

4550. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Cleveland Newspaper Guild, representing 334 organized editorial department workers of daily newspapers and press services and syndicates of Cleveland, Ohio, urging favorable action on the Wagner labor-disputes bill; to the Committee on Labor.

4551. Also, petition of Parent-Teacher Association of Vernon Junior High School, Marion, Ohio, by their secretary, Mrs. Edward Robson, opposing block booking and blind selling of motion pictures and urging passage of House bill 142; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4552. Also, petition of Charles E. Ausman Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, of Paulding, Ohio, by their commander, John Dewit, urging passage of House bill 100 to restore benefits to Spanish War veterans as taken away from them by the Economy Act; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4553. Also, petition of J. E. Overbeck and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, believing that the Rayburn-Wheeler bill introduced in Congress February 6, 1935, is unfair, unnecessary, and unwise and, if passed, will be detrimental to the best interests of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4554. Also, petition of the Ohio Association of Retail Lumber Dealers, by their secretary, Findley M. Torrenle, Xenia, Ohio, urging an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining what defects exist in the National Housing Act or in its method of administration which have delayed the revival of construction promised when the act was enacted, and to revise the personnel of the National Housing Administration so that this body will be composed of representatives of the building industry familiar with its problems and in sympathy with every effort to revive it; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4555. By Mr. WHITE: Memorial of the Idaho State Legislature, urging upon the Congress of the United States the favorable consideration of legislation and necessary appropriation to carry to completion a project that will divert the natural flow from the Yellowstone Lake into the Snake River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

4556. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Ralph McCoy, of Romeo, Mich., and 47 other residents of Macomb County, Mich., urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4557. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Iron Mountain, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4558. Also, petition of the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Camden County, N. J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4559. Also, petition of the National Veterans' Association, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4560. Also, petition of the Barnum Branch, Unemployment Council, Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor.

4561. Also, petition of the city of New York; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4562. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Murfreesborough, Tenn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4563. Also, petition of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4564. Also, petition of the Duncan Valley Booster's Club, Duncan, Ariz.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4565. Also, petition of the city of Chicago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4566. Also, petition of the Amex Post, No. 532, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4567. Also, petition of the University Labor Federation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4568. Also, petition of the city of New Kensington, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4569. Also, petition of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Nolicuckey chapter, Greeneville, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4570. Also, petition of Ignatius K. Werwinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4571. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Petition of Miss Helena Cronauer, of 84 Horatio Street, and sundry other

residents of New York City, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Mount Vernon, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the Rayburn public-utility bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4572. Also, petition of Lulu Rogers, of 126 St. Marks Avenue, and three other residents of that neighborhood, protesting against the passage of the Rayburn utility bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4573. Also, petition of Hannah J. Reiner, of 840 West End Avenue, and eight other voters of New York City, protesting against the passage of the Rayburn bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4574. By Mr. WERNER: Petition of citizens of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, urging the passage by Congress of the Dies bill, or similar legislation, providing for the expulsion from the United States of alien Communists and agitators against our present form of government; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

4575. By Mr. BEAM: Petition containing over 14,000 signatures, voluntarily mailed to the Chicago Times, expressing the wish that Congress pass a bill providing for the immediate payment in cash of the adjusted-service compensation certificates presented by Mervyn Molloy, representing the Chicago Times; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

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

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 19, 1935, 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 a bill (H. R. 6424) to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax under the Cotton Control Act, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5322. An act authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Maj. Gen. Adolphus Washington Greely; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the commission for determining the boundary line between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia for not to exceed 9 additional months, and to authorize not to exceed \$10,000 additional funds for its expenses.

### 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	Byrd	Frazier	Logan
Ashurst	Byrnes	George	Lonergan
Austin	Capper	Gerry	McAdoo
Bachman	Carey	Gibson	McCarran
Bailey	Clark	Glass	McGill
Bankhead	Connally	Guffey	McKellar
Barbour	Coolidge	Hale	McNary
Barkley	Copeland	Harrison	Maloney
Bilbo	Costigan	Hastings	Metcalf
Black	Couzens	Hatch	Minton
Bone	Cutting	Hayden	Moore
Borah	Dickinson	Johnson	Murphy
Brown	Dieterich	Keyes	Murray
Bulkley	Donahay	King	Neely
Bulow	Duffy	La Follette	Norbeck
Burke	Fletcher	Lewis	Norris

Nye	Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Van Nuys
O'Mahoney	Schall	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Pittman	Schwollenbach	Townsend	Walsh
Pope	Sheppard	Trammell	Wheeler
Radcliffe	Shipstead	Truman	White
Reynolds	Smith	Tydings	
Robinson	Steiwer	Vandenberg	

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], occasioned by illness, and ask that the announcement stand for the day.

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

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

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 39)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment under the Architect of the Capitol, fiscal year 1935, in the sum of \$10,000, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

##### House Joint Memorial 19

*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

We, your memorialists, the Thirty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

Whereas during the Spanish-American War the troops who were serving in the Philippine Islands in 1899 were requested by the War Department to remain in service for an additional 6 months after the expiration of their enlistment period and until troops could be sent to replace them; and

Whereas these troops were promised by the officers in charge that if they would so remain during the period of such emergency then existing that they would be given regular travel pay of soldiers whose enlistment expired and reenlisted in the service of the United States, as was authorized by section 15 of the Army bill then in force; and

Whereas these troops were held in service for said 6-month period under such agreement, and these troops were never paid such travel pay so promised; and

Whereas numerous citizens of the State of Oregon would be greatly benefited by such payments; and

Whereas House Resolution 2024 of the Federal Congress covering such payment has been recommended by the War Claims Committee for passage: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein),* That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed House Resolution 2024 of the Federal Congress; and be it further

*Resolved,* That certified copies of this resolution, duly certified, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon, and that the latter be urged to use their best offices to procure the enactment of such legislation as will accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, which were referred to the Committee on Finance:

##### House Joint Resolution 7

Whereas the question of social security is of paramount importance to the people of the Nation and of Tennessee at the present time; and

Whereas Congress is shortly to consider the passage of an act relating to old-age pension for those over 65 years of age needing such assistance; and

Whereas those who are unemployable by reason of disability and handicaps are of vital concern to the people of our State at this time: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives of the sixty-ninth general assembly (the senate concurring),* That Congress is hereby memorialized by a request from this body to include the old-age pension act, herein above referred to, provisions for such persons of 40 years of age and over who, by reason of total disability on account of physical handicap or otherwise, are in need of such assistance. And we respectfully petition each and every member of the Tennessee delegation in Congress, including Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to do all in their power to secure the passage of this legislation. Be it further

*Resolved,* That the clerk of the house is directed to send copies of this resolution to every member of the Tennessee delegation in Congress, including the Senators, and also a copy to the Clerks of the House of Representatives and Senate.

Whereas the manufacturers' gasoline tax levied by the Congress of the United States will expire on June 30, 1935, unless reenacted or extended by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the sale of gasoline is now taxed at a much higher rate than any other commodity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the senate concurring therein),* That we hereby respectfully urge the Congress of the United States not to reenact or to extend the provisions of said taxing act beyond the date on which it will expire; be it further

*Resolved,* That the clerk of the House of Representatives and clerk of the Senate of the State of Tennessee be, and they are hereby, instructed to furnish to the Speakers of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States copies of this resolution.

##### House Joint Resolution 15

Memorial asking Congress to pass such laws that will pay the soldiers' bonus, etc.

*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the senate concurring in),* That—

Whereas due to the long continued depression, thousands of American veterans of the World War are unemployed and without the means of adequate support and are unable to provide the necessities and comforts of life for themselves and their families, through no fault of their own; and

Whereas it is the policy of the national administration in its recovery program to bring about a distribution of public funds and accomplish wide-spread reemployment; and

Whereas the payment of the remainder of the amount due on the veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates held by veterans of the World War, will result in a distribution of money to every community in the United States, which money will find its way into every channel of trade through the purchase of necessities and comforts of life, the payments of debts, the building and repairing of homes, the rehabilitation of small business enterprises, and through many other needed expenditures; and

Whereas the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars have in their respective national conventions overwhelmingly approved the immediate cash payment of said certificates; and

Whereas such certificates constitute a just obligation of the Government to the veterans of the World War: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee (the senate concurring),* That the Congress of the United States immediately pass such legislation as is necessary for the immediate payment of the balance due on such adjusted-compensation certificates, with the remittance of interest and other charges against the principal sum of such certificates; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Tennessee be directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOE BYRNS, and also that a copy of the same be forwarded to Senators N. L. BACHMAN and K. D. MCKELLAR, and to each of the nine Members of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

##### House Joint Resolution 20

Whereas there is a marked discrimination against the South in the freight rates as set by the Interstate Commerce Commission in shipments of products from southern States going to the North and East as compared with rates on northern products coming South; and

Whereas Tennessee is fast becoming industrialized; that the products of its factories, farms, forests, and mines need wider markets; but under the ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Tennessee products are handicapped by freight rates in competing with the northern and eastern producers; and

Whereas one southern Governor has publicly asserted that the said discrimination against the South amounts to 23 percent of the freight rate; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress legislation to correct these inequalities, which provides "that all such charges for the transportation of property between the different rate-making or geographical sections of the United States as now designed or may hereafter be designed by the Interstate Commerce Commission for rate-making purposes, be so adjusted as to cause no greater charge for the transportation of property moving from one rate-making or geographical section into another rate-making or geographical section than the charge for the transportation of like classes of traffic moving wholly within the rate-making or geographical section, distance considered; and wherever differences exist entitling rate carriers in one rate-making or geographical section to higher revenues than carriers in another rate-making or geographical section, such differences in revenue needs shall be recognized in difference of rates among the several carriers affected": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Tennessee,* That we petition and urge the Tennessee delegation in both branches of Congress to support legislation that will correct the present rate discrimination; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be certified by the Governor and speakers of the senate and house to the entire Tennessee delegation at Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate petitions of several citizens of the States of Arkansas and North Carolina, praying for the enactment of old-age pension legislation, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Optical Retail Code Authority, New York City, N. Y., favoring continuance of the Optical Retail Code (approved N. R. A. Code No. 454), which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a memorial of sundry citizens of Bradford, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the control and elimination of public-utility holding companies operating or marketing securities in interstate and foreign commerce, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DICKINSON presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing for the immediate cash payment at face value of the adjusted-service certificates of World War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 18th instant, p. 3798, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Southwest Farm Congress, Dodge City, Kans., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1807, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Southwest Farm Congress, Dodge City, Kans., opposing any amendment to section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens, being farmers, stockgrowers, and dairymen, of Meade County, Kans., remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 1807, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. COPELAND presented a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the East Brooklyn Savings and Loan Association, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against alleged discrimination in the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 in favor of Federal savings and loan associations in the matter of exemption from taxes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Building Managers Association of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of rent-control legislation for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Local No. 239, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, Washington, D. C., endorsing House bill 5443, to regulate the election of delegates of the District of Columbia to national political conventions, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, Inc., favoring the enactment of legislation creating a new Cabinet office of public works, to be presided over by a professional engineer, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Memorial Associates, Inc., New York City, N. Y., favoring continuance of the operations of the N. R. A., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Nassau County Local, American League of the Friends of the New Germany, New Hyde Park, Long Island, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2753) to declare citizenship forfeited in the case of any naturalized citizen who left the United States for the purpose of voting in the plebiscite in the Saar region, Germany, and who did vote during said plebiscite in the Saar region in Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Middletown, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the regulation of the display of the American flag on Government buildings, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a resolution of the Polish-American Political Club of Southampton, Suffolk County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of measures making provision for public-works projects, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Oneida County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation bringing hospital care within the purview of Federal emergency relief, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the New York State Society of Professional Engineers, favoring the making of all loans and grants of Federal moneys to the States and political subdivisions thereof contingent upon the maintenance at full strength of the regular personnel of the State or municipal agencies applying for such moneys, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PITTMAN presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Senate joint resolution urging Congress to enact a Federal train-limit law

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Nevada, hereby respectfully represents that—

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada has enacted a bill limiting the length of freight trains operated within the State to a length of 70 cars, and there are pending before several State legislatures measures of identical or similar import, with indications that most of them will soon be adopted; and

Whereas there are several bills before Congress with practically identical provisions, except that they are national in scope, being applicable to interstate commerce throughout the Nation without exception or exemption; and

Whereas the purpose of all such bills is to promote the safety of employees and the travelling public; and

Whereas the consideration of such bills in State legislatures occasions a great deal of acrimony and recrimination, arising from threats of the railroad companies to remove their shops from States enacting such bills, and other threats of litigation, accompanied by costs that would be prohibitive; and

Whereas for these reasons it would be infinitely better to have a Federal law limiting freight trains engaged in interstate commerce to 70 cars, thus forestalling the removal of shops from one State to another, and silencing all threats of litigation; and

Whereas it would be far more economical and satisfactory to the railroads to have such an interstate law, through the operation of which they would run their trains from State to State without interference, without switching and breaking them up for the mere purpose of complying with varying laws which might be vastly different and inconsistent with each other within a space of a few miles; and

Whereas by the early passage of a national train-limit law a long step would be taken in the desirable direction of uniform legislation upon a subject where it is truly essential: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada,* That the Congress be most earnestly urged and beseeched to enact a bill at its earliest convenience, limiting the length of freight trains engaged in interstate commerce to 70 cars, and that such law be fashioned after the laws of Arizona and Nevada.

*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be and hereby is directed to forward a certified copy of this memorial to each member of the Nevada delegation at Washington.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

S. 17. A bill making it a felony to willfully fail to appear after having been admitted to bail (Rept. No. 350); and

S. 18. A bill to amend section 1015 of the Revised Statutes (Rept. No. 351).

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2145) extending the time for repayment of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 352) thereon.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 2306) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the heirs of James Taylor, deceased Cherokee Indian, for the value of certain lands now held by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2307) for the relief of Mrs. W. B. Nix and Mrs. J. A. Nix; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIETERICH:

A bill (S. 2308) for the relief of Martin M. Philipsborn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 2309) for the relief of owners of cargo aboard the steamship *Boxley*; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2310) to amend section 602 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2311) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWELLENBACH:

A bill (S. 2312) for the relief of the Western Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 2313) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, with respect to farm prices; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2314) to extend the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act to certain emergency officers of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Chinese Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 2315) to authorize the incorporated town of Valdez, Alaska, to construct a public-school building and for such purpose to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$50,000; and to authorize said town to accept grants of money to aid it in financing any public works;

A bill (S. 2316) to authorize the incorporated town of Petersburg, Alaska, to undertake certain municipal public works, including the filling, grading, and paving of streets and sidewalks and construction of necessary bridges and viaducts in connection with the same, and for such purposes to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$40,000; and

A bill (S. 2317) 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 Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2318) to protect producers, manufacturers, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of substitutes and mixtures in woven or knitted fabrics and in garments or

articles of apparel made therefrom, manufactured in any Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or transported or intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 2319) to provide for increasing the limit of cost for the construction and equipment of an annex to the Library of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 2320) authorizing the erection of a memorial statue of Chief Plenty Coos; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COSTIGAN:

A bill (S. 2321) for the relief of S. M. Price (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 88) to abolish the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission and transfer its functions to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6424) to continue the Cotton Control Act, to exempt a limited quantity of cotton from the tax thereunder, to provide for the better administration of such act, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. ASHURST, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the 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, and it was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

## FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ADAMS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6644) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, 22, 27, 28, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the words and figures in such amendment, "during the fiscal year 1936", insert the following: "until December 2, 1935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: " : Provided, That the use of the annex by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, is hereby continued until July 1, 1936 "; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1 and 26.

ALVA B. ADAMS,  
CARTER GLASS,  
KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
FREDERICK HALE,  
HENRY W. KEYES,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

J. P. BUCHANAN,  
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,  
WILLIAM W. ARNOLD,  
JOHN TABER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

## IMPORTATION OF FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Logan Observer, published at Logan, Iowa, entitled "Bring It Here: Hungry America Furnishes the Market."

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

[From the Logan (Iowa) Observer]

## BRING IT HERE: HUNGRY AMERICA FURNISHES THE MARKET

Hands extend across the seas. There are fewer cows in American meadows, less milk in bossy's reserves and food in her stomach. Cream separators are turning to rust and the back porch is littered with empty cream cans. Corn and wheat lands are swaying vistas of daisies and buttercups and oat fields are rank with burdock and milkweed. Butter-grease spots show on the stevedore's overalls. There are corn kernels in his shoes, wheat chaff in his hair, rye and oat beards in his whiskers.

Stars are falling elsewhere, and great ocean liners are filling their holds, while the American farmer looking on his regimented acres soliloquizes, "What the hell?"

What follows here is taken from the market letter of March 1 of James E. Bennett & Co., a large Chicago commission house:

"Butter \* \* \* over 1,500,000 pounds New Zealand butter are scheduled to arrive in New York next week. Market showing strong indications of going still lower."

Quotations serve well enough, so more follow: This from the Bennett Co. letter of March 7: "According to New York reports a cargo of 281,000 bushels of Argentine corn, half yellow and half white, has arrived there, with the yellow selling in a small way around 4 cents over Chicago May (corn), while the white was held at 7½ to 8 cents over May without takers. \* \* \* Local sentiment appears to be bearish due to reported importations and possibility of heavy arrivals this summer."

From a Bennett letter of a few days before: "Oats and rye \* \* \* Premiums are well maintained, but demand is somewhat disappointing especially in oats, with Argentine arrivals competing in the southern and southeastern territory."

The Uhlmann Grain Co., Chicago, provides this information: "According to the Canadian official exports for grain entering the United States since the 1st of August (1934), we find that nearly 25,000,000 bushels of various cereals and flour have been admitted to this country, constituting wheat which is the predominating influence, of over 13,000,000 bushels, and over 7,000,000 bushels of barley."

In a recent letter Thomson & McKinnon Co., Chicago, state: "Our advices from London say that the new Argentine wheat has been found of very satisfactory milling quality, and now that the United States millers are assured of its milling fitness a better demand is logically in order."

The southern politician has a way with him, and much influence where influence gets results, as apparent in this excerpt from a Bennett & Co. letter of March 2 concerning cotton: "It was reported that the A. A. A. would permit 10,983,264 bales of 500 pounds gross weight to be sold tax free from the crop to be grown this summer."

Have you by any chance heard that northern pork was to be sold free of any processing tax this summer?

A Bennett letter of March 5 gives this to ponder on: "Argentine oats have been competing with our own supplies in the South and Southeast for some time at a materially lower basis, and foreign rye continues to come into this country."

A Chicago market report on cattle, dated March 4, "Week's receipts included 20 cars of Canadian cattle that sold largely at \$9.50 to \$10.75." Another, dated March 2, "Yesterday's receipts of cattle were 2,500, including five cars from Canada."

Cattle from Mexico are making their way across the border. Some definite data on such cattle shipments will be available soon.

Meanwhile, overproduction in the United States must be stopped. This thing of the United States farmer and rancher producing more than this country can use and the export market will consume is nonsense. Take the word of Henry Wallace and the other A. A. A.-ers for that. New Zealanders, Argentinians, Canadians, and Mexicans must be kept off relief rolls.

## "THE PITTSBURGH-PLUS" PLAN

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brief editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times on the subject of the insertion of the "Pittsburgh-plus" plan in the steel code.

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

[From the St. Louis Star-Times]

## STEEL PRICE CONTROLS

The difference of opinion which has broken out between the Federal Trade Commission and the N. R. A. over the modernized version of "Pittsburgh plus" which is found in the steel code, is typical of two outlooks upon the conduct of business. The code provides that when steel, manufactured, for instance, in St. Louis, is sold in St. Louis, the price shall include the freight rate on such a steel shipment from the nearest "basing point", which happens to be Chicago. This means that Chicago steel mills can

lay down steel in St. Louis at the same price as St. Louis mills, unless the latter shade their list prices. The strongest kind of an effort is made in the steel industry to maintain uniform list prices, so by taking away freight differentials the general tendency is to establish a rigid price structure, without competition.

This is what the steel industry as a whole wants. It is what the N. R. A. steel code authority, dominated by steel men, secured from General Johnson and are retaining under Donald Richberg. The Federal Trade Commission, with a dislike for price fixing and monopoly, asks that the system be abolished, and their argument against it is termed "biased, inaccurate, and misleading" by the steel operators.

The N. R. A. is trying to save the basing-point system by greatly enlarging the number of basing points, including, it would seem, almost every city in the country that has a steel mill. But if that is done, of what use is the system? Establish enough basing points, and it is the same as having none, except for a lot of red tape.

It has been discovered, from the temporary uplifts in steel production, that the larger manufacturers can make money when operating at 40 percent of capacity or less. That means they are pricing their products so high that the attempt to attain high production is terrifically handicapped. A tremendous overhead is being absorbed on a small volume of business.

Lower steel prices, along with lower costs throughout the building-construction industry, would give the country exactly what it needs to get large-scale operations under way and absorb the unemployed. The artificial price controls established through the N. R. A., and previously maintained by arrangements which did not come to public notice, are a blight upon recovery. They are well illustrated in the steel basing-point system, even though that system is not so bad as it was a dozen years ago, when all steel prices in the eastern United States were based upon Pittsburgh, and that section was fortified in a near monopoly of the steel industry.

## WORK-RELIEF PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117) making appropriations for relief purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

All corporations organized for any purpose by officials or agencies of the United States for its use since March 4, 1933, shall be liquidated within 90 days; and no other or like corporations shall be organized for any purpose by or in behalf of the United States except by express authorization of Congress.

Mr. SCHALL. I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it may be read.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE,  
Philadelphia, March 7, 1935.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEMBERS AND GUESTS OF THE PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE AT A DINNER-MEETING HELD AT THE MANUFACTURERS' AND BANKERS' CLUB

Whereas there has been chartered under the laws of the State of Delaware the Public Works Emergency Leasing Corporation (January 1934), by Incorporators Harold L. Ickes, Oscar A. Chapman, and Theodore A. Walters; the Public Works Emergency Housing Corporation (October 27, 1933), by Harold L. Ickes, Frances Perkins, and Robert D. Kohn; the Commodity Credit Corporation (October 17, 1933) by H. A. Wallace, Oscar Johnston, and H. Morgenthau, Jr.; the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation (October 4, 1933) by H. A. Wallace, Harold L. Ickes, and Harry L. Hopkins; the Federal Subsistence Homesteads Corporation (November 21, 1933) by Harold L. Ickes, Oscar L. Chapman, and M. L. Wilson; organized in perpetuity and authorized to "acquire any real property or any interest therein and improve, develop, maintain, grant, sue, lease (with or without the privilege of purchasing) or otherwise dispose of any such property or interest therein"; and

Whereas the powers granted by these charters, obtained under Executive orders, interfere with the inherent constitutional rights of our citizens; and

Whereas we are opposed to the use by the Federal Government of corporations, incorporated under the laws of the several States, to carry out Federal purposes in competition with private enterprise: Therefore be it

Resolved, That such corporations as were organized since March 4, 1933, by officials or agencies of the United States for its use shall be liquidated within 90 days and that henceforth, except by express authorization of Congress, no other or like corporation shall be organized for any purpose by or on behalf of the United States.

THE PHILADELPHIA BOARD OF TRADE,  
H. W. WILLS, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution presented by the Senator from Minnesota will lie on the table.

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, about 150 years ago Washington crossed the Delaware. About a year and 4 months ago President Roosevelt and 4 Cabinet generals and 9 bureaucracy colonels crossed over into Delaware, established their camp in Wilmington, and organized six holding corporations with which to make an assault on the Republic of the United States and make of it a United States of Soviet Russia. Washington's Delaware experience aided in the establishment of the principles of the Constitution. The mission of the new-deal leader today, as revealed by the provisions of the six Delaware charters, is to evade the Constitution and set up a dynasty of economic socialization embracing all industries, enterprises, and activities, in which "any corporation now or hereafter organized" may engage. Washington resigned his commission when the work of emergency had been completed; but Roosevelt, instead of being content with the 2 years' commission of so-called "emergency" given to him by Congress, seeks by subterfuge of planned emergency to continue his powers and hopes that when he has created enough chaos, the remains of the Republic may fall into the lap of these secretly organized corporations through which he may accomplish his ambition of permanent dictatorship.

Washington and his followers aimed to restore all the rights of liberty and property to the American people. The new-deal plan chartered in Delaware aims to take all liberty and property from the individual American citizen and confer these rights upon Federal boards incorporated in Delaware and captained by the administration's bureaucracies.

I have inquired here on the floor of the Senate, I have inquired wherever I could come in contact with anyone who might know, why these corporations were organized, but no response has come from any source indicating for what purpose they were created. Perhaps a short analysis of the actions of the present administration might give premises for deduction.

During the campaign preceding the last election, when the Democratic slogan was that "It could not be worse", things seemed to take an upward turn in the country. Stocks and prices rose. Wheat in my State was selling for better than a dollar a bushel. There was a decidedly bright outlook. Mr. Roosevelt said it was Wall Street attempting to bolster up the Hoover campaign, but election came and Mr. Roosevelt was elected.

The upward turn continued. The then President-elect said, "That is because they have confidence in me." On the 4th day of March he came into office. He made some promises at that time, none of which has been kept. The pledges of the platform upon which he was elected and that he vowed he was 100 percent back of, a covenant with the people, are still in every particular left unfulfilled. The first thing he did when he came into office was to figure out some unlawful way by which he could do something which the Constitution did not warrant. He said to his Attorney General, "Find some way by which I can usurp the authority to close all the banks of the United States." He pretended to discover something left over from the war Congress which gave him that power, although the Congress had thought it had repealed all the war legislation. He closed all the banks in the country, 15,000 or more as sound as a hound's tooth, thus to begin his career as President at the lowest ebb of depression. He manufactured the slogan, "A war on depression." He did this not because he had a war but because he desired to usurp from the Government war powers to the furtherance of his ambition, and what better suggested slogan could there be than "War on depression"? It was nearly as good a slogan as another Democratic administration had when it coined, "He kept us out of war." And the "war on depression" has been carried on with exactly the same results as that other slogan, "He kept us out of war."

It seems to me, looking back over the administration, that it has not wanted recovery. It has deliberately set out to accomplish chaos, and in that respect it has been very successful.

Twenty-five days after the President raised his hand and swore to defend and maintain the Constitution, he sent to Congress a bill, and had it crowded through the House without even having it put in print, which would have put a publisher in jail for 10 years and fined him \$10,000 for daring to advocate anything of which the President did not approve.

That bill came to the Senate and, thanks to the efforts of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the poison was taken out of it. A communications bill was sent to the Congress and passed the House providing a complete censorship, but most of the censorship was stricken out here in the Senate. It always appeared to me that those things which it is desired to keep covered up must have some sinister thing back of them or there would not be required so much secrecy. The bill passed the Senate, but there still remained in it a clause which gives the President the power, upon his declaring an emergency, to take over every means of communication in the United States, such as the telegraph, the telephone, the radio, the movies, and the mails.

There came to Congress a bill creating what is known as the N. R. A., the National Racketeers Association, the National Ruin Act. This bill gave to the President a great number of powers. That was one emergency created by the administration.

Then the President followed it with the A. A. A. Act, another emergency created for his use. He had to have some foundation upon which to lay the idea that he should acquire these powers. He has acquired one power after another until there is not much left today of the Constitution. I hope today that the Senate may by its vote redeclare the Republic of the United States.

The 2-year lease to the N. R. A., giving the President these enormous powers, and the A. A. A. Act have about expired. At the beginning of the regular session of the Seventy-third Congress President Roosevelt sent word to the Congress that he wanted the 77 powers which he had usurped from Congress and the judiciary in the extra session of Congress made permanent. From this demand alone you can surmise the tenor of his ambition. They were not made permanent. They are about to expire.

The only thing left of the N. R. A. today is a skeleton. General Johnson, the ringmaster and nurse of the N. R. A., declared that it is as dead as the dodo, and intelligent people wonder why the administration insists on keeping it alive. I will tell you why he wants to keep it alive. It is because within its carcass is contained the usurped powers from the Constitution of our Republic without which powers he will be thwarted in his ambition. George Christians, of Tennessee, the leader of the white shirts and interested in other fascistic organizations, says he talked with President Roosevelt at Warm Springs in company with Moley and other well-known intimates of the President. He says he told the President that he was the Kerensky of the coming revolution. The President objected to being only Kerensky, and Christians stated that no one man had been able to weather the three phases of revolution and that other strong men must follow in order to make revolution an accomplished fact. The President reminded him that he had forgotten Cromwell, Napoleon, and Caesar. He foresaw that his hold on Congress might slip and he would not be able to secure more power or perhaps even hold that which he had, and in order to hold that which he had some permanent structure must be erected into which his usurped powers could be covered. The Delaware holding corporations fit the bill. They were created and filed a year and 4 months ago and are like a set trap lying there in ambush ready to capture its prey. All that is needed is more money with which to put them in action, and the powers that he asked Congress to make permanent and which they have not done will have been retained without their consent.

They have made these corporations permanent. If they get this \$4,000,000,000 lump-sum appropriation, \$2,500,000,000 will go into these corporations where several hundred millions of dollars are already planted. If that purpose is accomplished and this money goes into those corporations, then we are indeed on our way to Moscow.

Mr. President, I have been unable to get anyone in the Senate to tell me the purpose for which these organizations have been organized. They can take over and handle everything; banking, railroading, mining, manufacturing, building materials, development of natural and unnatural resources; in short, they can do anything in the world that any private citizen now does, and I use the word "world" advisedly, because they can extend their business to any part of the world. Any business of the country can be carried on by these corporations. They are outside of the Constitution. It is a clever move on the part of the administration to acquire the power in Delaware to move the Government of the United States to Delaware in case they can create enough chaos to warrant it without an uprising of the citizenry. Congress will have no authority over these corporations which are organized by the captains of the bureaucracies. They have put over their man-made laws and enforced them with the power of the Government, contrary to the Constitution that declares we are a country of law, not men.

My amendment, if adopted, will keep this country a Republic.

Perhaps I had a better opportunity than some Senators to get acquainted early with the President of the United States. I was on the *Mount Vernon* when it was torpedoed about 250 miles off the coast of Brest. She had a hole torn in her side about 20 by 30 feet and shipped something like 10,000 tons of water. A few of the boilers were left operating because of the airtight compartment, so that we could keep moving, and we finally got back to Brest. I was then transferred to the *Leviathan*, another German ship. The Germans had continually dropped notes saying they were going to get both of those ships.

I talked with Admiral Wilson just before I went on the *Leviathan*. I was at the top of a great room where one whole side of the building was covered with a map of the Atlantic Ocean, with fine wires running across it indicating here and there the location of the different ships, so that Admiral Wilson might be in constant control and know what was happening on the Atlantic Ocean. He said, "I am putting you on the *Leviathan*." Orders were issued to the captains of these ships, and they did not open them until they had started on their trips. He said to me further, "I am routing you over the same course the *Mount Vernon* took. I believe the Germans will think that since we had one ship torpedoed there we will not send another one on that route. But", he said, "I do not know of any safer way. Any way is dangerous."

Just before we sailed my attention was attracted by a great clamor of bands, and I inquired what might be happening. We were anchored about a mile and a half or two miles out from the coast, and they explained to me that a great bevy of motor boats was coming; that bands were playing; and so we listened until the motor boats finally arrived, and the bands marched upon the deck of the ship, and they played; and then there came on board—as the Bible would say, with 500 men to run before him—the Assistant Secretary of the Navy of the United States, henceforth whom history will undoubtedly know as Franklin "Delaware" Roosevelt!

The next morning I came on deck, and the captain was in controversy with somebody, saying that a flag of the Secretary of the Navy was at the top of the flagpole, and that it was hazarding and jeopardizing the ship.

That ship, the great *Leviathan*, which I note is being put out of commission today in the interest of English shipping, carried about 15,000 soldiers. It made a trip about every 10 days. That one vessel, Senators, could carry enough man power over there to win the war if it had been alone, and it was doing it. The saving of those ships meant everything. This was early in the morning, about the same time of the morning that the *Mount Vernon* was torpedoed, which I was upon. The captain explained to me that this ship stood some 90 feet, I think it was, above the water level; that it could be seen over a circle so many miles in circumference

on a clear day. It happened to be foggy that morning, but he said that the sun coming up would soon lift the fog. The flag at the top of that flagpole, running high into the air, he explained, would enlarge the circle of visibility so many times. I do not remember just what it was, but it was a tremendous amount of visibility that the flag at the top of the mast would carry out to the enemy, and give them an opportunity again to torpedo the *Leviathan*. The captain said, "That flag must come down"; and so he sent down word to communicate with Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Roosevelt sent back word that he was sick, and that the captain could confer with his secretary. The captain conferred with the secretary, and asked him to have the flag pulled down; but Mr. Roosevelt said no, that the flag should remain; that he was not afraid, and he did not see why a captain trained to encounter danger should be afraid. The captain finally ended the argument by saying, "I may never be an admiral, but that flag must come down", and so it was taken down.

My friends, Senators, this man's vanity is so great that he must have his flag at the top of the mast, even though the ship of state may be torpedoed. Thirty-eight men were killed in the *Mount Vernon*. Some of them were shut in when it was necessary to close the water-tight compartments. I could hear the poor devils yelling down there, but it was a question of their lives or the life of the ship; and so they were shut in, and there they died.

Mr. President, we are engaged in a battle over the pending joint resolution, proposing to appropriate a lump sum of \$4,000,000,000 this year; and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], who stood here upon the floor, said he supposed next year there would be a request for another \$5,000,000,000. No strings are attached to this appropriation. The joint resolution is here before us; and the four items which came over from the House in the first paragraph of the joint resolution, if you will read them, give us a clear idea of what the President intends to do with that money in connection with the corporations in Delaware. The Senate committee has cut that out. The joint resolution was finally referred back to the committee at the suggestion of the leader of the Senate, who no doubt received the suggestion from the White House, on account of the McCarran amendment.

The McCarran amendment has been defeated by the administration through careful underground maneuverings, for he holds tremendous power through appropriated billions under his absolute control. His flag still waves at the top of the mastpole, inviting disaster and chaos, because only through disaster and chaos can he possibly hope to carry out the international scheme of breaking down our Republic, leveling our standard of living with that of Europe, and through mass psychology, carefully matured through handling of all communications, transfer a docile, confiding, trusting people from the Ship of the Republic to a fascistic ship of which he is to be the undisputed captain and add his illustrious name to that group of Cromwell, Napoleon, and Caesar.

The difference between the "new plans" in Europe—Rome, Berlin, and Moscow—and the new deal here is in the method of approach. We have on our side of the Atlantic the smiling exterior of beneficent paternalism and the billions in doles and the steady encroachment of the Federal Government over the industrials and utilities, over the railways and banks, and over all branches of agriculture and commerce, both interstate and intrastate; whereas "over there", in Rome, Berlin, and Moscow, there is the blunt appeal to force. In Europe the "new plans" may be effective through "shock troops", whereas here the more effective method is by subsidy and control of communications.

The bill has come back to the Senate divided up into eight divisions. The first four of those divisions, taking something over a billion and a half of money, fit into these corporations of Delaware exactly as a hand fits into a glove; and, on top of that, the President is to have 20 percent of the \$4,000,000,000. These two sums added together give him absolute control of \$2,250,000,000 that it is absolutely up to him to do as he pleases with; and I have no doubt, Senators,

that he will please to put it into the corporations in Delaware and make of the United States a union of soviet social republics. There can be no other meaning.

In Chicago the other day a Communist was arrested for speaking. Why, Senators, there is no danger from foreign communism. It is the communism here within the bosom of our own country that is dangerous. The communism within this very administration that seeks to legislate us into a lockstepping, regimented, subservient, cringing people. It is right here within the country. An international plot is afoot to destroy our Republic.

This Fabian approach to the socialization of the United States by the method of incorporating Delaware holding companies is not at all fanciful. It is a concrete actuality with a strong international organization behind it.

Doubtless no Senator here is unfamiliar with the history of that socialistic order known as the "Fabian Society." Among its best-known figures in the United Kingdom is George Bernard Shaw, just as among its best known workers in the United States is Bernard M. Baruch, as many think the real President of the United States.

It has been demonstrated at every turn of this administration that the head of it is more interested in foreign countries than he is in our own. He was a candidate for the Vice Presidency and worked his head off from one end of the country to the other advocating our joining the League of Nations. Up to the time he became Governor of New York he was a member of the board of directors of the International Bankers Association and was instrumental in making the \$15,000,000,000 loans to foreign countries. He attempted his "damnedest" to put us into the World Court, only a back door to the League of Nations. He is today busy giving away to foreign countries, through treaty rights that should be shared with the Senate of the United States, our industries. His first thought is always of some country other than the United States. The platform on which he was elected President declared—and he said that he was back of it 100 percent—that no duties should be placed upon goods coming into this country unless it was so decided by the Tariff Commission, and that tariff making should be, as far as possible, removed from Executive interference. He came in here to Congress and crowded over, at the end of a braid, this bill, which gives the tariff-making power to him and deprives the Senate of any right of interference with him. The bill gives it to him in secret. Everything in this administration has been done in secret. Bills have been passed here and signed by the President, every one of them containing secret clauses, every one of them a censorship measure.

Bill after bill has been crowded through here; and all these powers accumulated there in the White House are now, my friends, to be transferred to corporations in Delaware that are marked "perpetual", and the incorporation papers were marked by the people who filed them "Do not publish", and you cannot get a word out of anybody here or anywhere else as to what the purposes of the corporations are.

In this treaty-making power that the President usurped from Congress he has the power to raise and lower tariffs 50 percent, at his own sweet will. Just the other day, in the interest of foreigners, he made a treaty with Belgium interfering with 47 industries in this country, lowering our tariff on glass, steel, textiles, laces, cement; in short, the products of 47 industries of the country, amounting to 76 articles all told, while the iron mines of my State of Minnesota are lying idle. His idea of helping the United States is to transfer to foreigners the labor for the production of the articles and materials that are to be shipped into this country.

The President made another treaty with Cuba, I understand—we get this only by hearsay, so it may be wrong—but I understand that in that treaty the duty of 70 cents per bushel on potatoes is lowered to 35 cents. In my State our farmers are selling their potatoes for from 12 to 15 cents a bushel; 11,000,000 men are out of employment, 22,000,000 on the dole, and ten billion increase in the public debt; we are taking in \$1 and spending \$5; our interest payments exceed our income-tax return; and our President has ordered

Congress, and it has obeyed, to raise the bonded-indebtedness limitation from twenty-eight billion to forty-five billion, twenty billion more than allowed for the World War peak. His pretended "war on depression" is twice as costly as the World War; and yet we are making treaties in secret, in "star chamber", where the United States is not represented, but every foreign country that may desire to do so sits there in conference. In "star chamber" these things are to be done.

Today over 300 newspaper men, put into the employ of the President, put into the employ of the Government, paid for by the taxpayers, are dishing out the news of the country to the newspapers, and the newspapers must print what they are given, tying up every department, punishing anybody who dares speak what he thinks, or dares speak in behalf of this Republic.

We are in a condition today where it seems that we are worse off than those in Russia, for at least in Russia the authorities come right out in the open and tell you what they are doing. Here they are down underneath, boiling away secretly to put over this and to put over that, of which the country or the Senate or the Congress knows nothing. Why does not somebody come here and tell us about these corporations, why they are organized, for what purpose, and what is going to be done?

The people elect us to come here and represent them. I am afraid I have not been able to do much representing. About all I have been able to do is to serve the purpose of the geese that cackled outside of Rome to save the republic, and thereby attracted attention to the enemy sneaking up, the assassins at night with the daggers in their hands. Some geese cackled, and that saved the republic of Rome.

God help me to be a goose and to continue to cackle! I know I am a goose. I know that the punishment visited upon me has been visited upon me only because I am goose enough to stand up here and ask God to help me, that in some way somebody will get up and stand for the Republic of the United States, and not allow it to be stolen by foreign emissaries with their tool in the house of the President of the United States. My God, Senators! stand up for your rights, and stand up for your country before it is too late, and vote for my amendment to do away with these corporations that are going to make our United States of America a United States of Russia!

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

Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HARRISON, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOGAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], who is necessarily detained from the Senate, and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR (after having voted in the negative). I find I have a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce the absence, on account of illness, of the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

I also wish to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are detained on important department business.

I desire also to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]; and

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD].

All of the Senators I have just named are detained on business of the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on account of illness. I am not advised how he would vote if present. His general pair has been announced.

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—10			
Austin	Dickinson	Metcalf	Steiwier
Barbour	Gibson	Schall	White
Carey	Hale		
NAYS—69			
Adams	Copeland	La Follette	Pope
Ashurst	Costigan	Lewis	Radcliffe
Bachman	Couzens	Logan	Reynolds
Bailey	Cutting	Loneragan	Robinson
Bankhead	Dieterich	McAdoo	Russell
Bilbo	Donahay	McGill	Schwellenbach
Black	Duffy	McKellar	Sheppard
Borah	Fletcher	Maloney	Smith
Brown	Frazier	Minton	Thomas, Okla.
Bulkeley	George	Moore	Trammell
Bulow	Gerry	Murphy	Truman
Burke	Glass	Murray	Tydings
Byrd	Guffey	Neely	Van Nuys
Byrnes	Harrison	Norbeck	Wagner
Capper	Hatch	Norris	Wheeler
Clark	Hayden	Nye	
Connally	Keyes	O'Mahoney	
Coolidge	King	Pittman	
NOT VOTING—16			
Barkley	Gore	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Hastings	McNary	Townsend
Caraway	Johnson	Overton	Vandenberg
Davis	Long	Shipstead	Walsh

So Mr. SCHALL'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate for just a moment to an amendment which I think will not be controversial and which I think the committee will accept, as it would cure an oversight in the joint resolution.

On page 3, line 18, after the word "States", I ask that there be inserted the words "and Territories." The joint resolution is supposed to cover the Territories as well as the States, and unless these words be inserted, it may be ambiguous. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the amendment which the Senator seeks to amend has already been agreed to, and in order that the parliamentary situation may be such that the Senator could offer his amendment to the amendment, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to would have to be reconsidered.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, in that circumstance, I would not give unanimous consent. In the first place, I think the matter is already covered in the joint resolution, although there is some difference as to its interpretation. However, if we have to go over that whole allocation again, I will not consent.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not think the Chair understood the Senator from Maryland. The Senator asked unanimous consent that his amendment be agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think there will be any controversy.

Mr. NORRIS. That could be done, I take it, without reconsideration of the vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Nebraska is correct, because almost anything can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the words "and Territories" be inserted after the word "States", in line 18, on page 3.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to be inserted as a new paragraph in the bill, and I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

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", except the amount authorized by section 4 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, national parkways, 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 or protection 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 on population as shown by the latest decennial census, one-fourth on the mileage of the Federal-aid highway system as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, and one-fourth on the railroad mileage 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, and money allocated under this joint resolution to State relief agencies may be expended by such agencies for the construction and improvement of roads and streets: *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 for each State the hours of work and the rates of wages to be paid to skilled, intermediate, and unskilled labor engaged in such construction therein.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the primary object of my amendment is to insure that all money appropriated by this joint resolution which may be allocated to the construction of highways and related projects shall be expended in accordance with existing law by the State highway departments. The final adoption of the amendment will guarantee that the principle of apportionment among the States of lump sums according to an equitable rule will be maintained. That principle was first adopted in 1916, and Congress has not departed from it in a single instance for 19 years. I ask that it remain unimpaired and in full force and effect.

Congress should insist that this be done, particularly at this time, when there appears to be a revival of an idea which was wholly discredited and discarded 20 years ago. Congress has consistently refused to designate what particular roads should be built, because that is a matter of local concern which can better be decided by the State highway departments. Now, however, we are told that an authority which Congress, for reasons of sound policy, has always refused to assume may safely be delegated to some executive branch of the Government.

The original Federal Aid Highway Act was sponsored in 1916 by two men of wide legislative experience who were well aware of the yearning for power which always possesses one with bureaucratic authority—Representative Dorsey W. Shackelford, of Missouri, and Senator John H. Bankhead, of Alabama, the father of our distinguished colleague. They were firm in the determination that Congress, and Congress only, should apportion all Federal grants for highway construction; that the States, and not the Federal Government, should do the actual work of road building.

What a blessing it has been that such a sound principle was adopted! For nearly two decades it has been unnecessary for any Senator or any Representative to approach any bureau chief, hat in hand, to beg for an allotment of road

funds to his State or to his district. Congress itself settled the matter, and left no discretion to any executive authority.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. Why should any State be compelled to come here with hat in hand to beg a bureaucrat for any sort of allocation or appropriation?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is particularly true with respect to highways, because we have within each State an efficient State highway department which can do the work.

Mr. GLASS. It is particularly true with respect to all States, because all States are supposed to be efficiently administered by their own governments.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask a question of the Senator from Arizona? Is not the principle which the Senator is seeking to apply with reference to the road department the same principle which is sought to be applied in section 10, which was stricken out the other day, with reference to other departments?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. On Saturday or Friday we struck out section 10, which provided that—

Federal public roads projects, rivers and harbors projects, reclamation projects, and public buildings projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution shall be carried out under the direction of the respective permanent Government departments or agencies having jurisdiction of such projects, and the performance of all contracts in connection with such projects shall be subject to the supervision and control of such departments or agencies.

That was stricken out.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a question there, if the Senator will permit the statement, as to whether any work now being done by an emergency agency would have to be transferred to a permanent agency. The issue was between permanent and emergency agencies. In my amendment, however, the distinction is clear. The work is to be done by the States and the State highway departments will have charge of the work.

Mr. GLASS. I will say to the Senator from Idaho, if I may, that the purposes of the amendments are so manifestly alike that I ascribed the other amendment to the Senator from Arizona rather than to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER].

Mr. HAYDEN. The same principle which I have stated was at stake nearly 2 years ago, when Congress had under consideration the \$3,300,000,000 public-works bill, and President Roosevelt himself agreed that the usual procedure should be followed, with the result that the appropriation of \$400,000,000 for highways was the only sum definitely earmarked in that measure. Senators may remember that the President appointed four members of his Cabinet as a public-works committee, and I made it my business to confer with them regarding funds for highways. Two of them, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture, promptly agreed that all road work should be done by the States in the usual way.

The two other Cabinet members would not agree to my suggestion. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of the Interior both thought the selection of highway construction projects should be made in Washington. Secretary Ickes said, with his usual frankness, that everyone else was willing to leave the determination of what should be done to the administrative authorities, and that he could see no reason why there should be an exception with respect to roads.

I remember that Secretary Ickes said to me, "Senator SHIPSTEAD was just here, and expressed a willingness to take his chances on obtaining funds to deepen the channel of the upper Mississippi River." My answer was: "Mr. Secretary, you have put your finger on the vital point. Senator SHIP-

STEAD will take his chances upon seeing you before I do." I then went on to say that if it were known that some man in Washington had the money to build roads my constituents would demand that I see that man and insist that a particular road be built. The people of every State and every congressional district would likewise demand that the Senators and their Representatives see the man who could build roads for them. If, on the other hand, the money should be apportioned among the States for expenditure by the State highway departments in the usual way, not a Senator and not a Representative would have to consult anybody in Washington about highway funds.

Since his Cabinet committee was equally divided, I took the problem to the President, who promptly said that he had no desire to see a new bureaucracy built up in Washington which 96 Senators and 435 Representatives in Congress would have to convince that road projects in their States or districts should be adopted for construction. The President spoke of his experience as Governor of New York, and readily agreed, from his own knowledge, that the regular and customary way was the best. That is how roads were made the exception in the public-works law of 1933. I insist that the same precedent be again followed in this appropriation.

But the idea that the Federal Government should build speedways across the States will not down. Admiral Peoples, the Director of Procurement, stated before both the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that the construction of such highways under direct Federal supervision was one of the objects which could be accomplished by this joint resolution.

I read from his testimony:

Consideration has been given to undertaking the construction of what may be termed "national highways" or "express highways", as illustrated by the form of construction used in some highways adjacent to large cities. These highways would be located in broad relation to population distribution, and would be laid out to avoid highly developed areas and to run outside of population centers. It is assumed consideration will be given to the elimination of major grade crossings in connection with these highways.

The idea apparently is that a wide right-of-way is to be acquired, and that the Treasury could be reimbursed for the cost of such superhighways by selling or leasing the frontage on either side for gasoline stations or other business enterprises. I am sure that if such a plan were adopted, more than one Senator would be importuned to obtain a lease for a "hot dog" stand desired by some resident of his State.

I have here a proposal to build a magnificent transcontinental express highway from Boston to San Francisco. The right-of-way is to be at least 1,000 feet wide. The total cost of this route with four traffic lanes is estimated at \$12,000,000,000. The idea has met with favor.

I have here a publication called "Highway Topics", published in Columbus, Ohio, and in it I read a quotation from a statement made by Secretary Ickes:

I have heard plans for the transcontinental highway which would capture the imagination of any believer in the country's future—a four-lane road stretching across the country, avoiding all congested city areas, uninterrupted by any grade crossing.

A 1,000-foot right-of-way contributed by the States would make it possible to control the landscaping of such a highway to make it the most beautiful as well as the most useful highway in the world.

A public-works program on some such basis as that discussed could absorb the energies of all our people on a self-respecting basis in wide-spread economic activity.

Under no circumstances would Congress ever appropriate the money to build such a highway. I have taken the trouble to check the route and find that it would pass through 12 States and 45 congressional districts. How can the Senators from the other 36 States make their people believe that such a highway is highly beneficial to them? How can the other 390 Representatives explain to the farmers in their districts that they must still drive through the dust or the mud because the road-making energies of the Nation are to be concentrated on this gigantic project?

The enactment of my amendment will put an end to all such dazzling schemes and will insure the continuance of a policy which is slowly but surely bringing about the con-

struction of a system of serviceable highways which benefits every section of the Union. What we have been doing through the State highway departments may not be magnificent, but it is intensely practical and entirely satisfactory to the great majority of the American people.

It is my desire that the Senate shall vote on this amendment with the distinct understanding that its adoption prohibits the Federal Government from undertaking the construction of any superhighways or interstate speedways. It is entirely proper that the National Government shall improve its own property within the national parks, the forest reserves, or other Federal reservations and build approach roads or connecting roads over federally owned rights-of-way where the chief purpose is to make accessible scenic beauty or points of historic interest. But such roads are for the tourist or the vacationist and are not commercial highways where speed and the saving of distance are the first consideration.

The amendment specifically provides that the sums allocated for the construction of public highways and other related projects shall be apportioned among the States in the manner provided by section 204 (b) of the National Industrial Recovery Act. This is the only reference to the National Industrial Recovery Act, and no other part of that act is made applicable to the money appropriated out of the Treasury by this joint resolution. Reference to section 204 (b) is made for the sole purpose of bringing about an apportionment of highway funds on the basis of seven-eighths in accordance with the Federal Highway Act of 1921 and one-eighth by population. Reference is made to section 1 of the act of June 18, 1934, to insure that, so far as highways are concerned, not less than 25 percent of the apportionment to any State may be applied to secondary or farm-to-market roads.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Would the Senator be willing to accept an amendment in the way of a new section, to read as follows?

That reclamation projects and public-buildings projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution shall be carried out under the direction of the respective permanent Government departments or agencies having jurisdiction of such projects, and the performance of all contracts in connection with such projects shall be subject to the supervision and control of such departments or agencies.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I prefer not to accept such an amendment. I prefer not to do so upon basis of the argument made a day or two ago by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], who very pertinently pointed out that the enactment of such a provision would prevent the Federal Emergency Works Administration doing any reclamation work.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment which I am now proposing would be that the reclamation projects proper only should be carried on in this way—not undertakings which were not reclamation projects. How could it be said to be unwise for the Reclamation Service to do the work to which it has been assigned for years and with which it is familiar?

Mr. HAYDEN. Has the Senator heard of any proposal to take away from the Reclamation Service that duty?

Mr. BORAH. Has the Senator from Arizona heard of any proposition to take road construction work away from the Bureau of Roads?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have directed the attention of the Senate to proposals for the construction of great interstate express highways to be built by a Federal bureaucracy, and not by the States. I propose to see that that does not occur; but I have heard nothing to indicate that the United States Reclamation Service is to be deprived of its usual jurisdiction.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to incorporate in the act that which would be objectionable under the argument of the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], but I desire to have incorporated in the act a provision which would make

it necessary that reclamation work be performed by the Reclamation Service. That certainly would be wise.

Mr. HAYDEN. As the Senator from Nevada pointed out the other day, in his State certain work was done by others which normally would be undertaken by the Reclamation Service, such as the drilling of wells or the cleaning of certain ditches, and things of that kind; but it was done with transient labor. If the language the Senator from Idaho proposes in his amendment would prohibit the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which has jurisdiction over transient labor, from doing anything in the nature of reclamation, then his amendment should not be adopted. That would also be true of the other items as he has listed them in his proposed amendment.

Mr. BORAH. What the Senator's amendment seems to do is to separate the work to be done under the road appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Because such work never has been done by the Federal Government.

Mr. BORAH. Neither has the reclamation work. It has always been conducted by the Reclamation Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; but the Reclamation Service is an agency of the Federal Government, whereas the State highway departments are the agencies of the States, and I am making that clear distinction.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. What is the significance of the reference to predetermined wages on page 3, in lines 22 to 25?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will remember that prior to 2 years ago the so-called "prevailing-wage rule" applied to all highway construction, and there were continuous disputes as to what was the prevailing wage in the locality where the contract had to be undertaken. The men who were building a road on a desert where nobody was living insisted that there was no prevailing wage in the locality. In order to avoid that situation, 2 years ago, at my suggestion, the Congress adopted an amendment which was first brought to my attention, by the way, by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY], that each State highway department should for that State predetermine the scale of wages. That is exactly what has been done. The scale is included in the offering of bids; the scale is included in the contract, that so much must be paid to the common laborer, so much to the truck driver, and so much to the steam-shovel man. Failure by the contractor to pay that scale is a breach of the contract, with the result that we have had complete satisfaction with respect to the rate of wages paid to road labor throughout the Nation.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Where States have laws requiring the payment of the prevailing wage will those laws govern?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the rule that governs, so far as Federal funds expended on State highways is concerned, is the scale predetermined by the State highway departments. All the President has to do in this instance is to look at 48 scales of wages on file in Washington and then determine what is the proper rate for each State.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Is this portion of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona necessary in view of the amendment already adopted by the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; because the amendment adopted by the Senate has in mind the prevailing scale of wages, whereas the amendment now offered proposes definitely to get away from that by providing for a predetermined scale. It has worked perfectly in every State; there has been no complaint from any source.

I might state to the Senate that this amendment has been submitted to every State highway department in the Union. They are entirely satisfied as to its workability. The joint resolution has been pending for a long time, and so I had opportunity to see that the amendment was sent out to the State highway departments for criticism and approval. They all say it is perfectly workable and is entirely satisfactory to them.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to ask the Senator if his amendment would not discontinue the policy of the Federal Government making the entire contribution for emergency road construction?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no; there is not a dollar covered by my amendment but what is a direct grant from the Federal Government, not a cent of which has to be matched.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It does not have to be matched?

Mr. HAYDEN. It does not.

Mr. TRAMMELL. We adopted that policy in 1933 and have continued it up to the present time.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no change in that policy. The amendment refers back to the act which provides that there shall be no matching of this fund.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have had no opportunity to check up all the references, but if the amendment goes back to the original act of 1916 and omits the later act of 1921 and makes no reference to the act of 1933 on the question of the distribution of the fund it will revert back to the old plan of matching 50-50.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will notice on page 2 of the amendment reference is made to "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." Under that section the money would not have to be matched. That feature has been carefully checked by every State highway department, and all agree that that is perfectly clear.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to thank the Senator for that information. I think it is a very vital matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. TRAMMELL. During this emergency and the present condition of most of the States it would be practically impossible for many of them to match on the old system of a 50-50 basis, and I am delighted that the Senator's amendment continues the policy of the act of 1933, not requiring the States to match on a 50-50 basis.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, upon reflection, I do not see how with any great degree of consistency I could vote against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona, but I should not think that any Senator who voted to eliminate the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], approved by the committee and favorably reported by the committee, could with any degree of consistency vote for the amendment now proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. It proposes to set aside one particular sort of work for a particular sort of preferment as against all other kinds of work. I am not going to vote against it, because I think that ought to be done as to all projects, but the so-called "Steiber amendment" provided that it should be so done, and the Senate, understanding the committee reported the Steiber amendment favorably, voted to strike it out. So I do not see how any Senator on this floor who voted to strike out the Steiber amendment can with any degree of consistency vote for the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, to read as follows:

*Provided further*, That rivers and harbors projects, reclamation projects, and public-buildings projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution shall be carried out under the direction of the respective permanent Government departments or agencies having jurisdiction of such projects, and the performance of all contracts in connection with such projects shall be subject to the supervision and control of such departments or agencies.

As a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President, I ask if that amendment would be in the third degree?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the occupant of the chair, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho, having been finally acted upon by the Senate, it is not in order to present it again to the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Chair to consider that I have changed the amendment? It is not the same amendment. I have changed it by striking out "Federal public-road projects", inserting the words "*Provided further*", and beginning with "rivers and harbors projects", so that it is not the same amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order so far as being in the second degree is concerned. It is not in the third degree, and therefore if the amendment is in order at all it is in order as an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. HAYDEN. May I suggest to the Senator that he is not offering the amendment in exactly the same language as finally proposed by the Senator from Oregon? He will note that the amendment had reference to permanent departments. If I remember correctly, the Senator from Oregon said "or existing agencies", because some agencies are not permanent.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator desire to have the words "existing agencies" inserted?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not think the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, which is a temporary agency, should be prohibited from taking men out to work on a country road or to do some reclamation work, such as was referred to by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I will insert the words "existing agencies", and I hope the Senator now will accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The final objection which the Senator from Nevada made to the proposal by the Senator from Oregon was that the enactment of the legislation would prohibit the President from creating any new agencies to do such work. Does the Senator desire to accomplish that purpose, to prohibit the President from establishing any new agencies?

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly willing to accept almost any amendment that will accomplish the purpose, but I want the permanent agencies, such as the Reclamation Service and other agencies, to be permitted to carry on the work which really belongs to them.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe the Senator is unduly alarmed. The President stated positively to the members of the Committee on Appropriations who visited him that he firmly intended to use all existing agencies of the Government. The President never has done anything else, and for that reason the amendment is not necessary.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. All the Senator has said about reclamation work is emphatically true with respect to rivers and harbors work. After many years of difficult development we have finally perfected our river and harbor formula under the Board of Engineers in the War Department in a fashion that ought not to be wrecked in any particular or jeopardized in connection with any of the responsibilities in relation to river and harbor work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator from Michigan say it has been wrecked or jeopardized?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Michigan does not say so, but he does say that when we affirmatively decline to recognize the jurisdiction of the United States Board of Engineers with reference to river and harbor work, there must be some reason for it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a distinct recollection of the high praise the President gave to the Army engineers.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the objection to saying so?

Mr. HAYDEN. Only that the language of the proposal made by the Senator from Idaho as it is written, as I understand it, prohibits the establishment of any new kind of agency.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why does the Senator want a new agency to carry on river and harbor work?

Mr. HAYDEN. We do not want to establish a new agency for that particular purpose.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the Senator ought distinctly to recall that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]

contended that the word "permanent" was not intended to be a qualification of "agencies", and that he was perfectly willing so to modify his amendment as to make it still more clear that it did not qualify "agencies", so that the President would be authorized to establish new agencies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?  
Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will accept the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. These matters ought to be left with the respective departments and agencies. Exactly the same principle applies. I think river and harbor projects ought to be left with the War Department, and I think reclamation work ought to be left with the Reclamation Service.

Mr. GLASS. I do not understand that is embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Idaho has offered the committee amendment including that particular item.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. This matter was discussed at some length in the Senate on Saturday. I understood that at the conclusion of the discussion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], who were the two Senators who participated in the discussion and were very much interested in it, they had some conferences as to changing the language. I think if the amendment of the Senator from Idaho could be withdrawn for a few minutes until the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Idaho had a chance to discuss the matter, an agreement might be reached. The language of the section to which there was objection related particularly to Federal road projects and reclamation projects where in each case the F. E. R. A., or any organization which succeeded it, might desire to do work which would not come within the scope of the ordinary reclamation projects or the Federal aid projects, and it was felt that they should not be precluded from doing that kind of work.

There is no desire to interfere with the existing departments or organizations in carrying on such work as rivers and harbors or regular reclamation projects. If that be true, I think there will be no difficulty in arriving at an agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The difficulty in withdrawing the amendment at the moment is that in the parliamentary situation we may not have an opportunity again to offer it, except that it be offered as an amendment to the amendment at this particular point.

Mr. BYRNES. I think if the Senator from Idaho would modify his amendment so as to provide, in line 25, "insofar as practicable" and at the end of the section add the words "upon which jurisdiction is conferred", it would be in accord with the views of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have in my hand a copy of the measure upon which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER] has been making notes and apparently his notes correspond with the language which the Senator from South Carolina has just suggested.

Mr. BYRNES. I had a copy of it on my desk, and that is why I suggested it.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if I may interject, if the matter may be adjusted by conference, why not withdraw the whole proposition for the time being? There are three other amendments to be offered and considered. After the Senators have agreed upon language which they believe the Senate would accept, then the amendment may be offered.

Mr. HAYDEN. I see no reason why it should not be offered as a new and substantive proposition.

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator from Michigan will persuade the Senator from Idaho to accept the language of the proposed amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER], who was the original proponent of the section, I believe there will be no objection to it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, when this question came up the other day I at first insisted that section 10 ought not to be rejected, on the ground that I did not propose to make it possible that river and harbor work, now being done under the War Department and under the competent and efficient Board of Army Engineers, could be placed under some other jurisdiction, such, for instance, as the P. W. A. I insisted that section 10 was sound and ought to remain in the joint resolution.

After the discussion the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] said there was no danger whatever of river and harbor work being transferred to the P. W. A. or any other organization, but it was to be done under the War Department and the Board of Engineers. That was thoroughly understood. It was that feature of the matter in which I was particularly interested.

After a further reflection, I think the President will do precisely what section 10 provides and therefore I think it is not very important one way or the other, either to put it in or leave it out. I have no objection to section 10. I suggested to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] that in line 23 the words "wherever practicable" ought to be inserted, and he agreed to that suggestion. That is the suggestion now made here. It was my suggestion and not the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. STEIWER]. The Senator from Nevada agreed to it at the time and said he had no objection to it.

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then, why does not the Senator say he is willing to have those words inserted.

I was saying, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, this is precisely what the President will do in carrying out the work referred to in section 10. After considering the matter, I do not believe it is important either to strike out the language or to leave it in. I think it is practically immaterial, although I have no objection to putting in the language. I certainly felt concerned, particularly about river and harbor work, at the beginning, because I know there has been some interference there, and I did not like that prospect. That work ought to be left to the War Department.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator believe that if there are not some prohibitions in the joint resolution, and if this matter is left entirely to the discretion of the President, certain influences—and I do not mean to imply that they are improper influences—may be brought to bear upon him to persuade him to assign the work to some other organization? If we believe that this work ought to be done by the Reclamation Service, by the Public Roads Service, and by the engineers of the War Department, why not say so? What is the objection to the legislative branch of the Government putting into the law those things which they believe to be proper, and which they desire to have carried into effect?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I think that is quite pertinent and quite sound reasoning. It is perfectly well that such a provision should go into the law, except that there is some confusion here about the use of words, and I do not think we ought to run any risk on that score. Some people think the word "permanent" does not apply to agencies and does not apply to departments. I do not care whether it does or not. I do not think the word "permanent" applies to agencies at all in this language, and I cannot see why there should be a difference of opinion about it; but, rather than have confusion in language and difference of opinion about the meaning of words, I felt that we could just as well leave it out entirely, because I believe this is exactly what the President will do.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Senator was so intent that there should be no misunderstanding about the matter that he voted, along with the

chairman of the committee and others, to retain the Steiwer amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. GLASS. And I think most Senators voted that way; but there was defective hearing and mathematics elsewhere.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was in favor of that amendment, as I have said. I was opposed to the motion to strike it out. I still am in favor of it. I have no objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho. At the same time, I say that I do not believe it is vital, because I believe it provides for exactly what the President will do.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire now to offer the amendment as it has been discussed between the State of Nevada and the State of Idaho. [Laughter.] I ask the clerk to take it down, because I shall have to read it:

Rivers and harbors projects, reclamation projects (except the drilling of wells, development of springs, and subsurface water), and public-buildings projects undertaken pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution shall be carried out under the direction of the respective permanent Government departments or agencies having jurisdiction of such projects, and the performance of all contracts in connection with such projects shall be subject to the supervision and control of such departments or agencies.

Mr. FLETCHER. I cannot see any connection between river and harbor projects and reclamation projects.

Mr. BORAH. There is no connection between them.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. As to river and harbor and reclamation projects, as I understand the amendment, I have no objection to it. As to public-buildings projects, the definition of public buildings including buildings, for instance, at a navy yard or an Army post or at a subsistence homestead, if such buildings had to be repaired, under this amendment, the work would have to be done under what department or agency? I have not a copy of the amendment before me, and therefore I have to ask the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the amendment in that respect is the same as the amendment printed in House Joint Resolution 117; but I confess that I am not particularly interested in the public-buildings phase of the amendment. I am only interested in the reclamation projects. Others are interested in the river and harbor projects.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that my only fear is as to that one classification. I should not want to restrict the measure too greatly in respect to the construction of buildings, other than courthouses, which are not to be constructed under any system other than contract and by the Treasury Department. I do not desire to have the language too broad. I wonder if the Senator will eliminate public buildings. Then I shall have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that the repair of buildings and barracks always has been done under the jurisdiction of the War Department. The Treasury Department has never bothered with that. This is a proposal to commit these matters to the departments having jurisdiction of them.

Mr. BYRNES. I think, then, there is no sound objection to the amendment. If there should be, we can ascertain it in conference, and the matter can be straightened out there.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. BORAH. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to which I ask the attention of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution, it is proposed to insert:

The sanitary plumbing work performed in connection with the building construction work undertaken under and by virtue of the authority granted in this resolution shall be let separately by contract to the lowest qualified bidder.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to consume unnecessary time. A day or two ago the Senate refused to agree to section 8, which was a committee amendment, because the language of the amendment was entirely too broad. The amendment as now presented represents what I believe to be a satisfactory and sound arrangement.

Mr. GLASS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter, in the nature of a memorandum, relating to the amendment.

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MASTER PLUMBERS  
OF THE UNITED STATES (INCORPORATED),  
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1935.

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

DEAR SENATOR ROBINSON: Many thanks for your consideration and courtesy extended this afternoon when I visited you in company with Mr. M. J. McDonough, president of the Building Trades Employees.

Complying with your recommendation that I give you a brief summary of reasons why we believe the Senate should adopt the proposed amendment to the works-relief bill, I respectfully submit you the following:

1. Unless the bill provides that sanitary mechanical construction work (plumbing) be let by contract, we believe the present tendency of most of the governmental agencies to purchase their own materials, and hire their own labor, will be continued.

2. When the Government purchases its own materials and hires its own labor, the retail branch of the industry does not have an opportunity of participating.

3. It is our understanding that the works-relief bill will provide funds for the erection of public buildings and various construction projects. Unless this work is let separately by contract, only the manufacturers, wholesalers, and labor will be benefited. The retailer will be eliminated.

4. As an important factor in the building industry, and as taxpayers, we believe it to be unfair to eliminate one of the divisions of an industry.

5. There is no economy effected by the elimination of the contractor in the plumbing industry. When work is let on a contract basis, an economy is actually effected. The reason for this is because the contractor carefully selects his employees and supervises their work in an efficient manner. This comes as a result of the contractor's many years of experience.

6. Aside from our belief that we should participate in a share of the "recovery dollar", there is an even greater motive for the letting of plumbing construction work by separate contract to the lowest qualified bidder: This is the intimate relationship that exists between plumbing and public health.

7. When plumbing is installed by irresponsible or unqualified mechanics, health hazards of major proportions are created. A recent notable evidence of this is found in the 1933 Chicago epidemic of amoebic dysentery.

8. Most States, and practically all cities, have laws and regulations covering the installation of plumbing. The experience of the past 2 years in relief-work projects is that there is a decided tendency to set aside existing laws that apply to our industry, and not to take them into consideration when work is constructed.

9. Many cases have reached our attention whereby State and local plumbing inspectors have attempted to carry out existing plumbing laws and regulations, only to be told that they were without authority on Federal projects.

In short, unless an amendment of the type we propose is adopted, we believe that there will be created a menace to public health. Further, as a result of our inability to participate in recovery work, unemployment will be created to a substantial extent.

The plumbing industry in the United States is very large in normal times. There are over 25,000 plumbing contractors (master plumbers) ordinarily engaged in the business of the industry. These master plumbers employ about 150,000 journeymen plumbers, and apprentices. The normal volume of the industry is in excess of \$2,000,000,000.

We are already in a chaotic condition, suffering from a severe depression. Frankly we are close to the breaking point. But the greater majority of our members have confidence in the admin-

istration, and they are looking forward with great hope and expectation to the relief program that appears to be in sight.

All our amendment does is guarantee these members of our industry the opportunity of participating in and being helped by the program the administration has planned; it guarantees the people of the Nation value received for public improvements, and protects them against undue hazards to public health.

Very sincerely,

JOSEPH D. GRIGSBY.

OUR NEW PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The sanitary plumbing work in connection with the building construction work undertaken under and by virtue of the authority granted in this resolution shall be let separately by contract to the lowest qualified bidder.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, there is on the clerk's desk an amendment which I proposed last Thursday, and which I ask to have stated.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to allow me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the amendment I have sent to the desk, and which I now offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 3, after the word "Agencies", it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 10. (a) Not less than \$500,000,000 of the sum appropriated by this act shall be utilized for the construction, preservation, or improvement of school houses, and buildings used exclusively or principally for educational purposes.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, this amendment concisely and clearly discloses its purpose. But there are unusual reasons why this purpose should be promptly effectuated which do not speak for themselves. These reasons are to be found in the melancholy history of the unparalleled depression that devastated the country from 1929 until 1933. The recent panic which generally paralyzed the building industry has been especially disastrous to the Nation's program of school-building construction.

In the short period of 3 years—from 1930 to 1933—the construction work on school buildings decreased 73 percent, or at the average rate of more than 24 percent a year. The impairment of the efficiency and the injury to the educational system which the rural school districts have suffered in this matter are beyond the possibility of exaggeration. While our school-building activities have diminished at an alarming rate, the demand for additional school facilities has increased as it never increased before.

By virtue of the benign National Recovery Act the curse of child labor has been eradicated from this country. Consequently, hundreds of thousands of boys and girls who, because of their employment in industry, formerly presented no perplexing problems to school authorities are now eager, deserving, persistent seekers for the blessings of free-school education. Unhappily, the insufficiency of school buildings

makes it impossible to provide these multitudes of underprivileged children the educational opportunities which they desire, and have the undoubted right to receive.

A recent survey made by the Office of Education in the Department of the Interior shows that a sum exceeding \$600,000,000 is needed for school-building construction. A survey of available public-works projects made by the Public Works Administration shows that almost a billion dollars is needed for school-building construction throughout the country.

But the pending amendment asks for neither of these sums from the extraordinary appropriation which the Senate has already approved. The amendment seeks to have only \$500,000,000 of the appropriation utilized for school-building construction.

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

Mr. NEELY. Gladly.

Mr. BONE. I shall have to leave the Chamber in a moment, and I am very anxious to hear an explanation of one phase of the joint resolution. The amendment offered by the Senator refers only to schoolhouses and buildings. I have had a great deal of correspondence about the pressing need of teachers.

Mr. NEELY. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING] will soon offer an amendment that will provide relief for the teachers.

Mr. BONE. May I intrude on the Senator's time for a moment?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. On page 3 of the joint resolution, in lines 15 and 16, appears the allowance of \$300,000,000 for projects for professional and clerical persons. I wonder if that would be broad enough to cover what the Senator from New Mexico has in mind.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. CUTTING. I do not feel, myself, that the language referred to by the Senator from Washington is clear enough to make certain the carrying out of the things which I desire to have carried out. There might be some doubt about the construction of that language, and I believe that the Congress ought to make it entirely clear just what they want to do with regard to the public schools of the United States. I call Senators attention to the fact that if we do not take action at this time, there will be some three and a half million children out of school next year.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, some of the outstanding reasons why the amendment should be adopted are impressively stated in a summary which is now before me, and which was supplied the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN] by an official of the Office of Education in the Department of the Interior. This summary is as follows:

ESTIMATE OF SCHOOL BUILDING NEEDS REPORTED TO THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION BY STATE AND CITY SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS, DECEMBER 1934

Reports from half the States and half the cities of 2,500 population and over show that there is need for the construction of 12,793 school-building projects, at an estimated cost of \$625,999,022. These data were received in answer to a questionnaire by the Office of Education as of December 1934. Returns from State departments of education in 24 States showed that 9,628 school-building projects at an estimated cost of \$241,285,254 are needed in rural areas, and returns from 1,026 cities of 2,500 population and over, or 52 percent of the number to which the questionnaire was sent, show that 2,965 building projects at an estimated cost of \$384,713,768 are needed in urban areas.

The schools of the country are in desperate need of these buildings for the following reasons:

1. From 1930 to 1933 school-building construction dropped 73 percent. Lack of money since 1930 to make necessary repairs on school buildings, many of which were obsolescent before that date, has increased the dangers of postponing needed school-building construction. While the \$125,000,000 allotted by the P. W. A. for school buildings helped the situation in a number of places, it has only made a beginning in catching up with the need.

2. The conditions arising out of the depression, coupled with the excellent provisions of the National Recovery Act prohibiting child labor, have thrown back upon the schools an army of boys and girls between 14 and 18 years of age who formerly did not attend any school. However, the public schools have neither the buildings, the equipment, nor funds to take care of the 2,500,000 children between 14 and 18 years of age who are neither in school nor able to find work. Efforts are being made through transient

camp, C. C. C. camps, youth organizations, etc., to meet this problem, but little has been done to enable the one agency whose job it is to provide education and recreation for this group to meet this situation. A school-building program is essential if this emergency is to be met by the public schools.

The attention of the friends of labor is particularly invited to the next paragraph of this summary.

Not only are the schools in need of school buildings but the workers in the building trades are in need of jobs. In 1929 there were 2,444,610 workers in the building trades. In December 1934, 619,058 were employed in the building trades. There is no type of building project of a socially desirable character requiring skilled workers which could put so many men to work as the construction of school buildings. It is estimated that a \$600,000,000 school-building program would give employment to 300,000 workers in the building trades.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REYNOLDS in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In support of the helpful and illuminating statement being made by my friend the able Senator from West Virginia, I wish to say that I have in my hands certain tables, furnished by the Office of Education in the Department of the Interior, with reference to the subject the Senator from West Virginia is now discussing. I trust he will permit me, at the close of his remarks, to have these tables inserted in the RECORD. They represent results obtained by the Office of Education from surveys referred to in the report which the Senator has brought to our attention.

These surveys, reported in separate tables, show the estimated cost and number of school-building projects needed in urban and rural areas, also the school-building needs in certain rural areas in 24 States, and the school-building needs in cities of 2,500 population and over in various States of the Union.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia will be very much obliged to the distinguished Senator from Colorado if he will now read to the Senate the tables to which he has referred.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, the tables are as follows:

TABLE I.—Total estimated number and cost of school-building projects needed in urban and rural areas, by States, as of December 1934

State	Total number projects	Total estimated cost	Urban		Rural	
			Number projects	Estimated cost	Number projects	Estimated cost
Total.....	12,615	\$621,781,722	2,919	\$382,137,768	9,775	\$239,643,754
Alabama.....	77	5,666,412	77	5,666,412		
Arizona.....	11	210,700	11	210,700		
Arkansas.....	50	788,500	50	788,500		
California.....	2,358	50,927,120	358	35,927,120	2,000	15,000,000
Colorado.....	547	7,313,200	22	2,546,200	525	4,767,000
Connecticut.....	92	9,378,500	32	5,128,500	60	4,250,000
Delaware.....	8	5,050,000	8	5,050,000		
District of Columbia.....	22	2,985,000	22	2,985,000		
Florida.....	758	18,548,874	253	10,126,265	505	8,422,609
Georgia.....	3,781	12,157,371	81	5,157,371	3,700	7,000,000
Illinois.....	88	19,064,200	88	19,064,200		
Indiana.....	72	17,451,320	72	9,451,320		8,000,000
Iowa.....	40	4,625,100	40	4,625,100		
Kansas.....	29	4,340,000	29	4,340,000		
Kentucky.....	665	26,209,000	53	6,302,500	612	19,906,500
Louisiana.....	78	5,650,300	78	650,300		5,000,000
Maine.....	271	7,394,646	21	1,394,646	250	6,000,000
Maryland.....	78	2,799,400			78	2,799,400
Massachusetts.....	168	31,726,729	119	28,926,729	49	2,800,000
Michigan.....	639	51,926,475	139	26,926,475	500	25,000,000
Minnesota.....	58	7,522,500	36	5,922,500	22	1,600,000
Mississippi.....	58	1,766,516	58	1,766,516		
Missouri.....	111	8,277,200	111	8,277,200		
Montana.....	155	2,728,000	5	328,000	150	2,400,000
Nebraska.....	19	2,395,500	19	2,395,500		
Nevada.....	1	75,000	1	75,000		
New Jersey.....	92	30,154,350	92	30,154,350		
New Mexico.....	17	1,163,800	17	1,163,800		
New York.....	169	92,678,841	169	92,678,841		
North Carolina.....	57	2,145,500	57	2,145,500		
North Dakota.....	6	1,032,300	6	1,032,300		
Ohio.....	203	24,140,210	162	19,454,465	41	4,685,745
Oklahoma.....	254	12,710,123	104	5,210,123	150	7,500,000
Oregon.....	193	6,230,000	18	1,480,000	175	4,750,000
Pennsylvania.....		80,000,000				80,000,000
Rhode Island.....	5	592,000	5	592,000		
South Carolina.....	27	830,000	27	830,000		
South Dakota.....	1	62,000	1	62,000		
Tennessee.....	356	11,756,000	32	2,319,000	324	9,437,000
Texas.....	231	12,464,761	231	12,464,761		
Utah.....	20	1,522,500	20	1,522,500		
Vermont.....	7	830,800	7	830,800		
Virginia.....	75	3,734,000	75	3,734,000		
Washington.....	208	12,006,000	48	2,924,000	160	9,082,000
West Virginia.....	94	7,743,500			94	7,743,500
Wisconsin.....	353	12,762,274	73	9,262,274	280	3,500,000
Wyoming.....	13	245,000	13	245,000		

TABLE II.—Estimates of school building needs in rural areas in 22 States, submitted by State departments of education, as of December 1934

State	Number of building projects needed	Total estimated cost of building projects
California.....	2,000	\$15,000,000
Colorado.....	525	4,767,000
Connecticut.....	60	4,250,000
Florida.....	505	8,422,609
Georgia.....	3,700	7,000,000
Indiana.....		8,000,000
Kentucky.....	612	19,906,500
Louisiana.....		5,000,000
Maine.....	250	6,000,000
Maryland.....	78	2,799,400
Massachusetts.....	49	2,800,000
Michigan.....	500	25,000,000

TABLE II.—Estimates of school building needs in rural areas in 22 States, submitted by State departments of education, as of December 1934—Continued

State	Number of building projects needed	Total estimated cost of building projects
Minnesota.....	22	\$1,600,000
Montana.....	150	2,400,000
Ohio.....	41	4,685,745
Oklahoma.....	150	7,500,000
Oregon.....	175	4,750,000
Pennsylvania.....		80,000,000
Tennessee.....	324	9,437,000
Washington.....	160	9,082,000
West Virginia.....	94	7,743,500
Wisconsin.....	280	3,500,000
Total for 22 States.....	9,775	239,643,754

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, I wish to add that I am deeply interested both in the argument and in the subject now being persuasively presented by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that the tables which my eminent friend from Colorado has so kindly read "have no tongue", they nevertheless speak with "most miraculous organ" in favor of the pending amendment. In view of the crying necessities which are demonstrated by the figures supplied by the able Senator from the West, who could ever hope to justify the casting of a vote against the amendment and the relief which it proposes for the distressed school districts of the Nation, and the hundreds of thousands of children who are pleading in vain for an opportunity to go to school?

The amendment, if adopted, will materially help to solve the problem of agonizing unemployment. It is estimated that the expenditure of the sum of \$500,000,000 for school-building construction will directly result in the employment of 250,000 workmen who, through no fault of their own, have been without jobs almost continuously ever since 1929.

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

Mr. NEELY. With great pleasure.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Would not the adoption of the amendment also result in the employment of much indirect labor—perhaps an equal number?

Mr. NEELY. Undoubtedly; and also the sale of great quantities of building material. In turn, the manufacture of such material would require the employment of armies of workers in the various enterprises which are related to the building industry.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President, some recent estimates which I have seen indicate that surveys will be required in advance of the construction of such buildings, and that approximately 45,000 white-collar workers outside of those to be engaged as workers on these buildings would also be given employment.

Mr. NEELY. All which is well said and undoubtedly true. Furthermore when the buildings shall have been constructed, by virtue of the adoption of the amendment, thousands of idle school teachers who have been without employment for 5 or 6 years will be again placed on the pay roll and afforded an opportunity to serve their country, by educating its children and preparing them for the duties of life.

Lyman Beecher, one of the most brilliant ministers that New England ever produced, in an address entitled "Necessity for Education", a part of which appears in one of the old McGuffey readers, says:

We must educate! We must educate! Or we must perish by our own prosperity. If we do not, short will be our race from the cradle to the grave. If in our haste to be rich and mighty we outrun our literary and religious institutions, they will never overtake us; or only come up after the battle for liberty is fought and lost, as spoils to grace the victory, and as resources of inexorable despotism for the perpetuity of our bondage.

How applicable are Mr. Beecher's words to the situation which confronts this Nation today. How deaf is he who does not hear them. How indifferent is he who does not heed them.

This Congress has appropriated almost a billion dollars for military purposes. Let it not insult every school teacher and school child in the country by refusing to make available half that sum for educational facilities. Let us not continue to make our educational system a pauper and our military establishment a prince.

After the Franco-Prussian War a great Frenchman said, in effect, not Germany's arms but her superior school system enabled her to vanquish all the forces of France. Let us learn a lesson from the sad experience of our friends across the sea and profit by the Frenchman's terse comment upon his country's loss of a great war.

Let us understand that ignorance is a greater menace to the peace and happiness of the American people than any foreign foe ever has been or ever will be. Let us learn once for all that it is better to build churches and schoolhouses than it is to build battleships and military fortifications;

that it is wiser and safer to send our children to school than it is to send our boys to war. Let us provide the means of teaching the young women and men of this land that it is more righteous to live for one's country and win for humanity the lasting victories of peace than it is to glory in the "images of camps and sieges and battles" and waste the wealth of the Nation in preparing for war. Let us take the first step toward a brighter and a better future by adopting the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a telegram from the State superintendent of schools of West Virginia and a letter from the president and the secretary of the National Education Association.

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

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1935.

The Honorable MATTHEW M. NEELY,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEELY: The National Education Association wishes to commend you for your proposed amendment to Joint Resolution 117, which calls for the utilization of \$500,000,000 for the construction, preservation, or improvement of school buildings. As you know, independent surveys and estimates by the United States Office of Education and the National Education Association have already clearly shown that at least this sum of money could be wisely spent immediately for the relief of unemployment through the construction of necessary school buildings.

During the past 5 years the normal program of school-building construction has come practically to a standstill. Almost no new buildings have been constructed; yet the total enrollment in the public schools has continued to increase. The studies to which we have referred show clearly that the school-building problem is not confined to any particular part of the country. The need exists in New England, Middle West, South, and far West.

Federal funds for the construction of school housing would help materially to:

1. Relieve insanitary, overcrowded conditions in thousands of school buildings.
  2. Improve instruction by making it possible to organize classes of normal size.
  3. Discontinue the use of hundreds of schoolhouses, already condemned by public health departments or fire marshals, which daily menace the health and the safety of some 700,000 school children.
  4. Discontinue half-day sessions and give some 400,000 children a more normal educational opportunity.
  5. Discontinue the use of portable shacks, rented buildings, and other substitutes for schools now used by about 600,000 children.
  6. Increase the efficiency and economy of rural schools. Some 16,000 could be quickly established in areas which are ready to consolidate, but which cannot do so now for lack of funds.
- For what other type of public work can greater returns in human values be secured?

Very cordially yours,

H. L. SMITH,  
President National Education Association.  
WILLARD E. GIVENS,  
Secretary National Education Association.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., March 13, 1935.

HON. M. M. NEELY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Boards of education, service clubs, parent-teachers associations, chambers of commerce, school administrators, and teachers join me in asking that part of appropriation for new work relief be earmarked for construction of school building. Federal aid for school buildings imperative to welfare of children and school progress in West Virginia. County and State funds insufficient.

W. W. TRENT,  
State Superintendent of Schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. CUTTING. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Adams	Brown	Couzens	Glass
Austin	Bulkley	Cutting	Guffey
Bachman	Bulow	Dickinson	Hale
Bailey	Burke	Dieterich	Hatch
Bankhead	Byrnes	Donahay	Hayden
Barbour	Capper	Duffy	Johnson
Barkley	Carey	Fletcher	Keyes
Bilbo	Clark	Frazier	Kling
Black	Connally	George	La Follette
Bone	Copeland	Gerry	Logan
Borah	Costigan	Gibson	Logan

McAdoo	Murphy	Russell	Trammell
McCarran	Murray	Schall	Truman
McGill	Neely	Schwellenbach	Tydings
McKellar	Norbeck	Sheppard	Vandenberg
McNary	Nye	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Maloney	Pope	Stelwer	Walsh
Metcalf	Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Minton	Reynolds	Thomas, Utah	White
Moore	Robinson	Townsend	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the pending amendment, contenting myself with calling attention to a few facts.

This is a proposal to expend a half billion dollars for the erection or preservation or improvement of schoolhouses in the country. It differs from other allocations in that it causes such expenditure to take a preferential position over all other expenditures. In other words, for the other allocations expenditure may be made or it may not be made, but under the amendment now proposed half a billion dollars must be expended on schoolhouses.

The only other observation which I care to make—and it seems needless, because Senators can perceive it for themselves—is that it projects the Federal Government, in a tremendous way and at a tremendous pace, into the educational affairs of the States. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I should like merely to say a few words, not desiring to delay the vote—and I wish to join the Senator from Virginia in asking for a yea-and-nay vote. With scarcely a murmur to disturb the placid serenity of the proceedings of this body we voted nearly a billion dollars this year for the Army and Navy. I think I merely express what is in the hearts of millions of people when I suggest the propriety, not to say the absolute wisdom, of preserving, at all costs, our school system, because if that fails us in this emergency we are, indeed, in a sad predicament.

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

Mr. BONE. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. While the Federal Government has built battleships, has it ever built schoolhouses?

Mr. BONE. I think it is high time that we consider our educational system, instead of giving all our time to the consideration of battleships. There will not be any civilization worth preserving if our educational system shall go on the rocks.

Mr. HAYDEN. After all, the fact remains that, while the Federal Government has loaned money for this purpose, the amendment proposes a direct gift to a project which is preferred over all other activities provided for in the joint resolution.

Mr. BONE. I do not want to make any argument; I merely want to content myself with expressing my own honest convictions on this subject. I know there is a tragic condition confronting our school system, and I do not believe the Congress of the United States can longer blink at that situation; we have got to look it squarely in the face. We have either got to determine that we are going to support our educational system or let it go on the rocks, when we are spending 50 percent of our revenues for war; that is, we are allocating that much of the Federal money for war.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I gathered from the remarks made by the Senator from Washington that he was interested not only in the physical facilities for education but in the maintenance and the protection and preservation of the school system. If I read the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia correctly, it provides exclusively for the expenditure of half a billion dollars for construction purposes, which, in my view, will not meet the situation, although I recognize that there could well be an improvement of the physical properties provided for educational purposes. However, many of the States and localities are finding it difficult, if not impossible, to keep their present facilities in

operation; and it seems to me the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, while appealing in its general aspects, specifically does not go to the heart of the situation with which the public educational system of the United States is confronted.

Mr. BONE. I realize that there is merit in what the Senator from Wisconsin suggests, but I am advised that the pending amendment is to be followed by an amendment to be offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING]. I know in my State and in many other States, as is made evident by the table submitted by the Senator from West Virginia, and also by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], that there is a great need now for the rehabilitation of the schools. There are literally millions of youngsters now of school age who are not afforded proper equipment for their education.

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

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was wondering whether it is not a fact, from our observation here, that the so-called "collapse" of our educational system, if it may be called that, has not involved so much a collapse of the physical facilities for education as it has along other lines. As I recall, a year or two ago we were compelled to vote money out of the Federal Treasury to pay school teachers; and there are many other unfortunate aspects of education which have come about as a result of the depression and the inability of local communities to raise funds or issue bonds for school purposes, and which are not necessarily involved in the physical facilities for education. It may be that in many communities, under the law which has already been put in effect, many loans have been made to schools, districts, and counties and cities to build high schools and common schools and other school facilities. They have not, however, so far as I recall, in any case asked that aid be extended as a gift.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I was impressed by the idea expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. It seems to me the whole subject ought to be given special study before we adopt an amendment of this kind. I think what are needed more than school buildings are the primary facilities for education. As Chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have had pressure brought upon me to provide relief money for textbooks, and I have had exhibited to me worn out and tattered textbooks unfit for use, which in many parts of the country the schools are obliged to use. So if we are going into this field of relief, it does not seem to me now is the time to do so; we ought not to begin with erecting buildings, but we ought to begin with supplying the basic needs of the pupils of the schools. The whole subject should be especially studied before we adopt amendments relating to only one aspect of this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. GLASS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOGAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

I wish further to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has a general pair with the Senator

from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. I am not advised as to how these Senators would vote on this question.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 44, as follows:

## YEAS—33

Bailey	Couzens	McCarran	Shipstead
Bilbo	Cutting	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Black	Dieterich	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Donahay	Neely	Vandenberg
Borah	Frazier	Norbeck	Wheeler
Burke	George	Nye	White
Capper	Hatch	Russell	
Copeland	Johnson	Schall	
Costigan	McAdoo	Schwellenbach	

## NAYS—44

Adams	Clark	Keyes	Radcliffe
Austin	Connally	King	Reynolds
Bachman	Dickinson	La Follette	Robinson
Bankhead	Duffy	Lonegan	Sheppard
Barbour	Fletcher	McKeellar	Steiwer
Barkley	Gerry	Maloney	Townsend
Brown	Gibson	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulkley	Glass	Minton	Truman
Bulow	Guffey	Moore	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Murphy	Van Nuys
Carey	Hayden	Pope	Walsh

## NOT VOTING—18

Ashurst	Gore	Long	Pittman
Byrd	Harrison	McNary	Smith
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Wagner
Coolidge	Lewis	O'Mahoney	
Davis	Logan	Overton	

So Mr. NEELY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask that it may be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 5, after the second parenthesis, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

*Provided*, That not less than 25 percent of any amounts allocated from the appropriation made herein for the construction of public highways and related projects shall be applied to secondary or feeder roads, including farm to market roads, Rural Free Delivery mail roads, and public-school bus routes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Senator from Kansas that his amendment is wholly unnecessary. An amendment which I offered and which the Senate has already adopted provides that all expenditures for highways and related projects shall be made under the provisions of section 1 of the highway act approved on June 18 last year. That act provides exactly the terms which the Senator has offered in his amendment, so that of any apportionment made to a State under this joint resolution not less than 25 percent of the Federal grant must be spent on the type of secondary roads he has in mind. The Senator is merely duplicating a provision of law already in existence which my amendment, heretofore adopted by the Senate, makes applicable.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, there was some doubt in my mind whether the purpose desired was really accomplished by existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me assure the Senator from Kansas there is no doubt about it at all. It is so understood by all the State highway departments.

Mr. CAPPER. With the assurance of the Senator from Arizona, I withdraw my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas withdraws his amendment.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 3, after the amendment there agreed to, it is proposed to insert the following:

Not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be made available to the States, on the basis of demonstrated need, to enable them to maintain their public schools for the remainder of the current school year.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I can hardly believe there will be any objection to the amendment I am now offering. It carries the comparatively small sum of \$30,000,000. It is

not in any way mandatory. It is left to the discretion of the President to determine how much less than \$30,000,000 may be necessary to use for this purpose.

It is based on an official survey being made at the present time by Dr. Dawson, of the United States Bureau of Education. Up to date, the survey has covered 32,000 school districts in 26 States. It shows that for this particular current year forty-two-thousand-and-odd schools will have to be closed unless immediate Federal aid be granted.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico what information he has as to the extent to which the sum mentioned in his amendment would go in correcting the conditions about which he is speaking? In other words, I am in sympathy with the purposes of the Senator's amendment, but it does seem to me that \$30,000,000 will be entirely inadequate to make any material contribution to the situation he is describing.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, as I have just said, the survey is not complete. It may be that more than that will be necessary. I have an estimate from former Representative Collins, of Mississippi, who is now heading the Public Education League, that approximately \$35,000,000 will be required from the Federal Government to enable the public schools to remain open during the present school year. In framing the amendment, I put in \$30,000,000 because it seemed to me a sum which would appeal to every Senator as a modest amount. If we do not do this, as I have said, 42,000 schools will be closed, more than 102,000 teachers will be out of work, and three and a half million school children will have to quit school about the 1st of April—that is, one-eighth of the school children in the United States.

It has been said that this situation can be taken care of through the existing agency of the F. E. R. A., and I think possibly that may be true; but I should not care to take any chance on that. The matter is too important and too vital to the continuation of our public-school system. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment. It seems to me much fairer to lay down the policy as coming from Congress than to leave a matter of this degree of importance to the decision of any administrative official.

I may call the attention of Senators who have printed copies of the amendment to the fact that I have modified it by inserting after the word "States" the words "on the basis of demonstrated need." That was to obviate the objection that possibly the amendment as originally proposed might be interpreted as requiring the money to be distributed pro rata among the States.

I should prefer not to continue the discussion of this matter, but will ask consent to have read from the desk two letters addressed to me, one by Miss Borchardt, of the American Federation of Teachers, and the other by former Representative Ross Collins, which I think will enlighten the Members of the Senate more than anything I could say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,  
Chicago, Ill., March 18, 1935.

Senator BRONSON CUTTING,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CUTTING: Three and a half million children will be deprived of their right to a free public-school education unless adequate Federal aid is now given to the States to enable them to maintain their schools for the remainder of this year. On behalf of these children we beg of you to use your good offices to assure to the people of this country that sufficient funds from the relief bill now pending before the Senate will be used to prevent the closing of America's public schools in 26 States. Every phase of endeavor in need of aid has been recognized by our National Government; many and varied interests have been given great aid. But the American free public school has been allowed to deteriorate to a miserably low level—to pass out of existence—in fact, in some places because the people of the several States have not been given aid during this grave emergency from their National Government to enable them to maintain their schools.

A desperate fight is necessary now. A recent survey made by the United States Office of Education of 32,139 school districts in 26 States shows that unless Federal funds are made immediately avail-

able 42,200 schools employing 102,116 teachers and serving 3,429,920 pupils will be closed. These are the figures of our very reliable United States Office of Education gathered and compiled by Dr. Howard A. Dawson.

Their survey further points out that the total deficit in the operating fund reported for these schools is \$31,816,009. (These figures, may we add, are very low. One-third of the teachers of the United States are at present getting less than the minimum established under the N. R. A. for unskilled labor.)

This problem is not a sectional one. Hardly a State in the Union but that its schools have suffered sorely; suffered proportionately more than any other undertaking in the State, for the schools have received relatively less aid from their National Government than any other agency. True, some States have been hit harder than others, and need relatively more aid. But the child deprived of his right to schooling in one State thereby becomes the potential problem of every other State. Illiteracy and crime—all forms of social waste—know no State lines. The welfare of the children of any State, deprived of an opportunity for schooling is a national problem. Many of the States cannot finance their public schools now. They simply cannot raise the funds. Eighty percent of all public-school support comes from local funds, 19 percent from State funds, and only 1 percent from the Federal Government. Without entering at this time into a consideration of equity of the taxing system of local governments, we must face the fact that at the present time 92 percent of their funds are raised by a general property tax. Assessed property valuations have declined materially in the last few years; in some States as much as 35 percent. And even this reduced income has not been forthcoming. Tax delinquencies as high as 40 percent in some States on a depreciated realty have prevented the States or the cities from getting the necessary funds with which to run their schools.

While one-eighth of the children of the elementary schools of the United States are in danger of losing their right to a free public-school education, we cannot stop to make still another survey on the State's capacity to finance education in an emergency and in good times.

We urge that studies be made; that the splendid research of the United States Office of Education be aided; that studies of note, such as those made by Dr. Paul Mort, be given the greatest attention. But in the immediate emergency we beg of you to ask for funds for the children of the United States, to keep open schools, with teachers paid in proportion to the value of the social contribution to the State and Nation which they make.

Last year, due to the persistent and effective demands made for our Nation's children by Representative Ross Collins and Senator WALTER GEORGE, the schools were given emergency aid. The Nation is, indeed, indebted to these men for their fight for the schools.

We beg of you, because we know of your deep interest in the social welfare of the Nation, to use your good offices to secure for the schools funds sufficient to guarantee the free public schools' being kept open with teachers paid for their services.

We shall, I assure, deeply appreciate your active support.

Sincerely yours,

SELMA M. BORCHARDT,  
Vice President and Legislative Representative  
American Federation of Teachers.

PUBLIC EDUCATION LEAGUE,  
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1935.

Senator BRONSON CUTTING,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CUTTING: The alarming conditions confronting the Nation's public schools today, together with your well-known interest in the cause of education, lead me to place before you the urgent need of an immediate appropriation by Congress of funds sufficient to enable the public schools to remain open during the rest of the present school year.

According to the Office of Education of the Department of the Interior, unless sufficient Federal funds are made available at least one-eighth of the public-school children of the country will be deprived of educational opportunity for the remainder of the school year. Through lack of funds, many schools will have to close on April 1 and others soon after that date. You will agree that this would be a public shame, as well as a great injustice to public-school teachers and pupils. It would create undeserved hardship and add to the already overcrowded ranks of the unemployed.

For your benefit I am enclosing a statement setting forth some of the conditions which imperil the cause of public education today. This statement has been drawn up by the Public Education League, recently organized to promote adequate Federal aid to the public schools now and in the future, and to serve the cause of public education in other ways. I am in hearty accord with the purpose and program of this organization.

The situation was bad last year; it is even worse now. I am most anxious that the calamity that threatens the schools this year shall be averted. To this end I earnestly trust you will promptly lend your interest and ability. I am confident that you will receive the hearty support of an overwhelming majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress.

Approximately \$35,000,000 will be required from the Federal Government to enable the public schools to remain open during the present school year. As you realize, this is a very modest sum

compared with the many billions appropriated for purposes of industrial recovery. I can conceive of no more appropriate and important action by Congress than the earmarking, for the purpose here mentioned, of this small portion of the \$4,000,000,000 carried in the works-relief bill.

Very sincerely yours,

ROSS A. COLLINS.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What States will not be able to finance their public schools?

Mr. CUTTING. I am unable to give that information to the Senator, because the survey has not been completed. I know there are 26 States in which that condition has been found to exist up to date. No doubt more will be added to the list before the survey shall be completed, but I have not a list of the 26 States.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not desire to stand in the way of children securing an education, but I doubt very much if any of the States that say they cannot finance this program are accurate in that statement. I believe they simply will not levy the necessary taxes. There are many rich men in the various States. Let the States pass State income-tax laws; let them raise their own taxes and stand on their own feet. I do not see why the States that are minding their own affairs, and whose people are struggling desperately to hold on, should pay for education in other States.

Is there to be no limit? If the Federal Government is to do all these things, then I must ask the people in my State not to go on trying to raise money to run their schools, but to come here and get their share of the Federal money. What is the sense of a State like Maryland, for example, or any other State that now is supporting itself, trying to carry on if it has to pay its own expenses and then contribute to the expenses of every other State in the Union?

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I think there might be something to the Senator's argument if this were not such a small item in the total budget of the schools of the country. The Federal Government is not contributing more than about 1 percent of the expenses of the public schools throughout the country. I do not know which States are indicted by the Senator. Neither does the Senator know which States he is indicting. Therefore it is quite impossible to answer him.

We are faced here with a condition, and not a theory. By the 1st of April, one-eighth of the school children of the United States will have to leave school unless we take some action right now. So I hope the Senator will defer his inquiry into the tax systems of the various States until the report shall have been completed, which probably will happen in a short time.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not doubt for a moment that some States have perhaps been without the money to carry on their educational systems, but it is their business to get the money; it is their business to call their legislatures together and levy sufficient taxes to keep the schools open, and if the real estate will not stand any more, then let them tax the wealthy in those States. That is what we will have to do here in Washington to replace this money. Why should not each State maintain its own educational system?

If the Senator will bear with me, I have just come from an experience along this line. The State of Maryland did not want to raise any taxes to carry on relief there, but now, under great pressure, they have finally passed a sales-tax law in the State in order to raise \$5,000,000 of relief money. Nobody in the legislature wanted it; they did not want to vote to put taxes on the people, but it is their business to run the State without coming to the Federal Government for money to carry on the ordinary, routine operations.

I do not know of one of the States in which there are not many wealthy men, and if the poor people cannot pay the taxes, let the legislatures tax the rich. Let the States stand on their own feet and not come here and penalize the States which are making a desperate effort to keep their expenses within their collections without assistance from Washington.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did not exactly this situation arise last year, and did not the Relief Administration as it is now constituted come to the relief of the schools?

Mr. CUTTING. That did happen.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would not that occur again this year? Why earmark the money when there is full authority in the Relief Administration to arrange the matter?

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, although I have no doubt that the Federal Relief Administration would actually use a good deal of its funds, as it has been doing in the past year, for the relief of school teachers, it seems to me a much better way to legislate is to have Congress come out directly and say that we believe in spending the amount of money necessary to do this particular job.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator know how much was expended out of the relief funds during the past year for this purpose?

Mr. CUTTING. No; I have not those figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. My information has been that it was something like \$20,000,000. I may be mistaken. Does the Senator from South Carolina know whether that is an accurate figure?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have not the figures; I thought I had them, but I find I have not. Inasmuch as I am on my feet, may I say that under the Federal Emergency Relief Act, as it has been construed by the Federal Relief Administrator, approved by the office of the Comptroller General, the Administrator has the power to solve this situation by employing teachers. That is not a violation of the principle of the pending joint resolution, because under the head of "professional and clerical workers" they simply employ teachers for such period as will enable them to continue the schools in session for the desired time.

What I do not like about the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico is that it would cause us to embark, I fear, upon a new policy, one not based upon relief to the individual teacher, but, as I caught his amendment from the reading, on the basis of need, on the need of the schools, or the need of the taxpayers of the district, or the need of some other individuals, which is entirely different from the policy which has heretofore been pursued. The policy heretofore followed is working satisfactorily. If the joint resolution shall be enacted, the Relief Administration will have the funds necessary to arrive at a solution of the problem presented by the Senator from New Mexico.

The reason why the Relief Administration cannot now arrive at a solution is because of the lack of funds, awaiting the enactment of the pending joint resolution. If this measure is enacted, then the teachers can be cared for. I understand that the Relief Administrator, not knowing how long the present situation will continue, is a little cautious in making advances at this time; but I am satisfied that just so soon as the joint resolution shall be enacted, the teachers will be provided for and the schools will be continued.

I know what the Senator from New Mexico has in mind, but I think it far better that we should continue to render the assistance by giving aid to teachers, just as we would to any other professional or clerical workers, and we can render assistance on that basis, instead of on the basis set forth in the amendment.

I ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will not be willing to await the enactment of the joint resolution and see whether the Federal Relief Administration will not continue to render aid, just as it did during the last year?

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator this question: If the Federal Emergency Relief Administration is not now giving out these sums on the basis of demonstrated need, then on what basis are they distributing them?

Mr. BYRNES. On the basis of demonstrated need of the teachers, and that is exactly in accord with the entire policy of the joint resolution and of the existing law. But I did not so understand the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. The teachers are employed in teaching night schools in various places. In the rural districts, where most of the aid has been rendered, I know hundreds of schools have been helped in this way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection, is it not also true that, in addition to aiding teachers out of relief funds, allocations have been made to the payment of expenses of students in certain colleges and other educational institutions throughout the country?

Mr. BYRNES. I think it was stated that almost 100,000 students have received what is called student aid and have been able to attend college because of such aid.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the administration of the funds heretofore appropriated, the Administrator has been most liberal, it seems to me, in distributing wherever the need was found to exist, not only to the professional teacher but to the student also.

Mr. CUTTING. I think that is true, Mr. President; but that very fact would seem to demonstrate that the aid has not been given entirely on the basis of need to the individual school teacher.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Kentucky asked about an entirely different question from that in which the Senator from New Mexico is interested, because the Senator from Kentucky asked about the assistance that had been rendered students attending colleges.

Mr. BARKLEY. My object was to show that, without any mandatory provision in the law which has already been enacted, and which has been in force for a year or two, the administration has been unusually liberal in the distribution of the funds for educational purposes.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator on that point; I should not want anything I have said to be construed as implying that the law has not been administered in a very liberal manner. But I do prefer to have matters of this sort directly sanctioned by Congress, because we never know what administrative officials may in the future decide to do.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to make inquiry of the Senator from New Mexico as to whether he does not know that in fact there have been advances of Federal funds made upon other bases than teachers' employment; as a matter of fact, whether the State of New Mexico has not received some \$250,000 of Federal funds for its schools?

Mr. CUTTING. I think that is true, although I have not the figures with me at the moment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. As I understand the Senator from South Carolina, he is of the opinion that in taking care of the teachers as has heretofore been done the situation designed to be covered by the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico will be taken care of?

Mr. BYRNES. That is my understanding.

Mr. BORAH. Would the paying of the teachers of itself keep open the schools? Are there not other expenses?

Mr. BYRNES. My understanding is that last year—and the Senator from New Mexico has already called attention to it—aid was rendered in the manner contemplated by the pending joint resolution, and it resulted in continuing the schools throughout the country for a considerable period, mostly in the rural districts. I do not know that it was done in any of the cities, but the aid was rendered, and it did result in keeping the schools open.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. May I ask the Senator whether there is anything in his amendment which would prevent a continuation of the exact practice mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CUTTING. I do not see anything at all that would prevent it.

Mr. BLACK. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment which would make it mandatory that the method suggested there be followed in aiding the schools, or is it merely suggestive?

Mr. CUTTING. It says "not to exceed \$30,000,000." Of course, if the need should not arise up to that amount, less would be expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has touched upon the very point about which I am most apprehensive—that this amendment might be construed to operate as a limitation and restrict the funds which could be expended to \$30,000,000. The need might be much greater, and under the method now being pursued by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in assisting schools they might not be able to reach some very deserving cases on account of the fact that the \$30,000,000 would not be sufficient to assist all the schools which could prove beyond any peradventure that they were in need of funds.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I based my figures on the estimate submitted to me by the different associations interested in this matter. They said \$35,000,000. Personally I should prefer \$35,000,000 or even \$40,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is permissive that the Administration could spend less than \$30,000,000, but they could not spend more than that. It occurs to me that if the amendment is to be adopted the limitation should be raised to at least \$50,000,000.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will again be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be made available to the States on the basis of demonstrated need to enable them to maintain their public schools for the remainder of the current school year.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. STEIWER. I wish to suggest to the Senator from New Mexico the same idea which was suggested by the Senator from Georgia. I am in sympathy with the object and purpose which the Senator from New Mexico has in mind; but I concur in the belief that the amendment as offered may operate as a limitation, and only as a limitation. I imagine that the Senator from New Mexico did not so intend it.

I desire to ask him how we may avoid the limiting effect of his amendment, in view of the fact that the first part or the committee amendment on page 3 of the joint resolution provides, in effect, that the President may employ as much of this appropriation as he may deem necessary for the purposes of the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933. How can we avoid the conclusion that that gives the President the unlimited right to employ the money for the payment of salaries to teachers who are in need, which is the equivalent of saying the salaries of teachers in districts which are financially unable to meet their obligations? Inasmuch as the Senator's amendment is itself permissive, and permits the expenditure up to \$30,000,000, and inasmuch as the President has a much greater power under the provisions of the Federal Emergency Relief Act, is it not true that the only effect of the Senator's amendment is to limit to the sum of \$30,000,000 the amount that may be

used for the employment of teachers? Is the Senator able to explain away that thought?

Mr. CUTTING. I can see the force of the Senator's argument. I simply assumed from the figures presented to me that the amount necessary would not go substantially beyond that figure, although it might be better, in view of what the Senator has said, to increase the amount to \$40,000,000 instead of \$30,000,000.

Mr. STEIWER. I have no objection to that.

While I am taking the Senator's time I desire to make some minor observations which I can make in a few sentences.

I think I was in error when I said that limitation would be the only effect of the Senator's amendment. One other effect, of course, would be to provide payment of money to the States rather than payment by the Relief Administration or by the Administrator direct to the teachers. That is another effect of the Senator's amendment, but I think it is not of controlling importance. The important phase is the possible limitation of the amount which may be expended for the purpose the Senator has in mind.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that the Senator's State has received some money from the relief fund for public-school purposes, and I understand now that the revenues as anticipated may make it necessary for the Federal Government again to assist the educational program in New Mexico. If that assumption be correct, may I ask the Senator whether it is not possible for the State of New Mexico to call the legislature into session and to levy the taxes necessary to provide sufficient funds to carry on the State's educational program?

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I do not think this is the time to go into a question involving the internal situation in the State of New Mexico. I have no information whatever of the sort the Senator mentions, and my interest in the matter is not based on local considerations at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not using that illustration personally; I am simply using it to elicit information.

Mr. CUTTING. Then, I will say to the Senator that of course he is familiar with the fact that the State of New Mexico has a peculiar educational situation which is not shared by any other State; that the language problem is of enormous importance with us; that no educational facilities whatever were given to the State under the long years of territorial rule, and that a vastly greater problem is put on the shoulders of that particular State in proportion to its resources than exists anywhere else. I prefer not to discuss that phase of the matter at the present time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me point out to the Senator that the language of his amendment is "based on needs." What is the need? Is it because of the refusal of the legislature of his State to do its duty and provide sufficient taxes to keep the school system going?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. May I make a further observation? Why should any State refuse to appropriate sufficient money to keep its school system going and then come over to Washington and ask for funds for that purpose?

Mr. CUTTING. In answer to the Senator, I will say that I think the people who are going to administer this proposed law can be trusted to use their own judgment as to what constitutes "need." I cannot believe that they would interpret the law in any such manner as is suggested by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I am making is that there is no need if the legislature will do what I suppose it can do, namely, raise sufficient taxes to keep the school system in a particular State going.

Mr. CUTTING. I am afraid the Senator's supposition so far as New Mexico is concerned is not entirely correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I venture to say there are not 25 States in the Union which cannot raise sufficient money to keep their educational systems going without appealing to the Federal Government. If we once get into that field, it will

encourage every other State to cut down its appropriations for schools so that there will be a deficit, and to come over to Washington and get the money.

Mr. CUTTING. I hope that when the survey is completed, the Senator from Maryland will study it carefully and give us the benefit of his judgment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am endeavoring to study it before we take a vote on the amendment and before the survey is completed. I will say to the Senator that with respect to those States which cannot take care of the situation and cannot raise the money, I think the Federal Government may properly step in; but I do not believe we should encourage a State, whose legislature is reluctant to do its duty and to appropriate the necessary money, to come and get money which belongs to all the States, so that one-half the school system of the State is supported by the Federal Government and the other half is supported by the State.

Mr. CUTTING. So far I have no information about any such State legislatures as the Senator is criticizing.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if it is not true that our State did call its legislature into special session and provided a sales tax in order to keep the schools open last year. We have adopted other forms of taxation in New Mexico with the exact purpose referred to by the Senator from Maryland. The State of New Mexico is trying to do its part in keeping the schools of the State open; and we are thankful for the aid we have received from the Federal Government, which assisted us materially last year and this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I prefer not to interfere further with the Senator from New Mexico in his discussion of his amendment. At the proper time I shall make some remarks.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Aside from the attitude of provincial statesmanship on a problem of this sort, does not the Senator's amendment open the measure to interpretation by any administrator so as to provide for the maximum which could be appropriated for educational purposes? Therefore, would there not be danger that, even if the need should become greater, the Administrator would be limited to that maximum? In view of the liberality of the Administrator so far, would it not be better to leave it to him, so that there would be no maximum limitation?

If I were the Administrator under an amendment of that sort I should feel almost constrained to interpret it as a mandatory limitation by Congress on the amount I might spend for that purpose.

Mr. CUTTING. I think, if I may say so to the Senator, that it could not be mandatory except to the extent of maintaining the public schools for the remainder of the current school year. I do not think it could be a limitation for any other purpose. As the people directly concerned feel that \$35,000,000 would be needed to take care of that situation, I think that \$40,000,000 would be a better figure than \$30,000,000.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I say to the Senator that, having glanced at his amendment, it seems to me it involves a complete deviation from the theory of this joint resolution, which is a relief measure designed to provide employment for those who are without opportunity to work. As I read the Senator's amendment, it is not designed to provide work for individuals but is for the relief of school districts which may have a "demonstrated need", not necessarily for the payment to teachers, but for any other school objectives. Does it not seem to the Senator that two utterly different theories are involved here; and that if this amendment proposed by the Senator were adopted, those who are administering the relief would find it incumbent upon them not to consider so much the need of individual teachers as the need of individual school districts; and then would not administrators be confronted with the problem of determining how

and upon what basis they should apportion this money amongst the several States? It seems to me, if I may say so, that there is a fundamental confusion of issues in the amendment of the Senator.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, to my mind, the argument of the Senator from Wyoming is entirely too theoretical and too tenuous to carry any weight in a matter of this importance. All through the joint resolution there is a certain amount of confusion, of course, between different objectives. We are trying to provide employment. We are trying to provide work relief, so far as possible. To some extent we are trying to provide direct relief. But when we deal with the public-works provision of this joint resolution we are going to have two somewhat different objectives to meet.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What does the Senator mean by "demonstrated need"?

Mr. BORAH. To keep the schools open.

Mr. CUTTING. I mean exactly that. To keep the schools open.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the rule, what is the standard by which we are to judge what "need" is? What will the Administrator say it means? What can he say it means?

Mr. CUTTING. The reason I put in the words "on the basis of demonstrated need" was in order to comply with the objections which Senators made as to the method by which this was to be administered.

Mr. BORAH. "Demonstrated need" to keep the schools open for a certain length of time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To keep the schools open. That is precisely what I was saying. The amendment means keeping the schools open, not providing employment for teachers—two utterly different things.

Mr. BORAH. But teachers may be employed under another provision of the bill entirely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. Therefore, I say that the amendment offered by the Senator is a clear departure from the theory of the joint resolution in that it undertakes to take \$30,000,000 out of this relief appropriation in order to keep schools open. That might be something utterly different from the payment of school teachers. Indeed, it is certain to mean something utterly different. This amendment opens the door to Federal control of education. If the Federal Government is to provide the money to support the schools, it will inevitably guide the schools. My feeling is that education should be recognized as a local duty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUTTING. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. According to a calculation I have just made, the relief money paid to New Mexico last year—and I may say to the Senator that I am taking New Mexico as an illustration merely because he is addressing the Senate on this issue—the relief paid to New Mexico last year, plus New Mexico's share of the Federal-aid projects, amounted to \$28 per capita, or, in round numbers, \$100 to a family. That came out of the Federal Treasury last year—\$100 to a family. I think that is going pretty far, and that the States ought to be able, through local taxation, with \$100 to a family being given to them, to pay to keep their schools open and not have the rest of the country taxed in order to give them more than they received last year.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield to me, if my memory serves me correctly, last year we appropriated a very large sum of money to take care of educational interests in one of the very rich States of the Union.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be true; I am not condoning that act; but I believe the legislature in every State in the Union can levy sufficient taxes to keep schools of the State open without a dollar coming from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BORAH. That argument would make unnecessary this joint resolution as a whole.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is true. I think that every State in the Union can levy sufficient taxes to take care of all relief, all the schools, and everything else if the legislatures have the courage to do it; and they ought to do it and ought not to pass the buck to the Federal Government.

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

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not want further to prolong the discussion, but there is one aspect of the situation which gives me concern and about which I should like to ask the Senator a question. I myself know of many instances in connection with hospitals where the situation is infinitely more acute than it is with respect to schools. I am wondering if this amendment which particularly relates to schools were adopted, whether it would militate in some way against provision being made for other institutions which might be equally or more important? In other words, I am wondering if it is a fact that the Senator's amendment—and I am in sympathy with it, for it has to do with a situation which appeals to us all—may make it very difficult perhaps to provide properly for institutions other than schools which might be equally deserving and equally in need. That is a possible consequence which seems to me not to have been mentioned or considered. I do not mean this premise to be a fixed conclusion of mine in the sense that it should defeat the Senator's purpose. But I do mean that if what I refer to is actually a fact, that I would then feel constrained to offer a similar amendment, similar, at least, to the extent of being for the relief of certain hospitals or other public institutions of that sort if the amendment now proposed by the Senator from New Mexico were adopted. I do not want further to complicate the joint resolution itself, however, for, as a matter of fact, I do not approve of it anyway, excepting as it provides enough to take care of any or all necessary relief for those unemployed otherwise actually in need.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. CUTTING. I will yield to the Senator after I shall have responded to the Senator from New Jersey. I cannot think that the adoption of this amendment would in any way limit the administration of the proposed act with respect to any other class of projects. I do not see how it could be interpreted in that way. The discretion of the President, as has been frequently pointed out, is exceedingly wide under the joint resolution as it stands.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not want to appear to quarrel with the Senator; as I have said, his proposal appeals to me; but if he is correct in his interpretation of the situation I see no need for his amendment, though I intend to vote for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Mexico very well said a few moments ago that, after all, it has to be left to the administrator. If I recollect aright, the present administrator of relief has been exceedingly mindful, to say the least, of the needs of the schools and of the school teachers, and much money—I do not know the exact amount—has been spent along those lines, and I think very properly spent; I endorse that work; but, at the same time, it seems to me that it would be infinitely better to leave it as it is, where it is being well done, than to embark on a new plan of this kind to impose a limitation of this kind.

Mr. GLASS and Mr. POPE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I do not rise to present any argument as to the Senator's amendment but to make a few suggestions.

In the first place, it departs from all the other allocations by making the appropriation of not exceeding \$30,000,000 peremptory; providing that it "shall" be done instead of that it "may" be done.

In the second place, I wish to emphasize what has already been suggested to the Senator, that, under the permissive allocations already made by the joint resolution \$350,000,000 are available, I think, for the purpose of paying teachers, and that the Senator's amendment is in danger of being interpreted as a severe limitation upon that amount.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said awhile ago that we appropriated money last year to take care of the schools in a very rich State. Did the Senator have in mind the State of that Senator who so entranced the Senate yesterday with his plea for patriotism and who, it seems, has been unable to impress his ideas of patriotism and self-respect upon his own community? Is that the State which the Senator from Idaho had in mind?

Mr. BORAH. I did not experience any entrancement, so I do not know just to whom the Senator from Virginia has reference.

Mr. GLASS. I do not imagine the Senator experienced it, but he witnessed it.

Mr. BORAH. Well, I listened to the eloquent speech of the Senator from Illinois. I had reference to the State of Illinois.

Mr. GLASS. Exactly; and the city of Chicago by legislation enacted by Congress was authorized to borrow \$22,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to pay its bad debts to its own school teachers. So I think anybody who wants to teach the whole Nation self-respect had better begin at home.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, before yielding further, I should like to say just a word in reply to the Senator from Virginia. He finds two objections to this amendment. The first is that he considers it peremptory.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator will understand that I am not objecting.

Mr. CUTTING. Perhaps "objection" is an incorrect term.

Mr. GLASS. The only reason I am not objecting is that I promised the Senator I would not object, and I keep my promises.

Mr. CUTTING. I am perfectly willing to release the Senator from any promise he may have made to me.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I be pardoned to ask the Senator from New Mexico if he will permit me a moment to say that I have just been informed that some allusions have been made concerning the teachers and the educational system in Chicago? I should like very much to know what they were, and if they call for any information on my part.

Mr. CUTTING. Would the Senator object to waiting until I conclude my reply to the Senator from Virginia? Then I will yield to him.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, the allusion does not require any information. We have the information. I said that Chicago borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation \$22,000,000 in order to pay back salaries to its school teachers.

Mr. LEWIS. The eminent Senator from Virginia and myself very commendably helped to pass that legislation, so that I can approve his action.

Mr. GLASS. No; I did not help to pass it.

Mr. LEWIS. The eminent Senator sat on the conference committee and yielded to the necessities of the school teachers and gave the provision approval.

Mr. GLASS. I yielded to the necessities of the conference and not to the necessities of the school teachers. [Laughter.]

Mr. LEWIS. Whatever the cause of the yielding, it was a yielding of which I greatly approve. [Laughter.]

Mr. GLASS. What I was suggesting was that the Senator yesterday lectured me upon the subject of patriotism and the exercise of self-respect, and I wanted to suggest to the Senator that he had better begin at Chicago.

Mr. LEWIS. I may say to my able friend that I know of nothing wherein I made allusion to self-respect; but the eminent Senator says it was alluded to and intimates that I ought to begin at Chicago. I take the vain consolation, so far as the self-respect of Chicago is concerned, that it is already quite sufficient, as demonstrated by its actions specifically and by its admiration for him.

Mr. GLASS. And by getting \$22,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury with which to pay its school teachers.

Mr. LEWIS. With the aid and connivance of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. No.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, if I may say a word in my own time, I should like to say to the Senator from Virginia, first, that I do not construe the use of the word "shall" as being mandatory in this particular amendment, because the amendment begins with the words "not to exceed \$30,000,000." That would allow the Administrator to spend anything less than the \$30,000,000 that he deemed it proper to use.

Mr. GLASS. That is true; but the Senator should seriously consider whether or not his amendment is not a limitation upon the amount he would desire expended for this purpose.

The Senator's proposition—and I am not opposing it; I told him I would not, and I am not—is not a drop in the bucket. Just think, Chicago alone borrowed \$22,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with which to pay the back pay of its school teachers—Chicago alone—and here the Senator is proposing simply \$30,000,000 for the entire Nation!

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

Mr. CUTTING. I should prefer to take up the points made by the Senator from Virginia. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho in a few moments.

The second point which the Senator from Virginia made was that there was a possible limitation involved in the amendment. In response to previous inquiries I stated that I would modify my amendment by increasing the amount to \$40,000,000, which would be in advance of anything that has been estimated by any of the associations as being necessary at this time. On that basis I think there could be no objection to the limitation. Of course the amount is a small amount if we were going to deal with the entire educational situation in the Nation; but this is merely a sum of money proposed to enable the public schools to be kept open for the remainder of this particular school year.

The third point made by the Senator from Virginia was that under the joint resolution we are already able to spend \$350,000,000 for miscellaneous projects.

Mr. GLASS. Oh, no! I said for professional services.

Mr. CUTTING. The Senator used the figure \$350,000,000, and that is why I thought he referred to that clause. The projects for professional and clerical persons carry the sum of \$300,000,000.

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. CUTTING. I am very doubtful whether that would be interpreted as including the public schools, though it might, of course, include the school teachers.

Mr. GLASS. Would not the objective of the Senator be reached if he would offer a parenthetical amendment reading "including school teachers"?

Mr. CUTTING. I think it might include school teachers, but I am more particularly interested in the schools than I am in the mere relief of school teachers. That is one reason why I have proposed the amendment.

It may, as the Senator from Wyoming said, be slightly inconsistent with other parts of the joint resolution, but I think it would be easy to go through the measure section by section and show far more serious inconsistencies between the different parts of it. I do not think we should stick at things of that sort when we are trying to remedy a serious condition which exists in 26 of the States of the Union, which is not merely of local importance, but is of extreme national importance.

Mr. POPE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield.

Mr. POPE. Since the discussion has been proceeding, I have called the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and was told that \$2,400,000 now is being paid out each month to teachers, \$60,000 each month to supervisors, and \$1,500,000 each month for relief of students; that the total which had been paid out within the last year has been between \$40,000,000 and \$50,000,000.

Mr. CUTTING. Yes; but my amendment only applies to the remainder of the current school year and is based on the figures furnished by the educational associations, which

say that amount of money will be necessary. I cannot see, from anything that has been stated, what objection there could be to the adoption of the amendment, especially since I have increased the amount from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000. It is not mandatory to spend any of it.

This amendment, at least, makes clear the intention of Congress. I do not believe any Senator would desire to have the public schools of the Nation close. I do not see why we should not say so. Even if we are able to take care of that situation through existing agencies, I can see no reason whatever why there should be any objection to the adoption of the amendment.

I modify my amendment by substituting "\$40,000,000" for "\$30,000,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico modifies his amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUTTING. I yield, though it is my desire to yield the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. There are many of us who have the same viewpoint as has the Senator, and who very much desire to see appropriate aid upon the part of the Federal Government rendered to the rural schools which are in need of assistance. There are some of us who believe it might be disadvantageous to enact this kind of legislation. Personally, I am very much perplexed as to the wisdom of the proposal, much as I desire it, because I am afraid, as has been pointed out, that the limitation placed might work out to disadvantage in some instances.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the relief authorities have placed a limitation against towns of 5,000 or more in the matter of granting relief, on the theory that towns and cities of that size could provide their own funds to carry on the schools. They have taken care of rural communities and small towns. Under the terms of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico there is no restriction as to the size or population of the municipality. It merely provides for the continuance of the public schools during the current school year.

With that limitation removed which has been placed on it by the authorities which have been administering the relief, I think it would greatly add to the amount suggested by the authorities. These figures no doubt were compiled on the same theory on which assistance was rendered last year, namely, to rural communities and towns of less than 5,000 population. With the amendment worded as it now is it might greatly add to the amount involved.

I believe the wise thing to do—because there is no limitation in the appropriation acts which we have passed and there is full power to render the assistance—is not to write into the joint resolution a limitation on the matter at all, although if the Senator should press his amendment to a vote I am going to vote for it because I am in entire sympathy with what he is trying to do.

Mr. CUTTING. I am glad the Senator will support it, because I intend to press it to a vote with the change to \$40,000,000 instead of \$30,000,000.

I have no idea just what communities were visited by this survey, but I have no reason to think they were purely rural communities. While, like the Senator, I am principally interested in the rural schools, yet we are all interested in the educational system of the United States as a whole and desire it to continue in industrial centers as well as rural communities. I have no doubt that the estimate was made taking into consideration both kinds of schools. For that reason I hope we shall have a record vote on my amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we are getting into fields of legislation which cannot be justified except on the ground that we are in a great emergency. I do not believe the emergency is great enough to justify a venture of the kind suggested in the pending amendment. We are already trying to provide work for the unemployed. We are already taking care of those on relief in the various States. Now

we propose to take over the educational system of the States as well.

I have been observing some of the State legislatures, and, in my opinion, the proposition now is getting to be one of not appropriating any more money than absolutely necessary so that a case can be made out for getting money from the Federal Government. Every State that is trying to stand on its hind legs and survive individually is being penalized. Every State that is not trying to do that is receiving an advantage.

I am about to give some figures as to the State of New Mexico; and in doing so I make no personal reflection on the Senators from New Mexico or on the people of the State. I am simply using it as an illustration.

Last year the State of New Mexico paid in Federal taxes \$1,160,000. The State received in Federal-aid projects \$2,539,000 and in relief \$3,610,000, or a total of \$12,149,000.

Let us suppose that we give back every dollar of Federal taxes which the State of New Mexico paid into the Treasury. Subtracting what they paid from what they received, that leaves \$10,989,000 over. So, giving them back all the Federal taxes they paid, we gave them \$100 a family, or \$28 a head, besides.

It strikes me that the State of New Mexico and all the other States which are in that category can afford to call their legislatures into session and levy sufficient taxes to raise the mere pittance which will be required to keep the public schools open. The Federal Government has no business financing the educational systems of the various States of the Union. We have gotten in the habit of spending money; we have gotten in the habit of dishing it out; and it occurs to me that we are not as careful as we might be.

Shall we appropriate money for relief? Oh, yes; if relief is absolutely necessary; but here, in a public-works measure supposed to provide employment for people, we have a proposition to take some of the money and use it for the routine State expenses in 24 or 25 States of the Union!

Senators, all this money will have to be paid back. Sooner or later every dollar we appropriate will have to be raised in Federal taxation. Where is the end? Why not take over something else in the next Congress and something else in the next Congress? Or instead of doing that, why not let the legislatures that now have not the courage to levy the taxes which they ought to levy to run their own internal affairs reassert their prerogatives and cease coming here to Washington to get money for every little State agency that breaks down?

We cannot go on financing everything in the Republic. What is the use of a State trying to keep away from Washington and raise taxes to finance its own public-school system if next door to that State another State refuses to raise the necessary taxes and gets the money from Washington?

We are only setting the example of encouraging States to shirk their responsibilities. It may be pleasant now, but sooner or later it will come home to plague us.

There is not a State in the Republic that could not get along with one-tenth of the Federal relief money which is now being expended within its borders, because the State itself could raise most of the money required to deal with this problem.

My State does not want to do it. No; it does not want to put up any money. It would rather get it all from Washington. So would every other State in the Union; but I cannot hereafter go down to my legislature and say, "Raise all the money you can to take care of unemployment in this State", because I should be forced to say, "Other States are not doing it, and if you do it you will not only pay for taking care of your own unemployment, but you will pay for taking care of the unemployment in other States as well."

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CUTTING. I wonder if the Senator from Maryland is aware that in his own State the proportion of relief funds provided by the Federal Government runs over 63 percent of the total.

Mr. TYDINGS. And what is the proportion in the Senator's State? Ninety-eight and one-half percent from the Federal Government and 1½ percent from New Mexico. My State raised as much, on the average, as any other State in the Union.

Mr. CUTTING. I desire to say also, in behalf of my State, that we have not received \$10,000,000 for any institution like the Maryland Casualty Co. or the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., or any of the other great benefits which have been received by the State of Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Those are not gifts. They are only loans upon security which the Government thinks ample. That has not anything at all to do with this question. That is only a collateral issue.

As long as we have gotten into the subject of Maryland, I desire to point out that Maryland paid \$39,000,000, not in income taxes, but in internal-revenue taxes, mass taxes, cigarette taxes, gasoline taxes; and how much did it get back? It did not get back half that much. The figures which the Senator from New Mexico read were for 2 years, not for 1 year. Maryland paid in 1 year, in mass taxes levied on the poor people, twice as much as it received in relief, while the State of New Mexico got back \$10 for every dollar it paid, and then came and got relief from the Federal Government while contributing only 1½ percent.

I have been in New Mexico, and there are as nice-looking towns and villages and cities in that State as in any State in the Union. I have seen as much prosperity there as I have seen in east Baltimore or south Baltimore, where the working people reside. In fact, I think the standard of living in New Mexico as a whole is superior to that of the poor sections of our large cities; yet the Senator from New Mexico is asking those people to pay their share of their own upkeep and their own schools and to contribute to the people of his State, who live on a higher plane than those of my State or those of the State of the Senator from Pennsylvania or those of the State of the Senator from Connecticut, where are located the big industrial cities, where real misery exists, and where a man cannot have a garden out in the back yard to raise his own vegetables, or a cow to milk to supply his own table.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CUTTING. I wonder if the Senator has been in the State of New Mexico since the drought of 1934.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I have been there. I was down there last year, and a lovely place it is.

Mr. CUTTING. I am afraid the Senator has not been very extensively around the State.

Mr. TYDINGS. I saw some of the prettiest towns there I have ever seen, with Spanish architecture, and prosperity, so far as I could see. I did not see any bread lines there. I did not see any mobs of unemployed persons there; but Senators may go over into the metropolis, which is only 36 miles from here, and they will find thousands at every employment office every day. They will find 150 people sitting in my office every morning at 11 o'clock, hoping to God they can get a job before the sun goes down.

This joint resolution is not a relief measure. It is a pork-barrel measure. It is a measure to take money from the sources that can least afford to pay it and give it to places which can get along without it. The joint resolution does not purport to deal with the great wells of unemployment in our large cities. It deals with reforestation, soil erosion, and what not, while in the cities of the country eight or nine or ten million people are without work.

We are asked to pay all our own expenses and to pay all the expense of other States, and then it is proposed to spend the unemployment-relief money in the agricultural areas, where there is no unemployment in comparison with that which exists elsewhere. It is an outrage on misery. It is an injustice on humanity. It is penalizing every large city in the country.

I know we are going to vote on this measure, not upon the basis of humanity, but each Senator is going to see that his

State "gets his." That is what we are doing. Each Senator here has his own little project; he is "set on the mark", waiting for the gun to go off in the air so that he can go down to the Administrator and get \$100,000 or \$1,000,000, or \$10,000,000, or \$50,000,000 for his State, without any regard to the unemployment which exists in the cities. Now it is proposed to take the little bit of unemployment money which we have safeguarded for the big cities and with it, forsooth, keep up the rural schools in the agricultural districts, and all this in the name of humanity!

I see seated near me the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. COOLIDGE]. Up in his State each community is bearing its proportionate share of unemployment relief. Am I correct?

Mr. COOLIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. The whole State is organized so that every city supports its unemployed, so to speak; but what credit does it get for that? The taxpayers are no more able to do that in Brockton, Mass., than they are in any city, village, or town in New Mexico or any other city in the Middle West; and when we look at the unemployment contributions we find that in the large spaces no contributions whatever have been made.

I do not mean to reflect on the whole agricultural area. There is no doubt, in my mind, that in some of the drought-stricken States generosity and humanity perhaps demand large expenditures, but not in the proportion in which they have been made during the past 2 or 3 years.

To come back to my original proposition, there is not a legislature in the land with courage enough to make it worthy to be a legislature which cannot immediately levy sufficient taxes to keep its school system open if the legislature and the Governor desire to do so; but is it not easier to come to Washington and get the money from the Federal Government than for the respective States to discharge their own responsibilities?

Before long there will not be any States if present tendencies continue. Some people may think that will be a good thing. I do not think so. When we take out of the Federal Treasury \$100 a family, \$28 for every man, woman, and child in a single State in a single year, and then, on top of that, give them back all the Federal taxes they have paid, we have done a pretty good job for the State. If it were my State, I should not have the nerve to come here and ask the Federal Government also to take care of my rural schools. I should think I had already been highwayman enough, and I should not want to take any more from the communities that pay most of the taxes.

This joint resolution carries, for rural rehabilitation and relief in stricken agricultural districts, half a billion dollars. How many unemployed are there in the drought-stricken areas? Has anyone here an estimate of the number? I have never seen any estimate of the number of rural unemployed, and yet one-eighth of the whole appropriation is set aside for that one object. Imagine the steel workers and others in the large cities who are out of employment rehabilitating the rural districts!

The joint resolution also carries \$100,000,000 for rural electrification; \$800,000,000 for roads and highways, most of which will be spent in the agricultural districts; \$350,000,000 for reforestation, and so on.

Mr. President, I think the large cities of the country have already been sufficiently penalized. I think most of us here have already shown a spirit of generosity toward the rest of the country in the expenditure of relief funds. I plead with Senators not to drive us too far.

Remember that the figures I quoted as to the taxes in Maryland were not the figures of income taxes. They referred only to internal-revenue taxes, the taxes which fall on the masses of the people; and they showed that we had paid more than twice the amount spent by the United States in our State for relief. In addition to that, we had contributed to relief in our State, and in addition to that we had received no extraordinary appropriations at all.

What is the use of the State of Maryland, or Rhode Island, or Iowa, or any other State, trying to balance its

budget and raise taxes, burdensome as they may be, if other States are to come to Washington and say, "Just because we have not the money, we are not going to try to get the money, and we want to get it from the Federal Government"? I know that my friend the Senator from New Mexico, fair as he is, will not contend seriously that the Legislature of New Mexico could not be called into session, and, within a week, raise sufficient money to provide for all the rural and other schools in that State. I am sure he would concede that. It might be hard on the people, of course, it would be hard; but, as in all other things, the people are going to pay for it in the end.

Although my voice may not amount to anything now, I believe the die is already cast, that this amendment will be adopted, and even if it is not adopted, the money will be used for this purpose, but I wish to register my protest now and sit here until the chickens come home to roost, and we will see whose chickens they are.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no desire or purpose of dragging the affairs of New Mexico into this debate. I am sure that my colleague, in offering the amendment which he has presented, did not have the State of New Mexico in mind at all, but was simply striving to serve the schools of the entire Nation.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I concur in what the Senator has just said, and while I used the State of New Mexico as an example and referred to the Senator's colleagues, I had no intention of reflecting upon New Mexico or on the Senator from New Mexico, and certainly had no intention of referring to him in any way that might injure his pride.

Mr. HATCH. I am quite sure the Senator from Maryland did not intend any reflection on the Senator from New Mexico or on the State of New Mexico; but the Senator from Maryland has repeatedly said that the Legislature of the State of New Mexico should and could be called into session immediately, and taxes provided to carry the burden of the schools of the State of New Mexico, and that the amounts we have received from the Federal Government should not have been paid.

As I have said, I do not want to discuss the affairs of my State here on the floor of the Senate, but I do want to say to the Senator from Maryland that the Legislature of New Mexico has already been called into special session; that when last year we were confronted with an unprecedented situation due to a drought which destroyed practically all our agricultural interests, when our cattle industry and our sheep industry were most severely injured and we were in the depths of the worst depression we had ever known, the Governor of our State called the legislature into special session, and they passed what seemed to be the only measure which would give relief to the schools. A sales tax was adopted, and the proceeds of that tax went directly into the school fund.

We already have in New Mexico a State income tax; we have taxed all our property to the limit of constitutional limitations. We had reached the point in New Mexico where there were no more sources of revenue. We had to have help in order to keep our schools open.

Unfortunately for us, we are not a rich State. We do not have a great deal of wealth. We are large in area, but small in population, and our people are not wealthy. The Federal Government saw the needs of New Mexico and came to the relief of the people of my State in a generous manner, but not in an excessive way, and not beyond the needs and requirements of the people of that State.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, can any State become a rich State by relying solely upon its own people to enrich it?

Mr. HATCH. It cannot.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there a large or wealthy city in the United States which has not drawn its wealth from all

parts of the country by reason of the willingness of the people in other States to patronize its industries and to pour wealth into it?

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his contribution. The people of New Mexico during our prosperous years—and we have had prosperous years in New Mexico—have contributed largely to the wealth of the cities of the United States, and we have paid much to the State of Maryland.

Mr. President, I do not see in the pending joint resolution any degree of sectionalism whatever. I do not conceive that a thing which is good for the agricultural part of the United States is not good for the whole Nation. I believe that measures which are helpful in New Mexico, and which assist the people of my State, contribute to the welfare of the whole country. I believe that when money is paid into New Mexico, my people spend that money in ways, as suggested by the Senator from Kentucky, which benefit the cities and States in other parts of the Nation.

It has been said here, "How about the shoes; how about the steel mills; how about various things?" When the people of New Mexico have money, they buy shoes, they buy clothing, they buy tractors, they buy farm implements, and all those come from the East, and from the big industrial centers, just as the Senator from Kentucky has intimated.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has at various times throughout this debate referred to the waste and extravagance—the terrible waste and extravagance—of soil-erosion control, of flood control, of reclamation, and similar things, and has said that the Federal Government should not be engaged in those projects.

One reason why the State of New Mexico does not have more taxable wealth is because a large part of our land is public domain, owned by the Federal Government, and the conservation policies of the Federal Government are necessary to preserve that land which is being washed away and which is being blown away. The wealth of the lands of the United States is decreasing through soil erosion more than \$400,000,000 annually. These are not my figures; they come from a report made by the Mississippi River Valley Commission in October last year to the Public Works Administration, and it is shown that more than 25 percent of the tillable land of the United States is depreciating each year through flood damage and through soil erosion.

Mr. President, is it waste and extravagance in the Federal Government now to seek, by the expenditure of money in the employment of men who are unemployed, to conserve those natural resources of the country, to build up and protect our lands, which are the sources of the real wealth of this Nation? It is the part of wisdom to take steps to preserve our resources. The waste and the extravagance lie in having let this deterioration go on for years past. The United States of America is a rich nation, but it is not able to stand \$400,000,000 annual damage to the lands of America, and if we do not correct that condition future generations will hold us responsible.

It is because I believe in a system of public works of permanent and lasting benefit and improvement that I advocate strongly the large appropriation contained in the pending measure, and I believe that the money will be spent in various parts of the country, not only in the agricultural sections of the Middle West but in the cities, where it will do good, and will mean the building up of real assets to the country. It is not waste, extravagance, and loss to spend money on permanent improvements which are of lasting benefit.

I repeat, when in New Mexico we have money we will buy shoes and we will buy clothing. I do not see the Senator from New York in the Chamber, but if he were here I would say that our women folks would even buy hats, many of which are made in New York City, and the milliners of New York City might be aided by this appropriation, even though the Senator cannot see it.

Mr. President, I said that I did not want to drag my own State into the discussion and the debate, but I feared that the statements which have been made would indicate that

my colleague had offered his amendment simply to benefit the State of New Mexico; and knowing that that was far from his mind, and believing in the amendment as a worthwhile amendment, which would serve to benefit all the people of the United States, whether they are in the cities in the East or in the West or in the Middle West, I shall support the amendment of my colleague.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, I may say to my colleague that he has stated the facts absolutely correctly. I offered the amendment at the request of two national educational associations, and without any local consideration in mind whatever, though, of course, as the Senator has aptly pointed out, the interests of New Mexico in this particular matter seem to correspond entirely with the interests of the country at large.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to consume only 3 or 4 minutes.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that under the joint resolution as it now stands, with the provision extending for one year the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, the Federal Relief Administrator has the power to do exactly what is sought to be done by this amendment.

Within the last few weeks the Federal Relief Administrator has made advances to six States. He now has pending applications from eight States. Within a week or 10 days the sum of \$700,000 has been advanced to the State of Mississippi. The two Dakotas, Alabama, and two other States have received advances. Representatives are now in the field investigating the applications from other States. There is no reason to doubt that under the existing law, wherever there is a need, when it is shown that there is some justification for it, assistance will be rendered to the schools to enable them to complete their terms.

I believe that embarking upon an entirely new policy may be dangerous. Certainly the pending amendment is a limitation upon the amount that should be used for school purposes, and those who really are in favor of rendering assistance to the schools should oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator sits down may I ask him a question? Has there been any complaint at all of lack of attention to these school matters by the Federal Relief Administration? As I understand, there has been none at all.

Mr. BYRNES. Not one complaint. The Relief Administrator advises me that within the past few weeks six States have received advances; that applications are pending at this time, and there has been no complaint from any State that any fair and just request has not received attention.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know that I would have said anything, Mr. President, had it not been for the suggestion that my State had recently obtained some \$700,000 for school relief.

As I indicated in a question I asked the Senator from New Mexico, I am in entire sympathy with the purpose he has in mind. I do not at all accept the viewpoint of the Senator from Maryland, much as I respect him, and much as I admire him. I think it is narrow statesmanship to attempt to arouse the country against the city, one section against the other, and one people against another. I do not know what taxes they pay up in Maryland. I do not know what taxes they have to pay in New Mexico. I do know, however, that so far as my own State is concerned, a purely agricultural State, the people have been burdened to the limit with taxes. They have not only paid a high tax on land and occupational callings, but they have even reverted to the sales tax out of necessity.

I know that in my own State public schools have closed. More of them are going to close. As a Mississippian, I appreciate what the Administrator of Emergency Relief has done in the matter of providing assistance to and carrying on some of the schools in my State. I may say, incidentally, that I do not know of any public official who has measured up to the duties of his office more than has Harry Hopkins. He has had a difficult task and he has performed it well. I agree that he has in the fullness of his heart and in the dis-

charge of his duty made allocations to some States, and will make them to more if the need requires. But I want to say that so far as this more than \$4,000,000,000 appropriation is concerned, I do not know where he could give greater relief than to the public-school system of the country. What purpose could be better served. Is not the education of our boys and girls the very foundation of our civilization and future place in the sun?

Some may not think that is the kind of relief they want to give, but I know that in many places throughout this country, teachers have gone without their warrants being paid, they have struggled with greatly reduced salaries, many of them can hardly live upon the salary they are obtaining. And I know that when schools close those people are thrown out of employment, and probably put in another way upon the relief rolls of the country. So I entertain the strongest conviction that a goodly portion of this money should go for relief to keep the public-school systems of this country going.

I regret that the situation is such as to demand Federal aid. But it is here, and I should rather see relief given in that way, even though the flood waters come down from the North and flood our land and my State, run people off of the land, endanger the lives of the people. I would rather see the school system of the State kept going than money go out even for flood relief.

The same is true as to the need for public highways in my State, which I think is as far behind as any State in the country, and I say it with no degree of pride. I think a large amount of this money should go to public-highway construction, because it gives man-power work, relieves the unemployment situation, and gives permanent benefit to the State. As much as I believe in that, however, I want to see the public-school system in my State come first and kept going.

I state to the Senator from New Mexico, because I know that in whatever he engages, his purposes are always high, and that he is sincere about what he is trying to do, that I believe it is a mistake for us to adopt the amendment limiting the amount which might go to the public-school expenditure.

I wish this matter might be put off until tomorrow. I do not believe myself more sincere in the position I take than he is, and I put both of ourselves upon the same plane, but all with whom I have talked think it is best to have the amount unlimited to take care of the needs, especially when the administrative officers are doing the work now and serving the purpose that we are trying to write into the legislation.

But when the distinguished Senator from Maryland, wonderfully qualified in every way that he is, a leader in this body and entitled to that leadership, rises in his place and makes a speech against the purposes of spending money to carry on the public schools of this country and giving employment to the teachers and education to the children in this emergency, and puts the issue before me, and the roll is called, I know where I am going to stand, and that is for the education of the children of the country and for the continued operation of the public schools. So I hope the Senator from New Mexico will confer with others who believe as he and I and others believe, and that in the end he will think it is wise, in view of the circumstances, and the assurance of the administrative officers, to withdraw his amendment so that it might not limit what we are trying to do.

Mr. CUTTING. Mr. President, may I call to the attention of the Senator that the amendment simply deals with maintenance of the public schools for the remainder of this particular current school year. Does the Senator think that it will be necessary to spend more than \$40,000,000 for that purpose? If so, it is contrary to the estimates made by these educational associations.

Mr. HARRISON. I know, Mr. President, that heretofore the administration has felt that in carrying on the public schools and rendering assistance they should not do it in cities of, say, over 5,000 population, because they have

felt that if it embraced all the cities of the country that it would be too costly, that it would be almost impossible. And so they have confined it to the smaller rural schools and smaller cities. I do not want that controversy to arise here. I am afraid it will provoke such an issue between the cities and rural communities that will add confusion to the question, and might hamper or destroy the present policy of the Government.

My State is not one of the large States. It has more schools, of course, than has New Mexico, but I think the figures might climb much higher than even \$40,000,000, and I am quite sure if the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is adopted, which does not limit the expenditure to cities of 5,000 or more, as is now the policy of the administration, that the expenditure will climb probably to \$100,000,000 or more. So I think we might get into some conflict and confusion about this whole matter which with rare exceptions the Senate of the United States wants to carry forward, namely, assistance to the public schools.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I hope we may have a vote. We will never pass this joint resolution if we are going to spend 2 hours as we have done today on every minor amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CUTTING. Has my amendment been modified so as to provide the amount of \$40,000,000?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment has been modified so as to provide \$40,000,000.

Mr. CUTTING. Then I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the vote; but before the vote is taken I wish to have it understood that if this amendment shall be adopted not only will rural towns and villages and counties be here asking for relief for educational purposes, but cities as well.

In my State of Massachusetts there are teachers in the schools of several cities who have not received their salaries for several months. We are trying to work out that problem, and are working it out without coming to the Federal Government; but once we open the Federal door for educational relief, if any Senator thinks we shall ever be able to confine it to rural communities, he is greatly mistaken. Once we depart from the policy of direct Federal relief to the needy and engage in other relief activities, there will be no limits to many proposals and excessive appropriations. Loans from the Federal Treasury to educational institutions and for school purposes may be justified, but grants will lead to the educational system becoming federalized, and will end local self-government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CUTTING]. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOGAN. On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who is absent. I find that I can transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], which I do, and vote "yea."

Mr. BULKLEY (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. BULKLEY. I have a general pair with that Senator. Not knowing how he would vote, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. ROBINSON. I wish again to announce that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained by illness.

I also announce that the following Senators are necessarily detained: The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr.

O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MURPHY].

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 25, as follows:

## YEAS—55

Austin	Copeland	King	Reynolds
Bailey	Costigan	La Follette	Russell
Bankhead	Couzens	Logan	Schall
Barbour	Cutting	McAdoo	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Dickinson	McCarran	Shipstead
Bilbo	Duffy	McGill	Steiwer
Black	Frazier	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	George	Metcalf	Thomas, Utah
Borah	Gibson	Murray	Townsend
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Truman
Burke	Harrison	Norbeck	Vandenberg
Capper	Hastings	Nye	Wagner
Clark	Hatch	Pittman	White
Connaally	Johnson	Pope	

## NAYS—25

Adams	Fletcher	Maloney	Smith
Ashurst	Gerry	McKellar	Tydings
Bachman	Glass	Minton	Van Nuys
Byrd	Guffey	Moore	Walsh
Byrnes	Hayden	Radcliffe	
Coolidge	Keyes	Robinson	
Dieterich	Loneragan	Sheppard	

## NOT VOTING—15

Brown	Davis	Long	Overton
Bulkley	Donahay	Murphy	Trammell
Caraway	Gore	Norris	Wheeler
Carey	Lewis	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. CUTTING's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 2, line 7, to strike out the sum of "\$4,000,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$9,000,000,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$4,000,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$9,000,000,000", so as to read:

That in order to provide relief and work relief, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used in the discretion and under the direction of the President, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1937, the sum of \$9,000,000,000—

And so forth.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator intend to allocate his \$9,000,000,000 if the amendment should be adopted?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Should the amendment be adopted it would be necessary, of course, to alter the break-downs contained on page 3 of the joint resolution.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the Senator, in all good faith, that some of us would be more inclined to look with favor on his amendment if we had the break-down that is going to result from the \$9,000,000,000. I do not mean to put the Senator to that trouble tonight; but if tomorrow he could give us the break-down it might be that some of us would be inclined to support the amendment who otherwise would not do so.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the break-down would come when these amounts had to be paid back.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I recognize that there is a basic conflict of opinion concerning the methods which should be employed in meeting the most serious economic disaster in the written history of the world. I do not question the sincerity of the motives or the patriotism of those who sharply disagree with the point of view to which I have adhered consistently since December 1929, when Congress met following the stock-market crash. The arguments of those who contend that this major economic catastrophe can be permitted to run its course cannot stand analysis for one moment. They cannot stand analysis because certain basic, essential, fundamental, and sweeping economic changes have taken place in this country during the past three or four decades.

Among the most important of these changes is the fact that within the past three or four decades we have taken rapid

strides toward the solution of the problem with which mankind has been wrestling since the dawn of written history—the problem of production.

When the pioneers came to this country they were armed with only a few crude tools. They had a bitter struggle against the forces of Nature just to wrest from her the barest necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter. It was not so long ago in the history of this Republic, for I remember hearing my own mother say that up until the time she was 8 years of age all the clothing which she wore upon her person was produced upon the farm where she lived, with the exception of her shoes, and they were made by hand by the village shoemaker. Thanks, however, to the natural resources with which the Nation was so richly and so generously endowed, thanks to a magnificent citizenship, and thanks to the progress of science and invention, within the past three or four decades we have come with a rush out of the age and the economy of scarcity into an economy of potential abundance and security for all.

Today we have the natural resources, we have the man power, and we have the productive capacity on the farm and in the factory to provide for every citizen of the Republic not only those bare necessities of life for which our immediate ancestors and our forebears had to struggle, but we can today provide for every family in the country those things which, in my view, are sometimes misnamed "luxuries"; those things which give some leisure to life; those things which add to the cultural and the human values of life; those things which make life worth living upon the earth, both from the material and from the spiritual standpoint.

Mr. President, I believe it is generally conceded that the basic, sweeping, and far-reaching economic changes which have taken place in this country have made every large economic group in America dependent upon every other large economic group. Today the farmer cannot get a decent price for his products unless those who live in the cities, towns, and villages have purchasing power with which to pay a decent price for farm products. On the other hand, those who live in the cities, towns, and villages of the country cannot obtain employment, they cannot secure decent wages, unless those who live upon the farm have the purchasing power with which to buy in part the products that are produced and distributed in the cities, towns, and villages of the Nation.

Furthermore, Mr. President, 99 percent of the business and professional men of the Nation have been made dependent for the successful operation of their businesses and for the successful practice of their professions upon the purchasing power of the great masses of the people of the country. Until there is adopted in this country a program which will put the idle at useful work, distribute purchasing power, and stimulate industry, we shall continue to find ourselves in the same or a worse economic situation.

In this session of Congress we are repeating the same procedure which has been repeated in every session of Congress since the depression began. During the first few years of the depression it was impossible to get the Congress to take action to meet the emergency in any respect whatsoever. Then finally, when there came a general recognition of the necessity for action upon the part of the Federal Government in meeting the emergency, in each succeeding session of Congress we have been confronted with a reluctance upon the part of a majority of the Congress to provide sufficient money to inaugurate a program adequate to deal with the crisis. When we came forward with the first relief bill in 1930-31, it was denounced as being excessive, although it provided for only \$250,000,000. In the special session of 1933, when the relief bill was finally enacted, providing for \$500,000,000, most of the Senators regarded the sum as excessive.

In the special session of 1933, when the \$3,300,000,000 public-works program was brought forward, there were many Senators on the floor who denounced that appropriation as being excessive. Yet, Mr. President, after the adjournment of each session of Congress, it has become perfectly obvious that the provisions made to meet not only the

relief situation, but the situation confronting us, so far as unemployment and reemployment were concerned, have been inadequate to the task at hand. In short, it has been impossible to secure the adoption of a program adequate to meet the situation, because there rests in the minds of many Senators—and it is reflected in the minds of many people in this country—the idea that the depression, if permitted to run its course, will cure itself.

It is my view that there is no greater fallacy in the minds of men in this country today than the one that we have drifted out of the depressions of the past, and that therefore we will come out of this depression. I am convinced that we never drifted out of a depression in the past. I am convinced that we have come out of those past depressions because we have been pulled out by the reinvestment of large blocks of private capital for further capital expenditure.

Today the real inducement for the reinvestment of huge blocks of private capital for capital expenditure purposes has disappeared, at least temporarily, from the American economic scene. This is largely due to the fact that the frontier in this country has finally expanded until it now touches the Pacific Ocean. In depressions of the past, when we had a rising tide of immigration, a rising birthrate, and, therefore, a constantly mounting population curve, there was real inducement at the bottom of one of these swings in the business cycle for huge blocks of private capital to flow in, and to reinvest in capital expenditures, for more railroads, to finance the development of the urban and agricultural communities which were constantly springing up from our frontier as it pushed westward, to build more factories and more plants, to provide for the ever-increasing consumer demand due to our ever-mounting population. But, as I said a few moments ago, the frontier has finally been expanded until it touches the Pacific Ocean.

Any young man who took Horace Greeley's advice today to go West would, in the first place, probably have to thumb his way across the United States, and then, when he got to the edge of the frontier, he would be very lucky if he could get a job carrying a spear in the moving pictures in Hollywood.

I do not discount the importance of capital investment for retooling of plants, for the replacement of depreciated property, and for the installation of new machinery to meet new methods. But, generally speaking, the inducement for private capital to reinvest in large blocks for capital-expenditure purposes is no longer present as a factor in our economic situation, and that is a very significant economic fact. It is the reason why this so-called "normal, natural recovery" which has been predicted by orthodox-minded business men, financiers, economists, and politicians, every 6 months since 1929, has not taken place and never will.

Mr. President, just to drive the point home, let us assume that we had \$15,000,000,000 right on my desk at this moment. Where would you invest that \$15,000,000,000 as a private investment, for capital-expenditure purposes, and expect to get your money back?

I do not want some Senator to tell me that he knows a hotel in his State which can be bought for 15 or 20 cents on the dollar. I do not want to be told of an apartment house which can be obtained for the first mortgage. Those are not the kind of reinvestments I am discussing. I am talking about reinvestment for capital expenditure purposes.

I am sure you would not invest it in the building of any more railroads, when today some of the railroads are before the Interstate Commerce Commission asking for orders of convenience and necessity to tear up some of their existing trackage.

I am sure you would not finance the building of any more hotels, when you can buy very good ones in this country for 15 to 20 cents on the dollar.

I am sure you would not build any more expensive apartment houses, when you can buy many of them for the first mortgages.

I am convinced that you would not finance the development of any more urban or agricultural communities. I am convinced that you would not recommend investing the money in any more automobile plants, when we have a

capacity of eight and one-half million units in this country today, and the figures show that at the peak of the boom we never sold more than six and one-half million units at home or abroad.

I am sure that if you have been to Akron, Ohio, you would not recommend building any more tire factories.

I am sure you would not invest the money in any more shoe plants when we have a capacity for producing shoes in this country which, if we let it run at the peak for 6 months, would turn out three and one-half pairs of shoes for every man, woman, and child in this country.

I do not believe you would recommend investing the money in any more textile plants, nor do I think you would recommend building any more silk mills. The fact is, Mr. President, that the real inducement for the reinvestment of huge blocks of private capital for a capital-expenditure purpose has disappeared from the American economic scene.

While it is true that this physical frontier, the expansion of which had so much to do with our constantly increasing development in this country, has been closed, there is another frontier beckoning to courageous statesmanship in this economic crisis. Half the homes in America, both on the farms and in the cities, are below a decent standard of sanitation, comfort, and convenience. In nearly every large metropolitan city of America there are areas which are a disgrace to American civilization. I refer to the slum areas which are in nearly every large metropolitan city in this country. In New York City, to which we often point with pride as the acme of metropolitan development, there are 504,433 apartments that do not have adequate inside plumbing. In the city of Cleveland, Ohio, a survey of the slum area in that community showed that the cost for police and fire protection for that area was approximately \$25.50 per capita, as compared with a per capita cost in every other community in the city of \$4.25. This survey does not take into account the cost of institutional and corrective care for those whose lives are warped, bent, and broken by their environment in the slum areas of America.

There are \$15,000,000,000 worth of highway-railroad grade-crossing separations which need to be made in the cities, towns, villages, and along the highways of this country. With the mounting speed of operation of railroad trains and with the increased speed of automobile travel, these death traps must be eliminated from our cities and from our highways. If we give only the lowest possible economic value to human life, the elimination of these highway-railroad grade-crossing death traps would be self-liquidating in the best sense of the word.

There are thousands of communities in this country, Mr. President, which do not have adequate potable water-supply systems. There are thousands of cities, villages, and towns in this country which do not have modern sanitary sewage-disposal plants. In my own State, as a result of 5 years of intensive study by competent persons, there has been developed a demonstrated need for useful needed work, upon which I base the assertion—applying that survey to the country as a whole—that there is \$100,000,000,000 worth of needed and useful work which remains to be done in this country.

What is the alternative, Mr. President? The alternative advanced by those who are opposed to this measure is to balance the Budget and to freeze upon the relief rolls of this Nation in idleness and in half misery those who have already been forced to go through the cruel and inhuman process of pauperization before they got upon the relief roll. To follow that course is to commit economic suicide by degrees. It not only means a demoralized morale—it not only means a loss of skill upon the part of the workers of this country due to enforced idleness—but it also means in the end the destruction of the progress which we have made toward the solution of the problem of production.

Mr. President, it is perfectly idle and futile to talk about balancing the Budget in an emergency of this character. We can no more balance the Budget of the Government of the United States in the emergency of this economic crisis than we could balance the Budget during the emergency of war. In that respect this crisis of the depression and the

crisis of war are similar. In both there are extraordinary expenditures which have to be made. They cannot be avoided. The difference is, however, that once we are in a war there seems to be a unanimity of opinion that the war must be carried on to a successful conclusion. I was about this Chamber, Mr. President, during the dark days of the war. I saw no Senator rise in his place to say that we could not fight the war because it would unbalance the Budget. On the contrary, the Budget of this Government was unbalanced \$7,000,000,000 in the first few weeks of the war, and before it was over it was unbalanced to the extent of twenty-six and a half billion dollars. Many Senators applauded the unbalancing process as a patriotic action on the part of this Government.

I will go a step further, Mr. President. Assume the unthinkable thing that some country should declare war upon this country tomorrow; is there a single Senator in this Chamber who would arise in his place and say that we could not defend the United States because it would further unbalance the Budget? Of course not! Everyone knows that in that event all the money necessary for the successful conduct of a war to defend this country would be provided instantaneously by this Congress.

On the other hand, Mr. President, if we were confronted by the emergency of war, we would not expect to see the President of the United States call in the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury and ask them how much money he could have to conduct the war. On the contrary, we would expect to see him call in the Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, and ask them how much money it was going to take to run the war, and then, once he had obtained those estimates, he would call in the Secretary of the Treasury and say "Mr. Secretary, here is the problem in your field. Get this money and be quick about it."

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, I will remind him that one of the most earnest messages sent to the Congress of the United States by any President was a message sent by President Woodrow Wilson, in which he very earnestly protested against undertaking to conduct the war solely by borrowing and urged that it be done by taxation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I remember that the message did not have very much effect on the Congress, because it voted down the tax bill which my father sponsored in this Chamber, which would have taxed war profits to the limit. Reactionary Democrats and reactionary Republicans joined hands to defeat his proposal and adopted one which provided a much less heavy taxation upon war profits and upon wealth, and thereby to that extent took the position that they preferred to finance the major expenses of the war out of borrowings.

Mr. GLASS. But the Congress did enact a tax law imposing unprecedented tax burdens on the American people at that time. It may not have been as extensive a tax bill or as severe a tax bill as the Senator's distinguished father proposed, but, at that, it was an unprecedented tax bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I acknowledge that a portion of the expenditure for the war was financed by taxation, but I simply wish to point out that the Congress did not follow the Executive's advice to finance the war out of taxation.

Mr. GLASS. That was not the point.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood that is what the Senator said.

Mr. GLASS. No. The protestation was against financing it altogether by bond issues, and that is what we are now doing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator will have to acknowledge that the course followed has not had my approval. As one of those who have advocated an adequate program to meet the emergency, I have been consistent in seizing every opportunity presented to attempt to increase the taxes of the country to meet the emergency, because I recognize as well as does the Senator from Virginia or any other Senator that in order to meet the problems with which we are confronted in this emergency we must tax!

Mr. GLASS. I think that is true. The Senator did not understand me as being critical of him, did he?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's specific argument, but I would not want his comment respecting the financing of war to pass without this supplemental observation, which, I am sure, will not only interest him but encourage him.

I am perfectly sure that the conclusion which our long-time munitions inquiry will lay down as an American fundamental for the future will be that we must never again fight a war, if it comes, on borrowed money. We must pay as we go. There is no other way to prevent the inflation which inevitably produces the subsequent reflexes precisely of the type from which we are now suffering.

I am sure the conclusion will be that we cannot make a profit out of war, we cannot avoid the subsequent deflation incident to war, except as we cease attempting such experiments on borrowed money. I think if there is an analogy between that situation and the one in which we now find ourselves, it most emphatically challenges the fact that we persist in spending, spending, spending, and decline to provide even a reasonable proportion of the revenues necessary to pay the bill.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, if the Senator will submit to a further interruption—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. GLASS. I think of all people I am competent to distinguish the difference between the exaltations which pervade the Nation in time of war when the lives of the boys are imperiled and the rather more deliberate and reluctant spirit, if it may be so characterized, which pervades the Nation when we are spending money in experimentation. I say that because as Secretary of the Treasury I floated the Victory Loan after the war, and I know that even so soon after the war I experienced a great deal of difficulty in arousing the patriotic spirit of the Nation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not in disagreement with the Senator from Michigan about the necessity of taxing in an emergency of this kind. I was very much interested in what he had to say about the prospective report of the committee investigating the munitions industry, a committee which has, in my opinion, rendered such splendid public service.

However, I wish to say in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Virginia that it is my firm conviction that the issues at stake in this economic crisis will have a greater potential effect upon the way men, women, and children have to live in this the richest Nation on earth, than the outcome of any war in which the Nation has ever been engaged since it was founded.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Human nature being what it is, both in and out of the Senate, I assume that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has some doubt as to the willingness of the present Congress to finance the pending relief measure now, and that the real question to be answered is whether we must proceed to make emergency expenditures in this country regardless of an immediate program of taxation adequate to pay for such emergency expenditures.

That being so, if it is so, I take for granted that the Senator from Wisconsin believes as an alternative that we must have a long-time balancing of the Budget, namely, adequate expenditures in the crisis, whether of peace or war, and, following that crisis, sufficient taxation in better times to help retire the indebtedness incurred during more difficult times. If that is the position of the Senator from Wisconsin, I need not say that I agree with him on both counts.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am in partial agreement with the statement made by the Senator from Colorado, but I was about to say, when he rose to interrupt me, that it seems perfectly clear, from the experience of other countries which have been afflicted with the same economic "disease" from which we have been suffering, but which have had it longer than we have, and therefore we may see something of its prognosis, that every large industrial country in the world has come to a point where it had to determine whether it would tax sufficiently to maintain government credit or whether it would resort to uncontrolled or an attempted controlled inflation. The only industrial country in the world which has had the courage to tax sufficiently to maintain its credit and at the same time to adopt measures which it considered necessary to meet the problems of its people is Great Britain.

Therefore, Mr. President, in further answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado, I think this country will be forced to increase taxation, not in order to balance the Budget—for that I believe to be an utter impossibility—but in order to make it possible to continue these extraordinary expenditures over a long period of time it must increase its taxation in order to maintain the credit of the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin would like to resume his address tomorrow.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am anxious not to delay the joint resolution, and I certainly have tried not to take up any time on it; but the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] advises me that it will have to go over until tomorrow. If the Senator from Arkansas wishes to have an executive session, it would be agreeable to me to yield at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is desired to have an executive session at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I yield the floor for the day.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBINSON. 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.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BILBO in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. LOGAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Stanley Reed, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor General, vice James Crawford Biggs, resigned.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following nominations:

Frank P. Lockhart, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a consul general, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service; and

George A. Makinson, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a consul, to be a consul general.

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The calendar is in order.

#### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles T. Fisher, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clifton Mathews, of Arizona, to be United States circuit judge for the ninth circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Moore to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, to be Archivist of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David B. Macgowan, of Tennessee, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Hurley, of New York, to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Jessalee Nash to be postmaster at Hollister, Mo., be passed over until I may have a chance to examine it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does the Senator desire to have the nomination recommitted?

Mr. CLARK. No; I merely ask to have it passed over.

Mr. MCKELLAR. With that exception, I ask to have the nominations of postmasters on the calendar confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters on the calendar, with the exception of the nomination of Jessalee Nash to be postmaster at Hollister, Mo., are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

#### RECESS

Mr. ROBINSON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 21, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935*

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Joseph T. Votava, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney, district of Nebraska, vice Charles E. Sandall, term expired.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Leo F. Walton to be postmaster at Lafayette, Ala., in place of J. F. Frazer. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1934.

##### COLORADO

Charles L. Dunn to be postmaster at Johnstown, Colo., in place of O. T. Brunner. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

## CONNECTICUT

James M. Tomney to be postmaster at Coscob, Conn., in place of H. G. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1934.

Albert P. Walsh to be postmaster at Danbury, Conn., in place of E. H. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1934.

John A. Jackson to be postmaster at Durham, Conn., in place of O. M. Bristol. Incumbent's commission expired May 2, 1934.

William J. Hernberg to be postmaster at Mansfield Depot, Conn., in place of M. M. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1932.

Harry A. Schultz to be postmaster at Middlefield, Conn., in place of E. M. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired March 18, 1934.

Joseph R. Tyrseck to be postmaster at Montville, Conn., in place of F. C. Perry. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1934.

Eugene B. Thomas to be postmaster at Moodus, Conn., in place of W. N. Manee. Incumbent's commission expired May 2, 1934.

James R. May to be postmaster at New London, Conn., in place of P. K. Dewire, resigned.

John A. Leahy to be postmaster at Plainfield, Conn., in place of C. A. Jerome, resigned.

Paul D. Wren to be postmaster at Westbrook, Conn., in place of E. F. Schmidt. Incumbent's commission expired May 9, 1934.

James J. Lee to be postmaster at Willimantic, Conn., in place of F. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1934.

Inez V. Lawson to be postmaster at Wilton, Conn., in place of J. L. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1933.

## FLORIDA

Gertrude Scott to be postmaster at Jacksonville Beach, Fla., in place of A. E. Koehler, deceased.

Lynn W. Bloom to be postmaster at Lakeland, Fla., in place of F. D. Smith, retired.

## GEORGIA

Bernie C. Chapman to be postmaster at Porterdale, Ga., in place of B. C. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1935.

## ILLINOIS

Theodore S. Wright to be postmaster at Kansas, Ill., in place of R. F. Sexton. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1933.

Vernon L. Baie to be postmaster at Shabbona, Ill., in place of E. R. Grant. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1932.

Louis H. Tegtmeyer to be postmaster at Steepleville, Ill., in place of N. A. Jay. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1934.

## INDIANA

Orlin F. Reinhardt to be postmaster at New Salisbury, Ind., in place of B. F. Pearson, removed.

## IOWA

William S. Richard to be postmaster at Corydon, Iowa, in place of G. R. West. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1934.

## KENTUCKY

Nannie G. Woodson to be postmaster at Eddyville, Ky., in place of L. G. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1934.

## MAINE

Arlene C. Hoffses to be postmaster at Waldoboro, Maine, in place of W. C. Flint. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1934.

## MARYLAND

Guy K. Motter to be postmaster at Frederick, Md., in place of I. S. Biser, retired.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Thomas S. Starodaj to be postmaster at Ware, Mass., in place of L. E. St. Onge, retired.

## MICHIGAN

Edgar S. Allen to be postmaster at Mancelona, Mich., in place of A. E. Gibbs. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1935.

Clarence J. Maloney to be postmaster at Mass, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1934.

Donald E. Howell to be postmaster at Wayne, Mich., in place of H. C. Ziegler, removed.

## MINNESOTA

May E. Aukofer to be postmaster at Welcome, Minn., in place of F. H. Wherland, deceased.

## MISSOURI

Sidney M. Cramer to be postmaster at Archie, Mo., in place of W. O. Tout. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1934.

Zera Lee Stokely to be postmaster at Poplar Bluff, Mo., in place of A. N. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1934.

## NEW JERSEY

William H. Fisher to be postmaster at Phillipsburg, N. J., in place of J. R. Dick, removed.

## NEW YORK

Ida P. Jenkins to be postmaster at Greenwood Lake, N. Y., in place of W. B. Phillips, removed.

Arthur J. Belgard to be postmaster at Ogdensburg, N. Y., in place of J. M. Bentley, retired.

## OREGON

Sylvester D. Goshert to be postmaster at Nyssa, Oreg., in place of P. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1934.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Leo McAlee to be postmaster at Johnsonburg, Pa., in place of J. J. Donnelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1934.

James M. Herrold to be postmaster at Port Trevorton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1932.

Edward L. Middleswarth to be postmaster at Yeagertown, Pa., in place of J. M. Aiken. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1934.

## PUERTO RICO

Hortensia R. O'Neill to be postmaster at San German, P. R., in place of H. R. O'Neill. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1934.

## RHODE ISLAND

Laura Francois to be postmaster at Alton, R. I., in place of J. A. Greenhalgh. Incumbent's commission expired October 16, 1933.

George W. Jenckes to be postmaster at Slatersville, R. I., in place of G. W. Jenckes. Incumbent's commission expired June 17, 1934.

Grace S. Croome to be postmaster at West Kingston, R. I., in place of G. S. Croome. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1935.

## TEXAS

Oscar L. Weaver to be postmaster at Thurber, Tex., in place of John Plummer, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935*

## RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Charles T. Fisher, Jr., to be member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

## ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

Robert D. W. Connor to be Archivist of the United States.

## UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Clifton Mathews to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit.

## UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John M. Moore to be United States marshal, eastern district of Kentucky.

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

David B. Macgowan to be consul general.  
John P. Hurley to be consul general.

## POSTMASTERS

## ARIZONA

John B. Boone, Coolidge.  
Albert H. Adams, Scottsdale.

## CALIFORNIA

Bertha A. Williams, Cloverdale.

## DELAWARE

Bradford P. Jones, Bridgeville.  
Roland F. Quillin, Laurel.

## FLORIDA

George H. Stokes, Callahan.

## GEORGIA

John Frank Chappell, Americus.

## ILLINOIS

Henry R. Engel, Beecher City.  
Scottie Brown, Edgewood.  
Paul H. Sachtleben, Hoyleton.  
Anthony H. Koselke, Lansing.  
Donald C. Simons, Maple Park.  
Madeline E. Brannick, Minooka.  
Mary Bellert Corson, Northbrook.

## INDIANA

Helen B. Fultz, Crothersville.  
Walter R. Meinert, Silver Lake.

## KANSAS

Harold P. Knipe, Grinnell.  
Ila M. Menefee, Hoxie.  
Albert H. Gillis, Kansas City.  
Wilbert F. Kunze, Kensington.  
Joseph H. Schneider, Nortonville.  
Elmer L. G. Epperson, Scott City.  
John E. Barrett, Topeka.  
Joseph B. Riddle, Wichita.

## MINNESOTA

Charles B. Smith, Alexandria.  
Marie H. Sands, Alvarado.  
Thomas H. Brandon, Annandale.  
John E. Pasch, Barnesville.  
Walter L. Dickson, Big Falls.  
Peter Evensen, Bigfork.  
Egbert J. Sutherland, Chatfield.  
James B. Hubbell, Forest Lake.  
Irene G. Almquist, Harris.  
Edward J. King, Hastings.  
Paul M. Saemrow, Morristown.  
Robert E. O'Donnell, Mound.  
Otto A. Kubat, Owatonna.  
George H. Tome, Pine Island.  
Robert S. Cowie, Rothsay.

## MISSOURI

Emmet O. Griffin, Cartersville.  
Elta E. Eubank, Clifton Hill.  
George L. Chancellor, Goodman.  
Albert J. Robinson, Gorin.  
Joseph W. Evans, Hale.  
Laurence D. Estill, Lawson.  
Edna S. Spencer, Malta Bend.  
Ivan Weber, Richmond.  
Charles E. Logan, Spickard.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harry B. Burt, Amherst.

## NEW YORK

John L. Purcell, Aurora.  
Hattie B. Dye, Cassadaga.

Charles C. Curry, Dansville.  
William C. Sharp, Greenwich.  
George H. Raum, Kenoza Lake.  
Frederick M. Dennin, Lake Placid.  
William H. Ordway, Mount McGregor.  
Frank D. Hurd, Napanoch.  
Edward V. Canavan, Niagara Falls.  
Percy C. Tatem, Old Westbury.  
Oren G. Hunter, Parish.  
Robert A. Lundy, Ray Brook.  
Virginia L. Dennison, Sackets Harbor.  
Victor J. Banfield, Van Etten.  
Fred Burns, Walden.  
Gertrude M. Ackert, West Park.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Otis Malone, Almont.  
John A. Knapp, Binford.  
William F. Moede, Dunn Center.  
Agnes S. Reynolds, Edmore.  
Michael C. Rausch, Elgin.  
Francis W. Powers, Havana.  
Thelma G. Bohrer, Stanton.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

Benjamin Rutledge Fuller, Clinton.  
Thomas E. Stokes, Darlington.  
Walter T. Barron, Fort Mill.  
George S. McCravey, Liberty.  
Raymond Phillips, Seneca.

## UTAH

Jesse M. French, Greenriver.

## VIRGINIA

Harvey G. McGlothlin, Richlands.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God of our fathers, at this time we would open the doors of our hearts to the divine presence, whose love shall bring us into fellowship and unity with Thy holy purpose. Do Thou grant it, blessed Lord. Let us hear Thy voice calling us into harmony with the wisest and best plans for the Republic. Heavenly Father, with our faltering lips we pray for an anguished world which is still sharpening its swords. The paganism of war is still brooding over the ideals of empires based on bloody tragedy which is lurking in the shadows. On the waves of militaristic emotion, generated by the insanity of hate, crying, "Dominion or death", the nations are headed toward the rocks and shoals on which the countless millions have perished. Almighty God, put forth Thine arm against the savagery of human nature. Teach man everywhere that the world can never be saved through the bludgeon of force. Oh spare it from the blinding flash that soon may convulse it in the throes of death and destruction. Bring all peoples to the realization that Bethlehem alone can overthrow the Caesars and the road to the cross is the way to peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6644) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes", disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses