill for the relief of R. A. Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1771. A bill for the relief of Pauline Fornabaio; with amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1830. A bill for the relief of Julia Santiago; with amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1912. A bill for the relief of William J. Ryan, chaplain, United States Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Jacobson; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of William E. Fossett; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4366) granting a pension to Estella May Duckworth and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 5693) to authorize the erection of a United States veterans' hospital in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BURNHAM: A bill (H. R. 5694) adding a new section to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act approved January 22, 1932, as amended (Public, No. 2, 72d Cong.), to authorize loans and the purchase of bonds or other obligations to aid in the refunding, refinancing, or retiring of the outstanding indebtedness of unincorporated tax or special assessment districts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho (by request): A bill (H. R. 5695) to amend the act of March 1, 1879, chapter 125 (20 Stat. 351), as amended by the act of March 3, 1883, chapter 121, section 1 (22 Stat. 488), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 5696) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide, by agreement with Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, a subdivision of the State of New Mexico, for maintenance and operation on newly reclaimed Pueblo Indian lands in the Rio Grande Valley, N. Mex., reclaimed under previous act of Congress, and authorizing an annual appropriation to pay the cost thereof for a period of not to exceed 5 years; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 5697) to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933 and amendments thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5698) for the erection of a public building at Charleston, Tallahatchie County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5699) to add certain lands to the Pisgah National Forest in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 5700) to eliminate the hazards of destitute old age, direct the creation of a systematic method of establishing old-age pensions, to raise revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 5701) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near La Fayette, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 5702) to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 5703) to provide for the printing and distribution of Government publications to the National Archives Establishment; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. NICHOLS: A bill (H. R. 5704) providing for an additional judge for the eastern district of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 5705) to require certain documents of vessels not wholly owned by citizens of the United States and navigated in the territorial waters of the United States, its Territories or its possessions, to regulate vessels engaged in the fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLAIBORNE: A bill (H. R. 5706) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near St. Charles, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 5707) to ratify and confirm the corporate existence of the city of Nome, Alaska, and to authorize it to undertake certain municipal public works, including the construction, reconstruction, enlargement, extension, and improvement of its sewers and drains, fire-fighting system, streets and alleys, sidewalks, curbs, and gutters, and a municipal building, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding $100,000; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5708) to provide for unemployment relief through development of mineral resources, to assist the development of privately owned mineral claims, to provide for the development of emergency and deficiency minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 5709) for the erection of a public building at New Albany, Union County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5710) for the erection of a public building at Ripley, Tippah County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 5711) to provide pensions for the needy blind persons of the District of Columbia, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 5712) to provide for the prevention of soil erosion, for control of floods, for irrigation, for organizing and constructing hydroelectric plants, for building dams and reservoirs, for marketing electrical energy to States, counties, municipalities, corporations, and individuals, for the establishment of recreational centers and parks in all areas drained by the Arkansas River and its tributaries, which will include areas in the States of New Mexico, Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Missouri, and for other beneficial purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GEHRMANN: A bill (H. R. 5713) to amend the postal laws relating to the appointment of acting postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5714) to exempt pensions from Federal income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: A bill (H. R. 5715) to exempt a limited quantity of cotton produced by small producers from the cotton-ginning tax under the Cotton Act of 1934, to authorize transfers or assignments of exemption certificates under such act outside the county, to provide for the payment of compensation to operators of cotton gins who incur additional expenses by reason of the operation of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 5716) to amend subsection (d) of section 116 of an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes", approved May 10, 1934, being the Revenue Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARRABEE: A bill (H. R. 5717) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses, and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5718) to provide for a census of unemployment, employment, occupations, and population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5719) to provide for the cooperation by the Federal Government with the several States and Territories in equalizing the benefits of public education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5720) to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5721) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to the training, attendance, and participation of the equestrian and modern pentathlon teams in the Eleventh Olympic Games; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5722) to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Colonial National Monument in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWEENEY: A bill (H. R. 5723) to give certain railway postal clerks the same time credits for promotion purposes as were given others who were promoted on July 1 when automatic promotions were restored; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 5724) to authorize naval and Marine Corps service of Army officers to be included in computing dates of retirement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 5725) to provide for registration of persons employed to advocate or oppose legislative measures and to regulate the method of such advocacy or opposition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN: A bill (H. R. 5726) to fix the staple length of exempt cotton at 1¼ inches and longer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 5727) to regulate the hours of employment of women employed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PIERCE: A bill (H. R. 5728) to prohibit the use of the mails for the taking of a straw vote; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5729) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty" to include officers assigned to duty at submarine training tanks and diving units, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5730) to amend section 3 (b) of an act entitled "An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy with respect to the categories of vessels limited by the treaties signed at Washington, February 6, 1922, and at London, April 22, 1930, at the limits prescribed by those treaties; to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes", approved March 27, 1934; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5731) to amend in certain particulars the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve", as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 5732) to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for books for the adult blind; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 5733) to create an industrial commission on Negro affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAVERICK: A bill (H. R. 5734) repealing section 701 of the Revenue Act of 1926, and remitting the special excise tax therein provided and all penalties and interest which may have been heretofore incurred by reason of the failure to pay said excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIERMANN: A bill (H. R. 5735) providing for the labeling, marking, and tagging of all boots and shoes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 5736) for the retirement of employees of the Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 5737) to extend the benefits of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to provisional officers whose commissions did not become permanent, and who are otherwise eligible under the act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEARIN: Resolution (H. Res. 110) for the appointment of a select committee of the House to investigate the *Macon* disaster and the advisability of constructing additional ships of similar type; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COX: Resolution (H. Res. 111) requesting certain information from the Secretary of the Treasury pertaining to the Agricultural Adjustment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WARREN: Resolution (H. Res. 112) to pay to Malvina Beckett, widow of William C. Beckett, 6 months' compensation, and not to exceed $250 funeral expenses; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DOXEY: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 165) to lower the tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 166) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Unalaska Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LUDLOW: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 167) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the declaration of war and the taking of property for public use in time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 168) to set up a national defense committee to study and report

on national defense generally; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 169) directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives the cause or causes for the high prices of agricultural implements and machinery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) temporarily suspending tariff duties in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, supporting the Lemke bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, regarding the construction of a road through the Okefenokee Swamp to the Florida line; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, regarding the furnishing of aid to school districts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 5738) granting an increase of pension to Mary R. Schreiber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 5739) granting a pension to Agnes Metcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYERS: A bill (H. R. 5740) for the relief of May C. Jacobson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H. R. 5741) for the relief of William F. Caplick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5742) for the relief of William T. Reese; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5743) for the relief of Robert D. Doherty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5744) to authorize the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Tom Silver; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 5745) for the relief of Antonnette Kara; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 5746) to authorize the removal of the bar of the statute of limitations with respect to certain taxes paid by Milton Kasch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARMICHAEL: A bill (H. R. 5747) for the relief of Gordon McGee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5748) for the relief of J. S. Smith and J. W. Smith, a firm doing business under the name of J. G. Smith & Sons, of Mount Hope, Lawrence County, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 5749) for the relief of Mrs. MacDermott Meggitt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 5750) for the relief of Mary Brown Raley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 5751) granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Col. John A. Lockwood, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND: A bill (H. R. 5752) to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, to the dependent beneficiaries of Dr. Frank W. Lamb; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5753) for the relief of Edith H. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOCKWEILER: A bill (H. R. 5754) for the relief of Emma M. Pearson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUTRICH: A bill (H. R. 5755) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Joseph A. Rudy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5756) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Rinehart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5757) for the relief of Charles C. Kerns; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 5758) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 5759) for the relief of Marie B. Neale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GINGERY: A bill (H. R. 5760) granting an increase of pension to Barbara Weber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAINES: A bill (H. R. 5761) granting an increase of pension to Drusilla Barnhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5762) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to Dr. George E. Holtzapple; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HOOK: A bill (H. R. 5763) for the relief of John Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5764) to compensate the Grand View Hospital and Dr. A. J. O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 5765) granting a pension to Anna C. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEY: A bill (H. R. 5766) granting compensation to Raymond F. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5767) for the relief of Budd M. Clymer; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 5768) for the relief of Peter Haan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 5769) granting an increase of pension to Alma H. Aultman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5770) for the relief of Samuel Marion Hann; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 5771) for the relief of Flora Jacobs, administratrix of the estate of A. L. Jacobs, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of Raphael Levy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 5773) to authorize a preliminary examination of Coquille River and its tributaries in the State of Oregon with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5774) to authorize a preliminary examination of Rogue River and its tributaries in the State of Oregon with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5775) to authorize a preliminary examination of the Siuslaw River and its tributaries, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5776) to authorize a preliminary examination of Yaquina River and its tributaries, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5777) to authorize a preliminary examination of Siletz River and its tributaries, in the State of Oregon, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 5778) to authorize the General Accounting Office to allow credit in the accounts of J. R. Lusby, disbursing officer of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 5779) for the relief of Edward DeForest King; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'LEARY: A bill (H. R. 5780) for the relief of Edward C. Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5781) for the relief of the widow and next of kin of James J. Curran; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'MALLEY: A bill (H. R. 5782) providing for the advancement in rank of Frederick L. Caudle on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5783) for the relief of Homer H. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDS: A bill (H. R. 5784) granting a pension to William L. Dickerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 5785) granting a pension to William Betts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5786) granting a pension to Cinda Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 5787) granting a pension to Sarah R. Beggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 5788) granting a pension to Helen M. Crowley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTPHIN: A bill (H. R. 5789) for the relief of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER: A bill (H. R. 5790) for the relief of certain creditors of J. R. & J. A. Whelan, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 5791) for the relief of the San Francisco Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 5792) for the relief of Alfred Burton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 5793) for the relief of Lovaura Schmidt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 5794) for the relief of Theodore Bedard, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1159. By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of interested citizens of Illinois, advocating the passage of a national old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1160. By Mr. BELL: Resolution of the Austrian Workingmen's Association, Inc., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the enactment of the Lundeen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1161. By Mr. BOYLAN: Letter from the municipal committee for the relief of home owners, New York City, urging the appropriating of additional funds for the Howe Owners' Loan Corporation, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1162. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of Art Dahling, commander, and L. J. Twedt, adjutant, and members of the Harold T. Swenson Post, No. 612, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, mostly all citizens of Fergus Falls and vicinity in Minnesota, urging the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates and the cancelation of accrued interest on existing loans on said certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1163. Also, petition of D. C. Goodsell, commander, and 70 members of Post No. 157 of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, all citizens of East Grand Forks and vicinity in Minnesota, urging the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates, together with cancelation and refundment of all interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1164. By Mr. CARTER: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging the Congress to remove the excessive taxation on wine made in this country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1165. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, State of California, memorializing Congress to provide compensation in lieu of taxes for certain lands of the United States within the borders of the several States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1166. By Mr. COLE of New York: Petition of the members of the Central New York Chapter, Knights of Columbus, Ithaca, N. Y., signed by T. J. McInerney, chairman, and Claude Baldwin, secretary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1167. Also, petition of members of the Holy Name Society of St. Patricks Church, Corning, N. Y., signed by M. A. Flynn, president, and others; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1168. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Gloversville Council, No. 265, Knights of Columbus, protesting against the persecution and oppression of the Mexican people by the National Revolutionary Party of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1169. Also, petition of group 614 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, Amsterdam, N. Y., requesting the enactment of House Joint Resolution 81; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1170. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of 100 persons residing at or near Natural Bridge, N. Y., favoring the Townsend plan of old-age insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1171. Also, petition of 252 persons residing at or near Natural Bridge, N. Y., favoring the Townsend plan of old-age insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1172. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging the Federal Government to undertake an engineering project for the purpose of taking steps to preserve the beauty of the Niagara Falls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1173. By Mr. DEEN: Petition of the Georgia State Legislature, memorializing the Members of Congress to enact proper legislation whereby funds will be available for building a road through the Okefenoke swamp in Georgia to the Florida line, with Lake City, Fla., as a terminus or objective; to the Committee on Roads.

1174. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Atlantic Avenue Improvement Committee of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging that Public Works Administration funds be allocated to eliminate the grade crossings on Atlantic Avenue in Brooklyn and construct a boulevard on its surface; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1175. By Mr. DEROUEN: Petition of citizens of Evangeline Parish, La., urging passage of House bill 2856, an old-age-pension bill by Representative WILL ROGERS; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1176. Also, petition of citizens of Hammond, La., urging support of House bill 100, restoring benefits to Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1177. By Mr. DOUGHTON: Memorial of the Legislature of North Carolina, memoralizing Congress to enact legislation to take the profit out of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1178. By Mr. DUFFY of New York: Petition of the Rochester Parent-Teacher Council, urging the enactment of legislation to provide for supervision over the selection and treatment of subject material used in the production of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1179. By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of B. F. Wagner and numerous other residents of Woodbury, Bedford County, a part of the Eighteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, supporting House bill 3977, the Townsend bill, for the relief of the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1180. By Mr. FULMER: Resolution of the Municipal Association of South Carolina, favoring the appropriation of funds sufficient for the continuance of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1181. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the City Council, Tacoma, Wash., urging that Congress immediately change the Air Mail Act so that the present experienced operator, United Air Lines, can operate the Pacific coast route from Seattle to San Diego permanently, subject to all regulations governing air mail lines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1182. Also, petition of the New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., representing 90,000 members, urging the Office of Education in the United States Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage visual education by means of motion pictures, and otherwise stimulate the State departments of public instruction; to the Committee on Education.

1183. By Mr. HAINES: Resolution of the chamber of commerce, Gettysburg, Pa., pledging support to bills introduced for erection of memorial highway from Washington to Gettysburg and erection of statue of Abraham Lincoln in

Gettysburg National Cemetery; to the Committee on the Library.

1184. Also, petition signed by certain citizens of York, Pa., recognizing the contribution by Dr. George E. Holtzapple in the administration of oxygen gas to the first pneumonia patient, and also petitioning the Congress for due recognition by the awarding of a medal to Dr. Holtzapple; to the Committee on the Library.

1185. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Hon. William McCraw, attorney general of Texas, Austin, Tex., favoring passage of the Connally oil bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1186. By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Petition of 150,000 residents of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Maryland, relative to pension legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

1187. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, urging Federal and State legislation that will protect workers from unemployment; to the Committee on Labor.

1188. By Mr. KNUTSON: Resolution of Brainerd Division, No. 28, of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, endorsing the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100, 73d Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1189. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of the Springer Post, No. 83, American Legion of Waterville, Kans., urging the immediate payment of the veterans' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1190. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Helen M. Peterson, of 2039 Collingswood Road, and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging the continuance of the Nye munitions investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1191. Also, petition of Elizabeth T. Sterner, of 1535 Menlo Park Place, and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging the continuance of the Nye munitions investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1192. By Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth General Assembly and Senate, Denver, Colo., in behalf of bills establishing a 6-hour day and 5-day week for labor in industry; to the Committee on Labor.

1193. Also, petitions of certain citizens of Saguache County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1194. Also, petition of certain citizens of Alamosa County, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for a direct Federal old-age pension of $30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1195. Also, petition of certain citizens of Las Animas County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1196. Also, petition of certain citizens of Rio Grande County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1197. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of group no. 194 of the Polish National Alliance, Buffalo, N. Y., memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 81 and Senate Joint Resolution 11, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Library.

1198. Also, petition of the Parent-Teachers' Association of New York, requesting the Education Office of the Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures for visual education and for suitable entertainment to meet the needs in rural and urban centers; and that Congress pass legislation which will provide for supervision over the selection and treatment of subject material used in the production of motion pictures during the process of making them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1199. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, requesting that the Federal Government be memorialized to make available to the several drought-stricken counties of western and northern New York sufficient hay and other roughage so that the farmers may maintain their herds throughout the winter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1200. Also, petition of the City Council of San Diego, Calif., requesting immediate and permanent repeal of national legislation which would remove the present operator, United Airlines, from the San Diego-Seattle route after March 1, 1935; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1201. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, requesting that the Hamilton Avenue-Governors Island Battery vehicular tunnel project be included in the Federal public works; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1202. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting the Congress of the United States to expedite the passage of House bill 6, authorizing the Postmaster General to construct underground pneumatic tubes for the transmission of mail between the general post office at Brooklyn and the Floyd Bennett Field, Barron Island, and the five postal stations lying between these two points—namely, stations Times Plaza, B, Flatbush, Kensington, and Vanderbilt; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1203. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting Congress to adopt the unemployment and social security bills and recommendations as proposed by Senator WAGNER; to the Committee on Labor.

1204. Also, petition of the Young Ladies' Sodality of St. Gerard's Roman Catholic Church, Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the treatment of the Catholic Church in Mexico and that the acts of Josephus Daniels, United States Ambassador to Mexico, were unwarranted and un-American, and that the President be hereby directed to reprimand the said Ambassador for his action and speech; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1205. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Tacoma, Wash., requesting Congress to change immediately the Air Mail Act so that the present United Airlines can operate the Pacific coast route from Seattle to San Diego permanently, subject to all regulations governing air mail lines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1206. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of certain citizens of Cave City, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2856, the Pope plan of direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1207. Also, petition of certain citizens of Jackson County, Ark., urging passage of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, of Oklahoma, for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 per month to persons over 55, independent of State participation, known as the "Pope plan"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1208. Also, petition of certain citizens of Smithville, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative ROGERS of Oklahoma, known as the "Pope plan", for direct Federal old-age pensions to persons over 55, independent of State participation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1209. Also, petition of Ella Waugh and other citizens of Stone County, Ark., urging the enactment of an adequate old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1210. By Mr. MONAGHAN: Petition of 20 citizens of Stevensville, Mont., favoring the old-age-pension bill (H. R. 2856); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1211. Also, memorial no. 1 of the Senate of the State of Montana, protesting against the reduction of the duty on manganese; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1212. By Mr. O'MALLEY: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, urging the Congress of the United States to conduct an investigation into the acts and practices of the natural-gas utilities, their subsidiaries, and financial interests, to determine whether or not Milwaukee or

other central western cities have been deprived of natural gas through the activities of monopolistic corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1213. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to favor immediate and full payment of adjusted-compensation certificates, commonly called the "soldiers' bonus"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1214. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of the Charles Wescott Post, No. 173, American Legion, Bath, N. Y., presented by E. M. Blakley, commander, whole-heartedly endorsing the provisions of House bill 1, with the belief that it complied with the mandate of the Miami convention, and disapproving the provisions of the Vinson bill as not having been in accord with the national mandate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1215. Also, petition of Frank Wood, Asle H. Clark, and 208 other citizens of the United States veterans' hospital, Fort Harrison, Mont., for enactment into law of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1216. Also, resolution of Enid Chapter, No. 6, of the Disabled American Veterans, Enid, Okla., favoring the enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1217. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York City, concerning the proposed silver legislation; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1218. Also, petition of Atlantic Avenue Improvement Committee of Brooklyn and Queens, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging Public Works Administration funds for the elimination of grade crossings and creation of a boulevard on Atlantic Avenue; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1219. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of some 62 citizens of Lyndonville, Vt., and vicinity, endorsing the Townsend plan of old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1220. Also, petition from Ezekiel Simmons and some 30 others, of Orleans, Vt., requesting passage of House bill 2856 for Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1221. By Mr. REED of New York: Memorial of Kenmore (N. Y.) Philatelic Society, urging that the Post Office Department issue a set of imperforated stamps, similar to those now in the hands of certain dealers, as a square deal to all; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1222. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, through its chief clerk, favoring the enactment of legislation by Congress for the purpose of establishing and constructing all-weather post roads; to the Committee on Roads.

1223. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Central Civic Association, Hollis, Long Island, N. Y., concerning the continuation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and additional appropriations for same; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1224. Also, petition of La Salle Council, No. 454, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., regarding conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1225. Also, petition of the Western Union Cable Employees Association, New York, concerning the communications merger; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1226. Also, petition of National Council of Business Mail Users, Inc., New York City, regarding a 2-cent postal rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1227. Also, petition of the Assembly, Legislature of the State of New York, concerning the Wagner old-age pensions and benefits to needy dependent mothers and children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1228. Also, petition of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, urging that consideration be given amendments to the War Risk Insurance Act; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1229. Also, petition of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the United States Department of Agriculture to make available to the several drought-stricken counties of western and northern New York sufficient hay and other roughage so that the farmers of such counties may maintain their herds for the rest of the winter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1230. Also, petition of the Senate, Legislature of the State of New York, concerning a vehicular tunnel from Hamilton Avenue, Brooklyn, to lower Manhattan via Governors Island, such project to be included in the Federal public works; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1231. Also, petition of the Senate of the State of New York, regarding the enactment of such laws or to authorize the promulgation of such rules by the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel every manufacturer of firearms to mark such firearms manufactured with a serial number which will be plainly visible, such serial number to be registered with the Department of Justice as to its consignee at the time of its shipment by the said manufacturer, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1232. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, endorsing House bill 8100; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1233. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich., endorsing unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1234. Also, petition of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, approving old-age pensions for noncitizens as well as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1235. By Mr. SCHAEFER: Petition of citizens of Granite City, Ill., protesting religious persecutions in Mexico, and asking recall of Ambassador Josephus Daniels for misrepresenting sympathies of the American people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1236. Also, petition of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, favoring enactment of the Costigan-Wagner anti-lynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1237. Also, petition of the Farmers Equity Union, Greenville, Ill., recommending favorable consideration of the Frazier-Lemke bill, the Jones commodity-exchange bill, and other legislation favorable to farm interests; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1238. Also, petition of citizens of Nashville, Washington County, Ill., supporting an old-age-pension plan, sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope, president the National Old Age Pension Association, as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1239. Also, petition of the Chicago Fur Workers Union, Local No. 45, asking repeal of the 10-percent excise tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1240. Also, petition of citizens of Dupo, Ill., supporting an old-age-pension plan, sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope, as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1241. Also, petition of citizens of Smithboro, Bond County, Ill., supporting an old-age-pension plan, sponsored by Dr. J. E. Pope, president the National Old Age Pension Association, as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1242. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Resolution of the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, of Charleston, W. Va., opposing the passage of all legislation seeking to impose a Nation-wide maximum 30-hour-work week; to the Committee on Labor.

1243. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of citizens of Spencer, Boyd County, Nebr., asking Congress to enact legislation affecting star routes that will eliminate competitive bidding as a means of securing contracts for the transportation of mail on star routes, also to provide adequate compensation for the services of star-route contract carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1244. Also, petition of the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact remedial legislation for refinancing of farm mortgages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1245. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of New Jersey Chapter, No. 1, Knights of Columbus, regarding the actions and utter-

ances of the Ambassador to Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1246. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of citizens of Chattooga County, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS, for direct Federal old-age pensions of $30 per month to persons over 55, independent of participation by the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1247. Also, petitions of W. T. Travis and 45 other citizens of Walker County, Prof. S. O. Williams and 34 other citizens of Murray County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1248. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition from citizens of Tiffany and other towns of La Plata County, Colo., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, providing for an old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1249. By Mr. TURNER: Petition of citizens of Humphreys and Lawrence Counties, Tenn., urging the enaction of the old-age-pension bill approved by Dr. J. E. Pope; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1250. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Lithuanian Supreme Lodge, of Youngstown, Ohio, by their secretary, John Carpar, demanding the enactment of a Federal system of genuine unemployment insurance as contained in the Workers' Act (H. R. 2827) in order that their future and the future of all workers, farmers, professionals, and other unemployed and their dependents may be more secure; to the Committee on Labor.

1251. Also, petition of the Citizens' Wholesale Supply Co., by their treasurer, R. P. Thomas, Columbus, Ohio, expressing approval of House bill 33, covering a proposed reduction of the present $2 tax on industrial alcohol to $1.10 per proof gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1252. Also, petition of Rev. M. M. Brown, Cleveland, Ohio, and other citizens belonging to the Glenville Townsend Club, protesting the gag rule and requesting a hearing of the Townsend plan in Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

1253. Also, petition of the Citizens' Wholesale Supply Co., Columbus, Ohio, by their treasurer, R. P. Thomas, urging that no change be made in House bill 3981, feeling that it is almost equivalent to having barriers put up at the State lines, and that if this small break is permitted it will be but a short time until other breaks may be made until the law is practically ruined; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1254. Also, petition of the Lithuanian Workers Association, of Youngstown, Ohio, by their secretary, F. J. Madiron, demanding the enactment of a Federal system of genuine unemployment insurance as contained in the Workers' Act (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Labor.

1255. Also, petition of Guy Boyer and other members of the Townsend Old Age Revolving Pension Club, of Napoleon, Ohio, urging support of the Townsend bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1256. By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution of Group No. 1625 (Turner Falls, Mass.), Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, for the designation of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1257. By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of the Rochester Parent-Teacher Council, of Rochester, N. Y., urging the Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures for visual education, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1258. Also, petition of the Batavia, N. Y., branch of the New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., urging the Department of the Interior to establish a national film institute to encourage the production, distribution, and exhibition of motion pictures for visual education, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1259. By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of various citizens of Missouri, praying Congress to enact old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1260. Also, petition of the House of Representatives, State of Missouri, Fifty-eighth General Assembly, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate relief funds for the purpose of establishing and constructing all-weather post roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1261. By Mr. ZIMMERMAN: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, urging Congress to speedily pass legislation appropriating unemployment or relief funds for the purpose of establishing and constructing all-weather post roads; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1262. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the American Science Foundation, Kansas City, Mo., regarding the payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1263. Also, petition of the American Science Foundation, regarding the payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1935

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

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, at whose word man goeth forth to his work and to his labor until the evening: direct us in all our doing with Thy most gracious favor; make us ever mindful of the great responsibility of service in this realm of our high calling; and so lead us by Thy spirit's gentle voice along our tangled way that we take each advancing step only in obedience to high thoughts inspired of Thee, lest our day become a weary waste of hours, and Thy people be disappointed of their hope. Thus into Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves, our spirits, souls, and bodies, ever conscious of the love vouchsafed to us through Thy blessed Son, our Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 14, 1935, when, on request of Mr. ROBINSON, 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 reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the California Pacific International Exposition, to be held at San Diego, Calif., in 1935 and 1936; authorizing an appropriation therefor; and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Costigan	King	Reynolds
Ashurst	Couzens	La Follette	Robinson
Austin	Cutting	Lewis	Russell
Bachman	Davis	Logan	Schall
Bailey	Dickinson	Lonergan	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barbour	Donahey	McCarran	Shipstead
Barkley	Duffy	McGill	Smith
Bilbo	Fletcher	McKellar	Steiwer
Black	Frazier	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	George	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gerry	Metcalf	Townsend
Bulkley	Gibson	Minton	Trammell
Bulow	Glass	Moore	Truman
Burke	Gore	Murphy	Tydings
Byrd	Guffey	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Hale	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Nye	Walsh
Carey	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Clark	Hayden	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson	Pope	
Coolidge	Keyes	Radcliffe	