J
11
.R5

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1939

*(Legislative day of Thursday, June 22, 1939)*

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Arthur E. Paterson, of Middletown, Conn., chaplain of the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art the source of all that is good, at this, the beginning of another day, again we seek Thy blessing.

Bless the President of these United States, the Presiding Officer, and the Members of this House, and all those in this and other lands in places of public responsibility.

Especially in these days of peculiar stress in many lands, give us patience, wisdom, and a courageous faith; and increasingly move our people to know, love, and honor Thy law.

This we ask to the end that the children of our homes, and that generations to come in all the world, may praise Thee tomorrow because of what we are and do today. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 27, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5610) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 20, 21, 34, 50, 57, 58, 117, 129, and 133 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 15, 39, 41, 55, 75, 122, and 127 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 101 to the bill.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Downey | King | Reynolds |
| Andrews | Ellender | La Follette | Russell |
| Ashurst | Frazier | Lee | Schwellenbach |
| Austin | George | Lodge | Shipstead |
| Bailey | Gerry | Logan | Slattery |
| Bankhead | Gibson | Lucas | Smathers |
| Barkley | Gillette | McCarran | Stewart |
| Bilbo | Glass | McKellar | Taft |
| Bone | Green | Maloney | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | Guffey | Mead | Tobey |
| Bridges | Gurney | Miller | Townsend |
| Bulow | Hale | Minton | Truman |
| Burke | Harrison | Murray | Tydings |
| Byrd | Hatch | Neely | Vandenberg |
| Byrnes | Hayden | Norris | Van Nuys |
| Capper | Herring | Nye | Wagner |
| Clark, Idaho | Hill | O'Mahoney | Walsh |
| Clark, Mo. | Holman | Overton | Wheeler |
| Connally | Holt | Pepper | White |
| Danaher | Hughes | Pittman | Wiley |
| Davis | Johnson, Calif. | Radcliffe | |
| Donahey | Johnson, Colo. | Reed | |

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent because of his participation of the dedication exercises of the New Jersey Pavilion at the New York World's Fair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

Senate Joint Resolution 28

Relative to Eel River flood control and channel rectification

Whereas frequent serious floods of the Eel River, in Humboldt County, constitute a serious menace to the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of this State, in that they cause soil erosion, debris obstruction, frequent river-bed shallowing and changing, constant increase in the course, winding and spreading of the river, gradual washing away of thousands of acres in Eel River Valley and the destruction and damage to farm structures, livestock, and crops in the Eel River delta; and

Whereas as a result of the foregoing, destruction occurs which runs into millions of dollars; and



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Whereas the control of the waters of the Eel River by revetment, channel straightening, rectification and deepening, and debris removal would assist in the prevention of such destruction and aid in the reclaiming of thousands of acres of Eel River delta lands, the controlling of the floodwaters of the Eel River, and in reducing the height of floodwaters, so as to, within a few years, effect sufficient property saving to repay the cost of such work; and

Whereas United States engineers in the twelfth district will within a short time complete a survey of the Eel River directed to be made in connection with a congressionally approved Federal project in relation to the Eel River: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the President and Congress of the United States be memorialized to include revetment, channel straightening, deepening, and rectification within said Eel River project and to appropriate Federal moneys in sums sufficient to complete said works at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Senators and Representatives from California be hereby respectfully requested to urge such action; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be disected to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and to each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Local No. 432, Farmers Union, of Chester, Mont., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 2395) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in wheat, providing for the orderly marketing of wheat at fair prices in interstate and foreign commerce, insuring to wheat producers a parity income from wheat based upon parity price or cost of production, whichever is the higher, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Robert Boeracher, of Findlay, Ohio, praying that the United States keep clear of foreign entanglements, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Angelo Perillo, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the so-called Murray-Casey bill, being the bill (S. 2507) to provide a program for the relief of unemployment by affording opportunities for employment upon a public-works program to persons unable to secure private employment, which was referred to the Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of several citizens of San Francisco, Calif., praying that the Federal theater, arts, and music projects be retained in pending legislation making appropriations for work relief, relief, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for amendment of the pending joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, so as to exempt handicapped persons who have been employed by the W. P. A. for 18 months from being laid off for a period of 60 days, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the enactment in its present form of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and favoring the enactment of such a relief measure as proposed by the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a petition of several citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying that a provision to the effect that workers under the W. P. A. for 18 months or more shall be laid off for a period of 60 days be retained in pending relief legislation, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PEPPER presented the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

House Memorial 14

Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the continuation of the present system of operating camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the State of Florida

Whereas it has been reported that Federal authorities, who are in charge of determining the policy followed in the operation of camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the State of Florida, are contemplating a change in the method of operating said camps, such proposed change to substitute civilians for Reserve officers of the United States Army, as the persons in charge of said camps; and

Whereas it would appear that the type of training and discipline afforded by the present system, which places such camps under the direction of Reserve officers of the United States Army, is beneficial to the persons enrolled in such camps and is advantageous to the welfare of the people of the United States from a military viewpoint: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully petitioned and requested to enact laws preserving the present system of operating camps of the Civilian Conservation Corps, under the direction of Reserve officers of the United States Army; and be it further

*Resolved,* That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the two United States Senators and the five Members of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Florida.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 687) thereon.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 324) for the relief of S. A. Rourke, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 688) thereon.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 119) for the relief of Helen M. Crowley, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 689) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 2491) for the relief of Edward J. Gebhart, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 690) thereon.

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1953) for the relief of Mrs. A. R. Barnard, Charles A. Stephens, Donald W. Prairie, and Mrs. Vern A. Needles, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 691) thereon.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1289) for the relief of the city of Leavenworth, Kans., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 692) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 2083. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Parker McKee, Sr., and Louise McKee (Rept. No. 693); and

H. R. 3541. A bill for the relief of John Chastain and Mollie Chastain, his wife (Rept. No. 694).

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6205) to provide for additional clerk hire in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 695) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6791) making additional appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 696) thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 2663) to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of

clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 697) thereon.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 153) authorizing the printing of the Executive Journals of the Senate (submitted by Mr. PITTMAN on the 27th instant), reported it without amendment.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 22, 1939, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1117) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men or former enlisted men of the United States Navy for the value of personal effects lost in the hurricane at the submarine base, New London, Conn., on September 21, 1938.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 2712. A bill to amend section 2803 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2713. A bill requiring reductions in Government expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2714. A bill to amend title III, veterans' provisions, section 27, of Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, by adding to section 27; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2715. A bill granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Shelton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. 2716. A bill to create a National Tax Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GIBSON:

S. 2717. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Broggi; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2718. A bill granting an increase in pension to Fannie J. Savery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2719. A bill to provide additional civil remedies against violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

S. 2720. A bill authorizing Douglas County, Nebr., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Florence Station, in the city of Omaha, Nebr.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN (for Mr. BARBOUR):

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present to Nicholas Casale an appropriate certificate in recognition of his military service during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. MALONEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 162, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

THIRD DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS (for Mr. LUNDEEN) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $100,000 for the relief of victims of the tornado which occurred in Hennepin and Anoka Counties, Minn., on June 18, 1939, intended to be proposed by Mr. LUNDEEN to the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THIRD TERM FOR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wish to place some newspaper items in the RECORD, but before making the request I shall make a short statement.

On Monday of this week I received a telegram from Mr. Walter Harrison, editor of the Daily Oklahoman. The telegram contained the question, "Are you for Roosevelt for a third term?" I wired back in four words, "As strong as horseradish."

This morning I noticed the following headline in the Washington Post:

Senator LEE climbs on third-term band wagon.

They would be closer to the truth if they said I helped to make it. I am surprised to have that appear in this newspaper, giving the impression that I am just now advocating a third term, when in the same newspaper—the Washington Post—of Friday, May 12, 1939, appeared an article under the headline "Democratic Women hear Senator LEE," in which it is stated:

Senator LEE launched his speech with the third term as the keynote and followed it through, diverging only long enough to discuss the three measures for which he urged support.

On March 1 of this year I addressed the Cosmos Luncheon Club here in Washington, D. C., advocating a continuation of the Roosevelt policies and a third term, if necessary, to carry them out. Then at Lancaster, Pa., at a Jefferson Day dinner on April 13, of this year, I made a speech in which I advocated a continuation of the liberal program of Roosevelt and a third term, if necessary, in order to accomplish that. The news services likewise carried the statement in which I was committed to a third term.

In fact, Mr. President, publicly and privately for over a year I have been giving expression to similar declarations, and I do not like to be pictured as climbing on a third-term band wagon which I have been helping to make from the very beginning.

I ask that the two articles to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of June 28, 1939]

SENATOR LEE CLIMBS ON THIRD TERM BAND WAGON

Senator LEE (Democrat), of Oklahoma, joined his colleague, Senator ELMER THOMAS, yesterday in support of a third term for President Roosevelt. LEE said he was "strong as horseradish" for the idea.

---

[From the Washington Post of May 12, 1939]

DEMOCRATIC WOMEN HEAR SENATOR LEE—THIRD TERM, FARM RELIEF, JOBS, AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS ARE HELD MAJOR OBJECTIVES

(By Jessie Ash Arndt)

A third term for President Roosevelt and championship of farm relief, old-age pensions, and jobs for the unemployed were advanced by Senator JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma, last night as objectives for the Democratic Party in 1940. Addressing the Woman's National Democratic Club, he declared that, in the Democratic National Convention, "Roosevelt will either carry the ball or call the signals."

"The play will hit the left side of the line, just left of center," Senator LEE added. "There may be some on our team who will try to make the play go to the right, but I am sorry to say that I fear they will be knocked down and run over. * * * The best answer to radicalism is liberalism. Franklin D. Roosevelt is today saving the country from a dangerous left turn.

"If the opposition were able to destroy Roosevelt's leadership today, this country would not swing back to the right, but it would go further to the left."

Senator LEE launched his speech with the third term as the keynote and followed it through, diverging only long enough to discuss the three measures for which he urged support.

"In my opinion, there is but one argument that might cause President Roosevelt to consider a third term," he said, "which is that his work is not finished."

SEES BUT ONE ARGUMENT AGAINST

Declaring that the only argument against third term was that it had never been done, Senator LEE cited the fact that a similar argument would have kept Columbus from discovering America and Lindbergh from flying the Atlantic. George Washington's retirement after a second term he assigned to Washington's advancing years.

He met the argument that the President might become a dictator by saying that he had not abused his power during his two terms, which gave assurance that he would not do so. The country would take a chance on a new man's doing so, he said.

"Last week," said Senator LEE, "the national Republican Party, under the guise of the national chamber of commerce, held its annual session here in Washington and the spokesmen of that organization did their best to make it appear that everything is against the policies of this administration."

He said of the November elections, that they brought into office Republicans who "in their campaign pledges were more liberal than the Democrats they replaced."

BIG TAX PROGRAM HELD ESSENTIAL

Hand in hand with championship of the measures he advocated, Senator LEE declared "our party must have courage to champion a tax program that will make it possible to carry out these three important measures. * * * The program will yield enough increased national income to reward our efforts. By such a program, the Government can take money from the mountain tops of wealth in this country and level up the valleys of despair."

SERMON BY DR. HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon delivered by Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick on February 19, 1939, at Riverside Church, New York City, the text being Dare We Break the Vicious Circle of Fighting Evil With Evil, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH PHILIPPINES—STATEMENT BY SAMUEL F. GACHES

[Mr. GIBSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Samuel F. Gaches, relative to the economic relations between the Philippines and the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION ON NEUTRALITY BY AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a declaration by a group of American citizens of Akron, Ohio, regarding neutrality, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT HELD RIGHT AND BIG BUSINESS WRONG ON ECONOMY APPRAISAL—ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Jay Franklin, published in the Washington Evening Star of May 31, 1939, entitled "Roosevelt Held Right and Big Business Wrong on Economy Appraisal," which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK-RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 21, beginning in line 14, as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I understood the situation last night, the committee amendment on page 21 was allowed to go over on the understanding that it was to be reworded. I inquire if any effort has been made to reword that section?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that there was talk about it but no agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that the amendment be passed over temporarily in order to try to work out some language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to passing over the amendment temporarily? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, we then are in such a position, I take it, that I may ask the Senator from Colorado to explain to us line 10, on page 22. In that connection I ask the Senator to observe that certification of work-relief clients may be made by "a local public certifying agency" or "the Work Projects Administration where no such agency exists"; and then we come to the nub of the import of this matter—

Or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies.

Will the Senator, for our benefit, please explain what possibilities are open to the Work Projects Administration by virtue of the last alternative?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this is a provision which came from the House. I do not know that I can offer any suggestions other than such as are open to the Senator from Connecticut.

It is no answer to say to the Senator that the committee has been driven to act under great pressure as to time. We have not given the time that we would have liked to give to the different sections. It is not our fault. The House, exercising its own prerogative, considered the joint resolution, and it only came into our hands about 6 or 8 days before final enactment was imperative.

The purpose of this provision, as I gather, is to provide that the first agency charged with responsibility of certification shall be the local agency, which is the case now in all but a few States, or, in the absence of a local certifying agency, the W. P. A. I may say to the Senator that there are four States in which the W. P. A. have found the local certifying agencies to be either neglecting or not properly performing their functions, and they have taken over all the burdens of certification. I do not want to put in the RECORD the names of the States, but there were four States in which the Works Progress Administration, for the purpose of efficiency, felt compelled, according to their statement, to take over the burdens of certification.

If the matter were left to me, I would have all certifications made by the W. P. A. As the money is being provided by the Federal Government, I would have the Federal Government do the certifying; but that is not the wish of the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I point out, then, that as the matter now stands, and as the language appears here, first, persons may be removed from the rolls; second, nobody may get on the rolls unless first a local certifying agency shall certify, or, in the alternative, the W. P. A. shall certify; and in the last connection it obviously has the right, has it not, to reject local certifications?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; which it has always exercised. Local certification has never been final or binding. It has always been a preliminary certification. In many places where the W. P. A. felt that the certifying officers were very careful, the local certifications have been accepted, not as a matter of law but as a matter of administration. Elsewhere the W. P. A. have reinvestigated.

We know that in the past year the W. P. A. was perhaps unduly lenient, because when the Congress directed the W. P. A. to make an investigation and eliminate those who did not belong on the rolls, some 60,000 persons were taken off who had gotten through the various certification agencies and on the rolls, but were not entitled to be there; also, an additional number of aliens who had been kept on the rolls in violation of law. But we are dealing with more than 3,000,000 persons, and it is inevitable that there shall be some errors. We thought the errors were perhaps larger than they should be.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the press reports that the administrative heads of the W. P. A. in a certain State have recently been transferred to another State because of their interjection of politics into their administration. If ever there was a clause that makes it possible for such politically minded persons to reject local certifications, and thereafter, by refusing to accept the local certifications, to put on persons of their own choice, it is this clause. Is not that so?

Mr. ADAMS. If the Senator had the list of States in which local certification has been refused, I think he would see that it was not a political action on the part of W. P. A.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, at this time I desire to make a very brief statement about a situation which concerns another bill, but about which I have heretofore made some comments on the floor.

Senators may recall that I stated on the floor the other day that if it became necessary I should offer as an amendment to the now pending relief bill the substance of what has come to be known as section 9 of Senate bill 1871. I made the statement, I think repeatedly, that such action would be taken if necessary. In doing so, I impute no bad

faith against anyone, against any committee of either body of the Congress; but it seemed that Senate bill 1871, having passed the Senate in April, should receive attention in the other branch of the Congress.

Generally, I do not believe in the practice of legislation on an appropriation bill. I dislike and did not want to take that course unless it should be necessary. Since that time—in fact, on yesterday—I conferred with Members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, which is considering Senate bill 1871. Specifically, I conferred with the acting chairman of that committee, Mr. CELLER, and with the Representative from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. They spoke not only for themselves but also for Representative HEALEY, of Massachusetts, chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill. They informed me that on Tuesday of this week the House committee had considered the first five sections of Senate bill 1871, and had passed on those sections of the bill practically without change, except that section 5, in my opinion, was considerably strengthened by the House action. The understanding was that the House committee will act on Senate bill 1871 on Thursday of this week, and report it to the House of Representatives.

In addition to that, the gentlemen whom I have mentioned assure me that they personally will appear before the Rules Committee of the House and request a rule to obtain a vote on this Senate bill. The Representative from my State [Mr. DEMPSEY], a member of the Rules Committee, was also present, and gave me as definite assurance as a man can give under the circumstances that the Rules Committee would provide for a rule to have a vote in the House of Representatives. In addition to that, Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, authorized me to say that the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives would also request the Rules Committee to grant the rule.

I make this statement deliberately for the RECORD at this time in order that there may be a clear understanding in the Senate and in the House. If I have misunderstood the agreement in any way, I shall be glad to be corrected. I am sure I did not misunderstand it, and that it is just exactly as I have stated it.

In view of the situation that pends on the present relief measure, the fact that time is limited, and perhaps it would not be fair to the Senate or the conferees of the Senate to insist on a controversial matter such as section 9 may be, and further and expressly in view of the representations made to me as I have outlined by the Members of the House of Representatives, I shall not now offer that amendment to the pending joint resolution.

But I wish to state, Mr. President, that I know these understandings are not ironclad; occasionally they go astray; and if, for any reason, the understanding to which I have referred should not be carried out, and if the House of Representatives should not have an opportunity within a reasonable time to vote on Senate bill 1871, I think I would be perfectly justified in asking the Senate to suspend the rule and permit me to offer the amendment to any measure which may be coming over to the Senate and which will require a vote by the House of Representatives, and that is exactly what I propose to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 22, to strike out lines 14 to 19, inclusive, as follows:

(e) After April 1, 1940, no person eligible to receive benefits provided for by the Social Security Act shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this title for any period for which there are available sufficient funds to enable the payment of such benefits to him.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 20, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 3, before the word "The", to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)", and in the same line, before the word "shall", to strike out "Board" and insert "Commissioner", so as to read:

(f) The Commissioner shall cause a periodic investigation to be made of the rolls of relief employees on work projects, and shall eliminate from the rolls those not in actual need, such investigation to be made so that each case is investigated not less frequently than once every 6 months.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "own", to insert a comma and "and if he has first drawn all the benefits of unemployment compensation that shall have accrued to him during his term in private employment", so as to read:

(b) Any person who takes such private employment shall at the expiration thereof be entitled to immediate resumption of his previous employment status with the Work Projects Administration if he is still in need and if he has lost the private employment through no fault of his own, and if he has first drawn all the benefits of unemployment compensation that shall have accrued to him during his term in private employment.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether or not he would be willing to accept an amendment to this amendment by adding at the conclusion thereof the words "and which are available to him"? My reason for suggesting the amendment is that, as the committee amendment stands, the mere fact that an individual might have unemployment compensation money accruing to him would make him ineligible for assistance under the act. We know that there are many instances, and as time goes on I think there will be more, of persons being entitled to this money but, because of difficulties of accounting, and so forth, they are not able to get it. All I propose is that a man must actually have the money available as well as accrued.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, Mr. President, I have no right to accept the amendment; but I will say that, so far as I am individually concerned, and as a member of the committee, I will accept the amendment. I think its purpose is sound.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I move, then, that the amendment of the committee beginning in line 21, page 23, be amended by inserting before the period at the end of the proposed amendment, after the word "employment", the words "and which are available to him."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 19, before the word "No", to insert "(a)"; in line 20, before the word "employment", to strike out "for" and insert "in"; and in line 22, after the word "this", to strike out "title" and insert "joint resolution", so as to read:

SEC. 18 (a) No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless such person before engaging in such employment (or prior to August 1, 1939, in the case of any person employed before such date who has not taken an oath of office) subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

The head of the agency shall designate administrative and supervisory employees to administer such oath, but no fee shall be charged therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 14, before the word "No", to insert "(b)"; in line 15, before the word "resolution", to insert "joint", and in the same line, after the word "pay", to strike out "the salary of" and insert "any compensation to", so as to read:

(b) No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 19, after the word "expenses", to strike out "(not to exceed $500 for any one agency) of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized" and insert "of attendance at meetings of officials and employees of the agency on official business", so as to read:

SEC. 21. The appropriations in this joint resolution for administrative expenses and such portions of other appropriations in this joint resolution as are available for administrative expenses may be obligated in the amounts which the agency, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary for personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for contract stenographic reporting services, supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals, newspapers and press clippings; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of officials and employees of the agency on official business; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this joint resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, an amendment on page 25 has already been agreed to, but my attention has just been attracted to it, and I desire to propound a question to the Senator having the joint resolution in charge, because the amendment concerns me somewhat, not its purpose, for I am in thorough accord with the purpose of the amendment, but how will it be construed by the General Accounting Office? Will the salary of everyone be held up until it is determined whether he has been advocating the overthrow of the Government? It struck me, on reading the amendment yesterday, that that might present some complications in administration. Has the Senator from Colorado any ideas on that subject?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have assumed that the burden would be the other way around, that those who are on the relief rolls and who draw salaries would be presumed to be loyal citizens, and that the obligation of denying compensation by reason of their advocacy of overthrow of the Government would rest upon the employing agencies.

Mr. HATCH. That interpretation would suit me very well. If I thought the General Accounting Office would adopt the interpretation, there would be no confusion and no harmful results from it. I wonder whether the committee report interprets the language.

Mr. ADAMS. It does not.

Mr. HATCH. I do not know how to get at what I have in mind, but I suggest for the RECORD that the officials of the General Accounting Office read the remarks of the Senator having the joint resolution in charge, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], and adopt the interpretation which the Senator from Colorado has placed on this section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 22, after the word "tenure", to insert a comma and "and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed", so as to read:

SEC. 22. (a) The provisions of Executive Order No. 7916, dated June 24, 1938, shall not apply to positions the compensation of which is payable from appropriations contained in this joint resolution, and such appropriations shall not be available for the compensation of the incumbent of any position placed in the competitive classified civil service of the United States after January 10, 1939.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the agencies receiving appropriations herein or allocations under such appropriations are authorized to accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, appoint, without regard to civil-service laws, such officers and employees, and utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, such Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State such State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the head of the agency involved, as may be necessary, and prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure, and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 28, to strike out:

(c) Under the appropriations in this title, no increase in compensation shall be granted to any administrative officer or employee, but this prohibition shall not be applicable in case of a change in office or position which increases the responsibilities or duties, or both, of any such officer or employee.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado the reason for striking out lines 1 to 6, which include salary increases.

Mr. ADAMS. The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] in the committee, as I recollect, explained that in the Reorganization Act there were provisions which covered this situation, and that this would conflict. I am not clear in my own mind, but the Senator from South Carolina is the expert on reorganization, so I ask him to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, in the Reorganization Act there is a provision to the effect that employees transferred to any other department by reason of any order of the President shall not be transferred to a higher grade. The exact language I cannot recite, but the object was to prevent something which has quite often occurred when there was a merger. When an employee was transferred to a new department he would often be transferred to a higher grade. There was a proviso that nothing contained in the act should be construed to prevent promotions after the end of the fiscal year.

A number of the departments have called my attention to the fact that because the Reorganization Act went into effect on July 1 it froze in the positions they held a number of persons who they think would be entitled to promotions, and it has been said they would be frozen for a whole year.

Of course, I do not cry about that. I think that if for 12 months there were no increases in salaries the world would not come to an end. However, I believe that in such matters we should try to do that which is just and fair to all employees. Therefore I suggested that this language be stricken out, because it would give to W. P. A. employees what was denied to the employees of all other organizations transferred. After the first of the year, immediately afterward, I intend, because of the interest I have taken in the Reorganization Act, to make an investigation to determine whether or not this does work a hardship; and if the Congress has to act on it, I think it should act as to all agencies and not only as to the W. P. A. It may be we will determine that the language should be modified in some way. I am disposed to think so.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator feels, then, that striking out the language in question really will prevent increases in salaries?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. The provision as it stands would give to the W. P. A. employees immediately after July 1, though they are transferred to the public-works agency, the right to an increase in salary, whereas other employees transferred to the same division would be denied that right. I think all should be treated alike. I think it may be wise to modify the language, but I think that ought to be done after we make an investigation, and it should apply not only to one agency.

Mr. HOLT. The reason I asked the question is that I have made a study of W. P. A. salary increases in the State of West Virginia. It was said that there were 538 administrative employees on W. P. A. in that State. I investigated the salaries paid when they first began to work in W. P. A. and the reason for the increases, and I found that 210 of those individuals had received salary increases varying from $60 to $120 a year.

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that one thing that causes me to believe that it is wise to follow the course I have suggested is that I am advised that, because of the provisions in the W. P. A. Act, some employees in the Department anticipate that after July 1 increases in salary could be made, and that prior to July 1 they would be as busy as a one-arm paperhanger.

Mr. HOLT. The sickening thing to me is to see applicants for relief told that they cannot get jobs because there is no money with which to pay them. They are told, "We cannot

put you on W. P. A. today because we are out of funds." Then we can look back and see the salary increases which have been given. That process is going on continually. One man in my State was receiving $3,200 per year, which was more than he ever before received in his life, but his salary was increased to $6,000.

I shall not make a long statement, but simply for the information of the Senate I wish to say that I found in the State of West Virginia—and again I say it is a small State—107 individuals who received salary increases of from $60 to $240 a year, 70 who received salary increases of from $300 to $600 a year, 20 who received salary increases of from $660 to $960 a year, and 11 who received salary increases of over a thousand dollars a year. Of the 538 administrative employees the W. P. A. claim they have, I found 210 salary increases. At the same time it is said that there is no money at all to be used for relief.

Mr. President, at this point I ask that the list to which I have referred may be included in the RECORD. It shows the number of persons whose salaries were increased in the State of West Virginia and the amount of the increases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

One at $2,800; 1 at $1,960; 1 at $1,500; 1 at $1,440; 2 at $1,200; 1 at $1,100; 1 at $1,080; 1 at $1,020; 1 at $1,000; 6 at $900; 1 at $840; 1 at $800; 2 at $780; 1 at $720; 2 at $700; 7 at $660; 12 at $600; 4 at $540; 6 at $480; 6 at $420; 1 at $400; 11 at $360; 20 at $300; 45 at $240; 2 at $200; 22 at $180; 19 at $120; 2 at $100; 17 at $60.

Mr. HOLT. Let me be specific with respect to just five salary increases. I wish to show the Senate that at the same time W. P. A. is telling the relief worker that there is no money for him they are increasing the salaries of some of their personnel. One man on a project received $85 a month. They boosted his salary to $210 a month, or an increase of $1,500 a year. Another man in the same county who was getting $75 a month had his salary boosted to $200 a month, or $1,500 increase per year.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator identify the time when these things happened?

Mr. HOLT. Between 1936 and 1938; in 2 years' time. Another man in the same county who was paid $75 a month received an increase in salary to $200 a month, or $1,500 a year, which is three times more than the project worker would receive if he worked every week in the year in West Virginia.

I find that one man who was getting $85 a month had his salary increased to $225 a month, or an increase of $1,680 a year.

Another man's salary was increased from $95 to $225 a month, or $1,560 a year.

All this occurred in one county in my State.

I found over 25 salary increases there, but every one of the 5 increases in that 1 county to which I have specifically referred amounted to more than $1,500 a year. That represents not total salary but simply the increase. At the same time people are told that there is no money for relief.

In the State and district offices I myself found that salary increases totaled $78,000. My opinion is that the total salary increases in the State of West Virginia will amount to more than $100,000 a year. Yet it is said there is no money with which to employ needy persons.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that we should not raise salaries in the W. P. A. so long as people are applying for relief. If we have money that can be used to raise salaries, why not take that money and use it to put needy persons to work?

I am glad the amendment was accepted. However, I did wish to call the attention of the Senate to the large salary increases. In my opinion they will amount to millions of dollars throughout the United States.

Mr. President, one reason those in charge get away with it is because they keep the pay roll secret, and feel that people will not find out what has occurred. If we have sufficient money to enable such salaries to be increased, then we have money with which to employ needy people.

Yesterday the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] spoke of "career men." It is not a question of those who are employed on W. P. A. being "career men." It is the bosses who are career men.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, is the information the Senator has just referred to generally available in any form?

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, it is not available, because the W. P. A. officials specifically say it is not. I have before me a letter written last fall by Mr. Aubrey Williams, who at that time was acting for Mr. Harry Hopkins. I wrote to him and asked him for a statement of the pay rolls in West Virginia. He replied:

DEAR SENATOR HOLT: I have your letter of the 19th, requesting a list of the persons on the W. P. A. administrative pay roll in West Virginia. If there is any particular information that you want about any particular person I shall be glad to furnish you with it, but I am not approving the sending of the whole personnel list to you.

In other words, a Member of the Senate cannot find out who is on the administrative pay roll in his own State, according to Mr. Williams. The letter from which I read is dated October 20.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does that represent general practice, or is that merely a personal compliment to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HOLT. I think it is a general practice, because I notice that a letter was placed in the RECORD in the other House recently, in which the administrative pay-roll list requested was denied a Member of the House.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How did the Senator get his information finally?

Mr. HOLT. I received my information through the General Accounting Office, and not through the W. P. A. The W. P. A. has never given me the pay-roll list of the W. P. A. in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator think the information would be available through the General Accounting Office to any Senator who might apply for it?

Mr. HOLT. I am not sure about that. It takes a great amount of work to obtain the information. I had to delegate some individuals in my office to help the General Accounting Office go through the list of the personnel. I cannot say whether or not the information would be available in the way the Senator mentioned. I know it should be.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I know of no reason on earth why this particular information should not be available to Members of the Senate. As a matter of fact the furnishing of such information should be required.

Mr. HOLT. I intend to offer an amendment to the joint resolution later today which will provide that the Administrator shall be required to submit to the Congress a list of the nonsecurity employees who make more than $1,000 per year, which will allow every Congressman to find out who are on the pay rolls and how much they get, because certainly it is the duty of Congress to know who are on the pay rolls. I hope there will be no objection to such an amendment, for we make all other agencies furnish a list of those on their pay rolls. Why should the W. P. A. keep secret its pay roll?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think if that information were made public in every State, it would have a tremendous impression on the people, and would result in the reduction of overhead expense in connection with relief.

Mr. HOLT. I can assure the Senator that since I made public in West Virginia the information I mentioned there has been a tremendous reduction in the administrative pay roll.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Has it not occurred to the Senator that if information is not available to him when he makes request for it, it can be obtained through the adoption of a Senate resolution requesting such information? I have never known a request for such information to be rejected.

Mr. HOLT. I think that would be a wise procedure, but, on the other hand, I believe such information should be made

available with respect to the different States. I may wish to have information concerning West Virginia. The Senator from Massachusetts may wish to have information with respect to Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. There should be separate pay-roll lists containing the names of those who are on relief and the names of those who are nonrelief employees. I think we ought to know how much we are paying to nonrelief persons to take care of people who need relief employment. I understand from what the Senator has been saying there is now no available information of that nature.

Mr. HOLT. Not at all, Mr. President. No one realizes more than I do how difficult it has been to get such information. That is not because of the fact that the General Accounting Office was unwilling to furnish it, but because we had to go over a pay roll containing thousands of names of persons in West Virginia in order to get the information desired.

Mr. WALSH. Is not every person who is employed as a foreman, or superintendent, or whatever job he may have, so employed in order to provide employment for those who are on relief?

Mr. HOLT. He should be.

Mr. WALSH. And is that not the basic principle of the legislation under consideration?

Mr. HOLT. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Therefore we should know how many persons it is necessary to employ in order to take care of the relief cases. To aid those on relief is our object in appropriating funds and setting up the necessary organizations to accomplish this purpose.

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

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the Senator if he has by any chance made any comparison between the salaries received by the administrative personnel on W. P. A. in his State with the salaries received by the administrative personnel on P. W. A. in his State?

Mr. HOLT. No, I have not; because I found the P. W. A. to have a very clean record, I may say, in the State of West Virginia, and, of course, its set-up is entirely different. However, I know of men who were working for $45 a month in private employment and who were put on W. P. A. at $225 a month, and they received increases in their salaries of $180 a month thereby. They were also given a Federal job.

Mr. PEPPER. I was very much interested as to what the comparison might show, in case we were to make a comparison between the two groups.

Mr. HOLT. There is a distinct difference between the P. W. A. and the W. P. A. The administrative force of the P. W. A. is decidedly smaller in numbers. One supervisor under the P. W. A. would take the place of perhaps half a dozen under the W. P. A. With regard to West Virginia, I know that the average relief foreman in West Virginia makes between $15 and $20 a month more than a school teacher with a college degree. We pay our school teachers far more than the average received by school teachers in the United States.

It is said that such information is not available and that we cannot obtain it. The only way we can find out the difference between the compensation paid relief and nonrelief workers is to obtain such information. That is the reason why I want it.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the amendment which the Senator proposes to offer?

Mr. HOLT. The amendment I intend to offer reads:

The Administrator shall submit to Congress a list of all noncertified employees whose wage scale is more than $1,000 annually. This list shall include the names, legal addresses, positions, and salaries of such employees.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not see why any reasonable person should object to such a requirement.

Mr. HOLT. Of course, this is not the time to offer the amendment. I was discussing salary increases and digressed to the other subject. However, it is time Congress knew where the hundreds of millions of dollars it appropriates are going.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 12, before the word "None", to insert "(a)"; in line 13, after the word "be", to strike out "available"; after line 13, to strike out "(a) After June 30, 1939, for the operation of any theater project; or"; in line 16, before the word "for", to strike out "(b) After August 31, 1939" and insert "available after October 31, 1939"; and in line 19, before the word "This", to insert "(b)", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 25. (a) None of the funds made available by this title shall be available after October 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

(b) This section shall not prohibit the payment of wages or salaries accrued, or of nonlabor obligations incurred, in connection with any such project if the wages or salaries accrued or the obligation was incurred prior to July 1, 1939, or September 1, 1939, as the case may be.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado if he will not permit consideration of this amendment to go over until we have disposed of the amendment on page 5, to which we are to return later, and which provides for a contribution of 25 percent by a State toward sponsored projects.

Mr. ADAMS. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment on page 29, in section 25, will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 24, after the word "The", to strike out "Board" and insert "Commissioner", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 26. The Commissioner and the National Youth Administrator are authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in section 1 or section 2 hereof any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after the effective date of this joint resolution on account of damage to or loss of privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the Work Projects Administration or the National Youth Administration, as the case may be, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500, or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 15, after the word "The", to strike out "Board" and insert "Commissioner", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 27. The Commissioner is authorized to call to the attention of the city, county, and State governments the unemployment situation of that city, county, or State, and to seek the cooperation of the State or any subdivision thereof in meeting the unemployment problem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 16, before the word "not", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the word "other", to strike out "sections" and insert "provisions", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 28. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any work project, employment, or relief aid under the appropriations in this title, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriations, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriations, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, or who disposes of, or assists in disposing of, except for the account of the United States, any property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this title or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 22, after the word "person", to strike out "entitled to or", so as to read:

SEC. 29. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to solicit, or knowingly be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the campaign expenses of any individual or political party from any person receiving compensation or employment provided for by this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 5, before the word "not", to insert "and"; and in line 6, after the word "other", to strike out "section" and insert "provisions", so as to read:

(b) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 14, after the word "election" and the period, to strike out "That no recommendations of any person who shall apply for office or place under the provisions of this act, which may be given by any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, except as to the character or residence of the applicant, shall be received or considered by any person concerned in making any appointment under this act", so as to read:

SEC. 30. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible by this title, or any other act of the Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 10, before the word "not", to insert "and"; and in line 11, after the word "other", to strike out "sections" and insert "provisions", so as to read:

(c) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 4, before the word "not", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the word "other", to strike out "sections" and insert "provisions", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 31. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative or supervisory capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by this title, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the results thereof. While such persons shall retain the right to vote as they please and to express privately their opinions on all political subjects, they shall take no active part, directly or indirectly, in political management or in political campaigns or in political conventions.

(b) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by this title shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 2, to strike out the following title:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful non-Federal public-works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, the sum of $125,000,000 transferred from section 1, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made under section 201 of such act of 1938, shall be available until June 30, 1941, and may be expended by the Commissioner of Public Works (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner"), subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or other public bodies (herein called public agencies), or (2) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

(b) No amount available under this title shall be allotted for any project which, in the determination of the Commissioner, cannot be commenced prior to March 1, 1940, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to July 1, 1941: *Provided*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project enjoined in any Federal or State court.

(c) Under the funds available in this title, no grant shall be made in excess of $225,000 or in excess of 45 percent of the cost of any project, and no project shall be constructed for lease to any public agency unless the Commissioner shall determine that the nonrecoverable portion of the cost of such project shall not exceed $225,000 and shall not exceed 45 percent of the cost thereof.

(d) No moneys for a non-Federal project shall be paid from the funds made available by this title to any public agency unless such agency will require that at least 25 percent of the labor employed on such project will come from relief rolls if such labor in the opinion of the Commissioner of Public Works is available and qualified, and will not unreasonably interfere with the construction of such project, and unless and until adequate provision has been made, or in the opinion of the Commissioner is assured, for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

(e) Not more than $2,875,000 of the amount available under this title may be used for administrative expenses of the Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, in connection with this title; such amount shall be available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth for such Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940. The Commissioner shall reserve from the amount available under this title an adequate sum for administrative expenses of the Administration in connection with this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

SEC. 202. Moneys realized from the sale of securities acquired by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Public Works Administration, or the proceeds of such securities, may be used by the Commissioner for the making of loans in connection with projects under this title, notwithstanding any previous limitation on the total amount of such securities or proceeds thereof that may be used for loan purposes.

SEC. 203. The Public Works Administration is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on July 1, 1939.

SEC. 204. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, as amended by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. No new applications for loans or grants for non-Federal projects shall be received by the Administration after September 30, 1939: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to applications amendatory of applications for projects received prior to October 1, 1939, and such amendatory applications shall be confined to projects, which, in the determination of the Commissioner, can be started and completed within the time limits specified in section 201 (b) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

SEC. 205. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, is this the public-works title?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is the public-works title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] intends to offer a substitute for title II. I should like to discuss the matter for a moment until he comes into the Chamber and offers his amendment.

As the House passed the joint resolution it provided that $125,000,000 of the amount estimated for the Works Progress Administration should be earmarked for public works. The committee determined that the entire amount asked for by the President for the Works Progress Administration should be allowed, and then declined to provide any money out of the Treasury for a public-works program. It will, therefore, be necessary to adopt a substitute for the stricken title if there is to be any public-works program next year.

The Secretary of the Interior, who is ex officio Public Works Administrator, appeared before our committee and said, first, that he did not believe in the principle of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and therefore that the Works Progress Administration should have the full amount estimated in the Budget. We then questioned him as to the desirability of carrying on some kind of a public-works program during the next fiscal year, and asked him for the status of the present program. He stated that at the previous session of Congress $965,000,000 was appropriated for such a program, of which $200,000,000 was for Federal projects, the remainder being for loans and grants on the basis of

a 45-percent grant and a 55-percent contribution by the local community; that that program, translated into terms of work, meant that there was now proceeding in the United States nearly $2,000,000,000 worth of work of all kinds in all sections of the United States; that that program would arrive at its peak in another 60 days; that the amount of employment would then begin to decline and by next winter it would be very substantially reduced, and that by next spring the program would be completed. It was his suggestion that if the Congress, as a matter of policy, determined that there should be a public-works program, its size should be about half the amount of money that we appropriated for the current fiscal year. Carrying out that idea, he suggested a program of $500,000,000, $400,000,000 to be for loans and grants, and $100,000,000 to be for Federal projects.

The proposal which the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] intends to offer would carry out that suggestion. I am in favor of such a program. There is bound to be a period of transition between what we are now doing and what may be undertaken under the new suggestion recently submitted to the Congress by the President. The proposal of the President is that communities desiring to undertake public works of one kind or another, such as sewer systems, electric-light plants, street paving, erection of new buildings, city halls, jails, or whatever they desire, may come to the Federal Government with a proposal that the Federal Government guarantee their bonds at a very low rate of interest. That is what the suggestion amounts to. If the current rate of interest for the commercial use of money were 4 percent and the Federal Government enabled communities to obtain money at 2 percent, it would mean, in effect, a subsidy of the difference in interest they would have to pay if the Government did not guarantee their obligations. It is estimated that the subsidy over the period required would amount to between 12 and 15 percent. The idea is entirely new. It may have much merit. We do not know how it will work out until it is tried. Secretary Ickes testified that he had on hand about $1,000,000,000 worth of projects which had been studied by the finance division and by the legal division and had gone through every process of examination, and that if he had the money he could undertake the work immediately.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I will yield in just a moment.

It has been suggested by those who are advocating the plan of guaranteeing bonds 100 percent that projects which have already been investigated and have gone "through the mill" might be taken up in that way. If there is any merit in the suggestion, I can see no harm in opening up the public-works program to receive new applications between now and next fall, as the House has proposed in the joint resolution; and then if the new scheme works, such projects can be picked up just as well as those that have already been approved.

I think there should be a cushion between the existing program and the new one; and I think the Secretary of the Interior, as Public Works Administrator, was wise in recommending a program of that kind.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Administrator does not think that $125,000,000 is sufficient to carry out the program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no; there is no question about that. He has applications on hand for a much larger sum.

Mr. LUCAS. Yesterday when the debate on the joint resolution was commenced I briefly interrogated the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] relative to the $125,000,000 which was stricken out of the joint resolution as it came from the House. I made the statement at that time that there were certain communities where applications had been made for certain Public Works Administration projects, which applications have been approved by the Administrator.

Mr. HAYDEN. What is true in Illinois is true in every other State in the Union.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to add this further information, which I think may be rather interesting to the Senator. In a certain community in Illinois a waterworks project application has been approved by the P. W. A. It is admitted by those who know that the sanitary conditions in that city are very bad. Realizing the seriousness of the situation, the W. P. A. authorities, so I am informed, agreed to carry through this project providing the city authorities could get the P. W. A. to release jurisdiction over the project. An attempt was made to get P. W. A. to release jurisdiction, but the Administrator refused, and the conditions in that community are the same as they were last October when the application was approved. Certainly something should be done either to complete that project or to obtain the relinquishment of the authority of the Administrator of the P. W. A. and give the people in that community what they have been promised. Mr. President, there is apparently a conflict of authority between P. W. A. and W. P. A. upon that application.

Let me ask the Senator, Why should P. W. A., when there are no funds available for the completion of a project, withhold jurisdiction of the application when the W. P. A. in that community want to complete the project?

Mr. HAYDEN. I was just going to answer the question. Looking at it broadly, taking the country over, while it may work a hardship in some instances, it is a good rule, because if we do not have a rule of that kind, if a community elects to follow one course and then finds out that it cannot get it that way it can follow some other course, we are simply jumping from one agency to the other and having one agency compete against the other as to which will render the service. That situation has arisen in a great many places.

For that reason it is my understanding that the President issued the general order under which if a community elected in the beginning to take a project under W. P. A., then it could not change it over to a project under the Public Works Administration, or, if they elected to take a public-works project and found they could not get their money immediately that way, they could not change over to a W. P. A. project. There is reason in that idea.

There are exceptional circumstances, no doubt, such as the Senator has in mind, when there is a critical situation in the community, and it might be that the Administrator did not exercise the discretion that he had. He can release the project if it is necessary to do so, and perhaps he should have done it in the instance referred to. But will not the Senator concede that we do not need to set up two agencies, one competing against the other for projects?

Mr. LUCAS. I will concede that, providing there is money available to carry on any project from either one of the administrative agencies; but in the instance referred to the application was made last October. P. W. A. accepted that application immediately, but after they accepted the application, as I understand, they advised the community that they had no funds to carry it through. They have withheld it all this time and done nothing because they have no money, but, immediately after that, the W. P. A. came along and said, "If we can get the Administrator to relinquish jurisdiction, we will go ahead with the project."

Mr. HAYDEN. In that case the Senator presents an argument that, to my mind, if I were administrator, would be conclusive.

There is no question at all, so far as the local contribution is concerned, that the local community has to put up less money on a W. P. A. project than it does on a public-works project, on which the contribution is 55 percent. For that reason, taking the country over, the public-works projects have been of a higher standard and of a more substantial character. There is no doubt about that at all. What I am trying to say to the Senator is that we have been traveling these two roads, and we have accomplished great good on both of them. I think it would be a mistake totally and completely to cut off any hope of any kind of public-works projects, to allow no further applications to be received, and end it now, in the absence of some certainty as to how the new plan is to work. For that reason I am inclined to support an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what the committee proposes to do, as I understand, under the joint resolution as reported.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, we have not finished the consideration of the committee amendments. Is the amendment now offered an amendment to a committee amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. MEAD. It is a substitute for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York offers an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter in title II, beginning on page 35, proposed to be stricken out by the committee, it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful non-Federal public works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, there is hereby appropriated to the Public Works Administration (herein called the "Administration") in the Federal Works Agency, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400,000,000, together with the balance of the appropriation made under section 201 of such act of 1938, not reserved for administrative expenses of the Administration and not now or hereafter expended pursuant to allotments heretofore made, which amounts shall be available until June 30, 1941, and may be expended by the Commissioner of Public Works (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner"), subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or other public bodies (herein called public agencies), or (2) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

(b) No amount available under this title shall be allotted for any project which, in the determination of the Commissioner, cannot be commenced prior to March 1, 1940, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to July 1, 1941: *Provided*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project enjoined in any Federal or State court.

(c) Under the funds available in this title, no grant shall be made in excess of 45 percent of the cost of any project.

(d) No moneys for a non-Federal project shall be paid from the funds made available by this title to any public agency unless and until adequate provision has been made, or in the opinion of the Commissioner is assured, for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

(e) Not more than $9,750,000 of the amount available under this title may be used for administrative expenses of the Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, in connection with this title; such amount shall be available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth for such Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940. The Commissioner shall reserve from the amount available under this title an adequate sum for administrative expenses of the Administration in connection with this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

SEC. 202. Moneys realized from the sale of securities acquired by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Public Works Administration, or the proceeds of such securities, may be used by the Commissioner for the making of loans in connection with projects under this title, notwithstanding any previous limitation on the total amount of such securities or proceeds thereof that may be used for loan purposes.

SEC. 203. The Public Works Administration is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on July 1, 1939. On and after the effective date of reorganization plan No. I transmitted to the Congress by the President of the United States pursuant to the authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1939, all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Public Works Administration, and all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Federal Works Administrator.

SEC. 204. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, as amended by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. No new applications for loans or grants for non-Federal projects shall be received by the Administration after September 30, 1939: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to applications amendatory of applications for projects received prior to October 1, 1939, and such amendatory applications shall be confined to projects, which, in the determination of the Commissioner, can be started and completed within the time limits specified in section 201 (b) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939. That portion of section 201 (f) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 which reads 'for the completion (except liquidation) of the activities of such Administration,' is hereby repealed."

SEC. 205. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until expended, the sum of $100,000,000, to be expended at the direction of the Administrator, for the making of allotments to Federal agencies for the financing of Federal construction projects (including projects for making surveys and maps) in continental United States outside of the District of Columbia, and the acquisition of land for sites therefor, such projects to be selected from (1) projects authorized by law and (2) projects for the enlargement, extension, or remodeling of existing Federal plants, institutions, or facilities.

(b) No Federal construction project, except flood control and water conservation or utilization projects now under actual construction, shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds made available by this section unless and until moneys sufficient for the completion thereof shall have been irrevocably allocated or appropriated therefor.

SEC. 206. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make an inquiry as to the legislative status.

The committee amendment which is before the Senate is simply an amendment to strike out certain sections of the bill. This is a substitute for the motion to strike out. In other words, it would take the place of it, and apparently would still leave in the bill the subject matter which the committee seeks to strike out, and would add to it other matter which is a duplication of much of that which is proposed to be stricken out.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, certainly a motion to perfect a section would have precedence over one to strike it out entirely; and that is all this motion is.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the committee amendment is merely a motion to strike out. I do not know just how a motion to strike out can be perfected. That is, if a substitute for it is proposed, and the substitute carries, the motion to strike out falls.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. And the words which were to be stricken out remain.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; parts of them do.

Mr. ADAMS. They will all remain; and then we shall have added what is practically a duplication, except in the figures. All I want to do is to get the parliamentary situation straight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado makes a parliamentary inquiry. A motion to strike out and insert has preference over a motion simply to strike out.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion now submitted, in the opinion of the Chair, is a motion to strike out and insert. If that motion is lost, then the committee amendment to strike out will come up; but, under the rules of the Senate, when a motion is made to strike out, and a second motion is made to strike out and insert, the latter has precedence. If that motion is lost, then the original motion of the committee to strike out is in order.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I desire to make a suggestion to the Senators who are proposing the amendment.

This amendment is the most important amendment we have. There are five or six pages of it, and I think those of us who have just come from the committee ought to have a little time to study the amendment. Therefore, I suggest that we go back to the committee amendments which have been passed over, and dispose of those, which will afford us an opportunity to give some thought to this amendment.

Mr. MEAD. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that that course is agreeable to me.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask, then, that we return to the amendments which were temporarily passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to laying aside temporarily this amendment, and returning to

those passed over? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendments passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first amendment passed over is on page 1, changing the title of the act.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the first amendment is allied to the amendment that we passed over. I think it should go over until the Senate acts upon the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be again passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. The next amendment passed over is on page 5, beginning in line 15, to insert the following:

(d) In administering the funds appropriated in this section, not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all projects hereafter undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used, shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, this amendment is the one which makes a requirement of a 25-percent contribution by the sponsors, upon the basis that the sponsors within a State must average a 25-percent contribution.

Members of the Senate who were here in 1937 will remember that that was a subject of great controversy when the relief appropriation was made at that time. My recollection is that at that time the sponsors' contributions, as made during the previous year, amounted to about 15 or 16 percent. As a result of the arguments presented at that time, the Works Progress Administration has made a very definite effort and has achieved a certain amount of success in increasing the amount of the contributions.

For the fiscal year, ending on April 30 of this year, the amount was increased to 18.9 percent. For the 3 months ending April 30—that is, the last 3 months of that fiscal year—it was up to 20 percent. It is my understanding now that the contributions of the various States have amounted to 22.4 percent during the past 3-month period.

I should like, if I may, to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of the contributions which have been made by the various States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

*Expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated work projects, by regions and States and by sources of funds*

[Subject to revision]

| Administrative region and State | July 1, 1938, through Apr. 30, 1939 | | | | Feb. 1, 1939, through Apr. 30, 1939 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Federal funds | Sponsors' funds | | Total | Federal funds | Sponsors' funds | |
| | | | Amount | Percent of total funds | | | Amount | Percent of total funds |
| Grand total | $2,168,046,403 | $1,758,641,331 | $409,405,072 | 18.9 | $616,599,376 | $493,493,305 | $123,106,071 | 20.0 |
| Region I | 154,475,043 | 129,594,227 | 24,880,816 | 16.1 | 42,782,565 | 35,506,894 | 7,275,671 | 17.0 |
| Connecticut | 23,918,402 | 19,716,674 | 4,201,728 | 17.6 | 6,282,281 | 5,272,215 | 1,010,066 | 16.1 |
| Maine | 6,424,872 | 5,041,470 | 1,383,402 | 21.5 | 1,861,431 | 1,518,431 | 343,000 | 18.4 |
| Massachusetts | 98,387,823 | 83,446,047 | 14,941,776 | 15.2 | 28,105,132 | 23,263,885 | 4,841,247 | 17.2 |
| New Hampshire | 7,242,820 | 5,868,228 | 1,374,592 | 19.0 | 1,894,959 | 1,565,088 | 329,871 | 17.4 |
| Rhode Island | 13,691,433 | 11,762,037 | 1,929,396 | 14.1 | 3,429,787 | 2,895,260 | 534,527 | 15.6 |
| Vermont | 4,809,693 | 3,759,771 | 1,049,922 | 21.8 | 1,208,975 | 992,015 | 216,960 | 17.9 |
| Region II | 522,573,808 | 428,947,857 | 93,625,951 | 17.9 | 149,542,431 | 117,869,996 | 31,672,435 | 21.2 |
| New Jersey | 86,176,657 | 67,060,776 | [1] 19,115,881 | 22.2 | 23,289,316 | 18,169,959 | [1] 5,119,357 | 22.0 |
| New York | 233,054,143 | 188,428,628 | 44,625,515 | 19.1 | 71,532,298 | 54,046,977 | 17,485,321 | 24.4 |
| New York City | 176,729,989 | 148,312,709 | 28,417,280 | 16.1 | 54,983,792 | 42,837,255 | 12,146,537 | 22.1 |
| New York (excluding New York City) | 56,324,154 | 40,115,919 | 16,208,235 | 28.8 | 16,548,506 | 11,209,722 | 5,338,784 | 32.3 |
| Pennsylvania | 203,343,008 | 173,458,453 | 29,884,555 | 14.7 | 54,720,817 | 45,653,060 | 9,067,757 | 16.6 |
| Region III | 66,372,925 | 51,931,269 | 14,441,656 | 21.8 | 19,581,693 | 15,220,296 | 4,361,397 | 22.3 |
| Delaware | 2,361,019 | 1,870,455 | 490,564 | 20.8 | 642,311 | 491,496 | 150,815 | 23.5 |
| District of Columbia | 8,893,471 | 7,212,301 | 1,681,170 | 18.9 | 2,783,150 | 2,174,548 | 608,602 | 21.9 |
| Maryland | 10,739,512 | 8,103,460 | 2,636,052 | 24.5 | 3,026,219 | 2,295,710 | 730,509 | 24.1 |
| Virginia | 15,514,460 | 11,388,795 | 4,125,665 | 26.6 | 4,997,593 | 3,596,729 | 1,400,864 | 28.0 |
| West Virginia | 28,864,463 | 23,356,258 | 5,508,205 | 19.1 | 8,132,420 | 6,661,813 | 1,470,607 | 18.1 |
| Region IV | 632,930,457 | 535,283,969 | 97,646,488 | 15.4 | 167,186,451 | 141,921,330 | 25,265,121 | 15.1 |
| Illinois | 181,946,574 | 149,764,918 | 32,181,656 | 17.7 | 49,401,914 | 41,337,549 | 8,064,365 | 16.3 |
| Indiana | 69,161,749 | 56,165,410 | 12,996,339 | 18.8 | 18,539,037 | 15,173,742 | 3,365,295 | 18.2 |
| Michigan | 121,648,261 | 103,565,263 | 18,082,998 | 14.9 | 30,254,062 | 25,259,609 | 4,994,453 | 16.5 |
| Missouri | 66,143,600 | 55,686,776 | 10,456,824 | 15.8 | 18,073,863 | 15,078,218 | 2,995,645 | 16.6 |
| Ohio | 194,030,273 | 170,101,602 | 23,928,671 | 12.3 | 50,917,575 | 45,072,212 | 5,845,363 | 11.5 |
| Region V | 197,087,758 | 154,223,531 | 42,864,227 | 21.7 | 60,586,976 | 46,463,098 | 14,123,878 | 23.3 |
| Alabama | 29,187,469 | 22,744,926 | 6,442,543 | 22.1 | 9,245,738 | 6,996,570 | 2,249,168 | 24.3 |
| Florida | 28,079,876 | 22,504,907 | 5,574,969 | 19.9 | 9,358,720 | 7,003,993 | 2,354,727 | 25.2 |
| Georgia | 30,309,678 | 23,845,201 | 6,464,477 | 21.3 | 9,443,827 | 7,359,018 | 2,084,809 | 22.1 |
| Kentucky | 38,025,912 | 30,873,922 | 7,151,990 | 18.8 | 10,225,091 | 8,390,396 | 1,834,695 | 17.9 |
| North Carolina | 23,446,252 | 17,882,332 | 5,563,920 | 23.7 | 7,351,438 | 5,564,642 | 1,786,796 | 24.3 |
| South Carolina | 22,495,775 | 17,591,284 | 4,904,491 | 21.8 | 7,125,903 | 5,398,266 | 1,727,637 | 24.3 |
| Tennessee | 25,542,796 | 18,780,959 | 6,761,837 | 26.5 | 7,836,259 | 5,750,213 | 2,086,046 | 26.6 |
| Region VI | 162,802,130 | 125,907,354 | 36,894,776 | 22.7 | 51,031,769 | 39,058,942 | 11,972,827 | 23.5 |
| Arkansas | 23,109,796 | 19,642,638 | 3,467,158 | 15.0 | 7,264,223 | 6,288,773 | 975,450 | 13.4 |
| Louisiana | 27,957,374 | 21,699,823 | 6,257,551 | 22.4 | 9,357,630 | 6,769,562 | 2,588,068 | 27.7 |
| Mississippi | 23,287,841 | 16,835,317 | 6,452,524 | 27.7 | 7,423,117 | 5,160,997 | 2,262,120 | 30.5 |
| Oklahoma | 35,608,278 | 28,672,394 | 6,935,884 | 19.5 | 10,157,990 | 8,279,656 | 1,878,334 | 18.5 |
| Texas | 52,838,841 | 39,057,182 | 13,781,659 | 26.1 | 16,828,809 | 12,559,954 | 4,268,855 | 25.4 |
| Region VII | 208,127,996 | 160,984,976 | 47,143,020 | 22.7 | 57,996,956 | 45,453,882 | 12,543,074 | 21.6 |
| Iowa | 25,232,265 | 17,837,856 | 7,394,409 | 29.3 | 7,006,540 | 4,841,661 | 2,164,879 | 30.9 |
| Kansas | 22,991,078 | 17,537,156 | 5,453,922 | 23.7 | 6,464,431 | 4,942,235 | 1,522,196 | 23.5 |
| Minnesota | 55,454,646 | 43,581,552 | 11,873,094 | 21.4 | 15,167,193 | 12,413,144 | 2,754,049 | 18.2 |
| Nebraska | 21,380,867 | 16,584,505 | 4,796,352 | 22.4 | 6,010,353 | 4,782,467 | 1,227,886 | 20.4 |
| North Dakota | 10,466,339 | 7,855,089 | 2,611,250 | 24.9 | 2,800,874 | 2,257,035 | 543,839 | 19.4 |
| South Dakota | 11,396,406 | 8,235,827 | 3,160,579 | 27.7 | 3,542,006 | 2,458,204 | 1,083,802 | 30.6 |
| Wisconsin | 61,206,405 | 49,352,991 | 11,853,414 | 19.4 | 17,005,559 | 13,759,136 | 3,246,423 | 19.1 |

[1] Data for April are estimated.

*Expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated work projects, by regions and States and by sources of funds*—Continued

| Administrative region and State | July 1, 1938, through Apr. 30, 1939 | | | | Feb. 1, 1939, through Apr. 30, 1939 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | Federal funds | Sponsors' funds | | Total | Federal funds | Sponsors' funds | |
| | | | Amount | Percent of total funds | | | Amount | Percent of total funds |
| Region VIII | $68,148,117 | $52,073,077 | $16,075,040 | 23.6 | $19,565,485 | $14,851,775 | $4,713,710 | 24.1 |
| Colorado | 22,592,866 | 17,626,844 | 4,966,022 | 22.0 | 6,751,581 | 5,087,962 | 1,663,619 | 24.6 |
| Idaho | 7,723,217 | 5,619,001 | 2,104,216 | 27.2 | 2,411,510 | 1,777,424 | 634,086 | 26.3 |
| Montana | 16,200,665 | 12,772,171 | 3,428,494 | 21.2 | 4,030,581 | 3,288,239 | 742,342 | 18.4 |
| New Mexico | 8,230,851 | 6,571,538 | 1,659,313 | 20.2 | 2,479,768 | 1,856,454 | 623,314 | 25.1 |
| Utah | 9,846,815 | 7,094,414 | 2,752,401 | 28.0 | 2,951,529 | 2,140,093 | 811,436 | 27.5 |
| Wyoming | 3,553,703 | 2,389,109 | 1,164,594 | 32.8 | 940,516 | 701,603 | 238,913 | 25.4 |
| Region IX | 157,540,626 | 122,793,150 | 34,747,476 | 22.1 | 47,215,022 | 36,362,202 | 10,852,820 | 23.0 |
| Arizona | 8,885,161 | 6,351,796 | 2,533,365 | 28.5 | 2,772,650 | 1,797,180 | 975,470 | 35.2 |
| California | 93,629,084 | 74,446,751 | 19,182,333 | 20.5 | 28,474,853 | 22,504,929 | 5,969,924 | 21.0 |
| Northern California | 52,700,643 | 39,833,563 | 12,867,080 | 24.4 | 16,287,842 | 11,997,441 | 4,290,401 | 26.3 |
| Southern California | 40,928,441 | 34,613,188 | 6,315,253 | 15.4 | 12,187,011 | 10,507,488 | 1,679,523 | 13.8 |
| Nevada | 2,187,133 | 1,361,366 | 825,767 | 37.8 | 590,581 | 387,971 | 202,610 | 34.3 |
| Oregon | 14,366,755 | 11,139,732 | 3,227,023 | 22.5 | 4,395,444 | 3,374,339 | 1,021,105 | 23.2 |
| Washington | 38,472,493 | 29,493,505 | 8,978,988 | 23.3 | 10,981,494 | 8,297,783 | 2,683,711 | 24.4 |
| Hawaii | 2,799,448 | 1,713,826 | 1,085,622 | 38.8 | 811,763 | 486,625 | 325,138 | 40.1 |
| Not distributed by States [1] | −4,811,905 | −4,811,905 | | | 298,265 | 298,265 | | |

[1] Includes data for central office projects, textile adjustment account, and Works Progress Administration supply fund account.

Source: Federal funds represent voucher payments reported by the Treasury Department; sponsors' funds based on reports of sponsors' certifications.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, to adopt this amendment and place upon the Commissioner of Work Projects the very arbitrary provision that he must require a 25-percent contribution averaged over the State and place in the hands of the General Accounting Office, as would naturally follow, the amendment which is proposed, the determination as to whether or not that rule had been complied with would make almost impossible the administration of the act.

There are some States in which, in a part of the State, the contribution is very low, and in other parts of the State it is high. It seems to me this amendment, which would simply bind the Commissioner without giving him any discretion, without giving him any right to determine as between the various projects, should be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, when this matter was discussed yesterday, at the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I stated that it was entirely agreeable to me to amend it so as to provide that the determination of compliance with the section should be left with the Commissioner to avoid the fear that the General Accounting Office might make the section difficult to administer. I therefore ask to have considered at this time an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk to be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "In" and in lieu thereof to insert "On and after November 1, 1939, in."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that is a perfecting amendment; and after discussing the matter with the Commissioner I think it is right that this section should not become operative until November 1. At this time the average contributions are 22½ percent. It is the statement of the Commissioner that by December he is convinced that the average contribution will be 25 percent. This amendment, therefore, would only incorporate in the law that which the Commissioner says he expects to be able to comply with by December 1.

The Commissioner, however, was interested in the matter suggested by the Senator from Kentucky.

Before discussing the matter further, I ask for a vote upon my amendment perfecting the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. In addition to the change suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, should there not be a change in line 17, substituting "thereafter" for "hereafter"?

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Rhode Island is correct. I ask to modify the amendment by changing "hereafter" to "thereafter."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Ohio if he will not permit me to perfect the amendment and then discuss it.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I want to suggest, however, that the date be made January 1, 1940, instead of November 1939; and I desire to state my reasons.

Mr. BYRNES. The Commissioner states that in December he will have arrived at the 75–25 basis. I will agree to accept the Senator's amendment, and make the effective date January 1 instead of November 1.

Mr. TAFT. That is all I desire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina a question regarding the effective date. Does the amendment include projects which have been approved, or projects to be approved after this date?

Mr. BYRNES. "Thereafter," as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] suggested.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. So that a project approved the day before the effective date, even though it might not be finished, would be included?

Mr. BYRNES. I will say to the Senator that the amendment does not affect individual projects at all. The amendment simply says that the total average contributions from a State after January 1 shall be, under the regulations adopted by the Commissioner, 25 percent—that is all—but not the individual projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is to be done with all the projects within a State if they do not measure up to that requirement? Are they to be abandoned?

Mr. BYRNES. Oh, no. The amendment merely says that in the case of all projects which are thereafter undertaken there shall be required from the State an amount which will make the average contribution 25 percent.

For instance, the contributions in the State of Colorado now are above 25 percent. This amendment would provide that they must be at least 25 percent; not that the authorities would demand less, but that the total contributions from Colorado should be at least 25 percent. As far back as April the contributions from Colorado were 24.6 percent. It does

not mean an individual project. In the case of one project the Administrator can make it 30; in the case of another, 20.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It means all the projects in the State.

Mr. BYRNES. The total; yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. After all the projects in the State have been approved and accepted and are under way on January 1, or the effective date, whenever the amendment goes into effect, they all must be changed, and proceed on a different base altogether.

Mr. BYRNES. No; they would not. After January 1, in administering the fund under rules and regulations—which language is contained in an amendment I wish to offer, and which will be read in a few minutes—the Administrator would make the determination as to the total contributions on all projects in the State undertaken after January 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Projects undertaken after that date?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On projects under way after that date?

Mr. BYRNES. No projects undertaken thereafter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the answer to my question.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. In my State, where it is found impossible to make an average sponsoring contribution of 25 percent, what would happen?

Mr. BYRNES. The amendment merely provides that thereafter the State administrator would be instructed to require of the State such contributions on all projects as would make 25 percent. That does not mean money. For the information of the Senator I will state that less than 5 percent of the sponsors' contributions are money. It represents equipment, rental of equipment, the furnishing of supervisory services. After that it would require the total in any State to be 25 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the Administration has constantly raised the amount of sponsoring contributions throughout the country?

Mr. BYRNES. Not exactly. What has occurred is this: It was up as high as 27 percent, and last year it was down somewhat. Now, as I have stated, it is 22½ percent. It varies in the different States. In Idaho it is about the highest.

Mr. MURRAY. It varies according to the economic conditions in each State?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. In Ohio it is 11 percent; in Idaho it is about 30 percent; in Mississippi it is 30 percent; in Pennsylvania it is about 10 percent. It depends on conditions. The Administrator does not require States such as Pennsylvania and Ohio to put up as much as States such as Idaho and Mississippi. Instead of having it left to discretion, in the haphazard manner as it is at present, it would be provided for in the law. What would happen would be that the Administrator would be saved much trouble. The Administrator would have the oportunity to say "It is the law, and therefore I must try to secure the required percentage."

Mr. MURRAY. Inasmuch as the communities have advanced their contributions, and raised them up to the figure of 22½ percent, does not the Senator think it would work a great hardship on the country suddenly to advance the figure to 25 percent, especially in view of the continuance of the economic conditions which have been prevailing?

Mr. BYRNES. The best answer, in the first place, is that it is not going to be done suddenly. In the second place, the Commissioner says he is going to have it done by December, and this would not require it before January.

Mr. MURRAY. My information is that in many of the communities it is going to be absolutely impossible for them to make further contributions to the sponsoring funds, that is to say, increase them any further; that they have reached the point where they cannot possibly go any further.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, it comes to this: It depends on the voice of the Administrator and his persuasiveness. In some States, where there are high-powered salesmen with affidavit faces, they can, with tears in their voices, picture conditions so terrible that they can "get by" by putting up 10 percent. When they get to the Senator's State, where they have no man selected for the purpose working on this particular subject, and who does not present the case in so tearful a manner, they make it put up 30 percent.

The Commissioner will now have the advantage of saying, "The policy has been stated, and I think for the State at large you ought to put up this amount." It does not affect every community. If there is a poor community, it can put up 10 percent.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not speaking of my own State. In my State we have constantly increased the sponsoring contribution, and have succeeded in getting it up to a very high figure.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator is speaking of the low-percentage States, such as Pennsylvania and Ohio.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; some of the large States, or the conditions reflected in the testimony submitted by the mayors of New York and Cleveland and Boston.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator overlooks entirely the provisions of the amendment, because the condition in one city does not affect the situation. There was a time when New York City did not want to put up more than one-half of 1 percent. Fortunately that time has passed, and, by reason, I think, in great measure, of the action of the Senate committee, it is now putting up more than 25 percent, so that it does not affect New York City at all.

Mr. MURRAY. My information is that the administration of the W. P. A. is going to find it impossible, as the result of this amendment, if it is put into operation, to carry out the program.

Mr. BYRNES. I discussed the matter with the Commissioner this morning, and that is not his view of what would happen if the amendment I am about to submit should be adopted. The amendment reads:

> The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

That is the language used in one or two agricultural acts where the question of fact is to be determined, and to avoid conflicts between the General Accounting Office and the Department. If this amendment shall be adopted—and I hope it will be—the Commissioner says he will have no trouble in administering the act. Without it, he would have.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator knows I am entirely in sympathy with his efforts, which have extended over a long period of time, in an attempt to work out some definite rule. As I listened to the Senator discussing what we know to be a fact—that people come from various towns and States and municipalities, high-powered salesmen, with the affidavit face, as the Senator said—that is true, and that is happening all over the country—I was just wondering whether we might be shifting responsibility within the State to the communities in the State, where the high-powered salesman with the affidavit face in the community able to put up the money does his work, while in a poorer community there is no one to represent them, and they will be imposed on for a higher sponsorship contribution. Has the Senator thought of that?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes, because in every State necessarily there is a different sponsoring contribution. The bill provides that the Commissioner shall endeavor to act equitably as between communities, and the determination in the State must be left, of course, to the State Administrator. There can be no way of avoiding that. The small community, having no one to represent the sponsor, is not as effective as is the representative of a large city. But the best we can do is to provide for the effect as to States. I know it will be a step forward.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator's perfecting amendment to do only with the effective date of the act, or does it affect its provisions?

Mr. BYRNES. Not only that, but it gives to the Commissioner, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, the power to determine compliance, in order to avoid any question which the General Accounting Office might raise.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, following the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico, and in keeping with his inquiry, is it not true that the 25 percent applies to the State?

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Following that thought, the Administrator may reduce the percentage of contribution in one community within a State, but that would necessarily entail raising the contribution to other communities, because the general average over the whole State must be 25 percent?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. Let me show how it would work in the Senator's State. As far back as April they were demanding of Nevada 34 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. For the Nation they were demanding 22 percent. Nevada was asked to pay 12 percent more than the general average, and I think more than any other State in the Union.

Mr. McCARARN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. The amendment would not disturb that situation anyway, because in the State of Nevada the Administrator, of course, would have the determination as between the communities in Nevada. It would not affect that situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. It would not reduce the contribution we have been making.

Mr. BYRNES. No.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, the minimum must be 25 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; but the law does not say how high it can be made.

Mr. McCARRAN. With reference to the other matter raised by the question of the Senator from New Mexico, suppose, we will say, one community in Nevada, by its persuasiveness, was able to get away with a 10-percent contribution. Then the Administrator could raise the contributions of other communities as they applied for projects so as to make a level of 25 percent at least. Is not that true?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes. Of course, in the State of Nevada it would not affect the matter at all, because the contribution of that State is put so high.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is too high now.

Mr. BYRNES. The highest in the Union. I suppose that is a tribute to the wealth of Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; and it is a tribute to the patriotism of Nevada. We do not want to drain the Federal Treasury any more than we have to.

Mr. BYRNES. I think that is the best illustration that could be given. It is too high. They ask 34 percent from Nevada, and 10 percent from another State.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very glad to have the Senator from South Carolina say it is too high, and I hope his statement will be observed.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and which I ask to have stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 5, line 23, after the words "may be" and the period, the following:

> The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner and his determination made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him shall be final and conclusive.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to address myself to the pending amendment. It seems to me there will be two or three inevitable effects, even when the amendment is perfected as the Senator from South Carolina proposes to perfect it. In the first place the amendment would make it impossible in the future to have any Federal projects. Every project would have to be a State project, because every State would have to put up at least 25 percent of the cost of the project constructed within the State.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, there was no such intent, and because it has been suggested that such a construction might be placed upon it as the Senator from Florida has placed upon it, I intend to amend by inserting "non-Federal." It was suggested to me to make it specifically "non-Federal." The word "non" should be inserted in the language.

Mr. PEPPER. That would be a very helpful amendment. I am glad the Senator from South Carolina proposes to make that change, so that it will be possible hereafter to continue Federal projects.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the provision would have no effect whatever upon Federal projects.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say that the next vice which I think the amendment in any form has is that it lays down a rule of rigidity rather than a flexible rule. Heretofore the Administrator has been working toward a satisfactory relationship between the Federal and the State contributions, and the figures which have just been presented show that he has done a good job, and constantly has been requiring a larger contribution from the States and the sponsors of the several projects. Therefore, I feel that to lay down a rigid requirement—that is to say, that every State must contribute a minimum of 25 percent—would impair the quality of flexibility which I believe a program of this sort must have to be effective.

In my State, in spite of the fact that, according to the figures presented, we paid 25 percent, so that on the face of it we would suffer no detriment by the adoption of the amendment, yet I am told from reliable sources in the administration in my State that four-fifths of our projects, which have already been approved by the President and which are ready for execution, would be handicapped or would be retarded if the provision in question were in effect.

I know that the Senator from South Carolina proposes to change the language so that it will not restrict individual projects; but it restricts the whole State. If four-fifths of the projects are below the 25-percent minimum, the other one-fifth will have to be high enough to bring the whole contribution of the State up to the level of 25 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. If I understood the Senator correctly, he said the provision would apply to projects now under construction. That would not be so, by reason of the change of the word "hereafter" to "thereafter."

Mr. PEPPER. I mean to say that the rule would apply to four-fifths of the projects that have already been approved by the President but upon which construction has not yet begun.

Mr. President, the determination of the amount of a State's contribution should be based on the nature of the project. In my State the State university is getting some very fine dormitories and university buildings under the W. P. A. program. It is a permanent construction, which will be worth something next year, 10 years, and 25 years from now. That kind of construction should be encouraged and not discouraged. On such projects an average of 50 percent has to be put up in my State. Of course, that makes the contribution high. So the effect of the amendment would be to encourage the cheaper projects and the less-permanent projects at the expense of the permanent and the valuable projects which would stand year after year as monuments to the value of the program.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment in any form will not be agreed to, because experience does not show necessity for it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD two telegrams, one from the mayor of Cleveland and another from the mayor of Toledo, regarding the proposed amendment. I read first the telegram from Mayor Burton, of Cleveland:

Understand proposed Senate amendment to W. P. A. appropriation bill provides for 25-percent contribution from local subdivisions to cost of projects. Respectfully submit that provision requiring flat or arbitrary percentage contribution from local governments is extremely unwise because of various types of projects now in operation in different sections of country. No subdivision in Greater Cleveland is able to meet this proposed requirement.

I now read a telegram from the city manager of Toledo:

Regarding 25-percent local contribution W. P. A. projects, inability to raise funds thus required would mean reduction of available man-months work from present 120,000 to 40,000 for Government fiscal year 1940. This would mean lay-off 6,666 men immediately, most of whom would go on relief, for which our funds are entirely inadequate.

Mr. President, it happens that Ohio is one of the States in which the W. P. A. needs are the largest, and in which the State contribution is the smallest on a percentage basis. If Senators will examine the figures submitted by the Senator from Washington, they will see that in Ohio the contribution was 12.3 percent last year, and, instead of improving this year under the Administrator's assistance, it is lower. It is now 11½ percent. That is not because Ohio does not contribute a very substantial sum. I think if Senators will consider the total sum contributed, over twenty-three million, for sponsors' shares of these projects they will find that, in proportion to population, that is as large a percentage as any State puts up, or substantially the same as any State puts up. The difficulty is that the unemployment in Ohio is greater. That is why it seems to me that a 25-percent flat percentage is not a fair percentage to require.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The telegrams read by the Senator indicate that the mayors of those two cities are under the impression that the 25-percent limitation applies to local projects. Of course, it does not. It is the average for the State. A local project may not have more than 10 percent or 15 percent local contribution, but some other project would have to go above 25 percent in order to make the average 25 percent.

Mr. TAFT. How is the State going to apportion the 25 percent to one city and not to another city? How will the authorities determine what the percentage shall be? Or must we call the legislature together before the 1st of January in order to provide a new allotment of State funds to municipalities and counties in Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is up to the administrator of the W. P. A. in the State, and not up to the legislature. The legislature does not as a rule appropriate moneys to match Federal funds. They are put up largely by local communities.

Mr. TAFT. Our legislature, however, is attempting to work out that problem and contribute some part of the money from the State. Other parts come from localities.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to draw any invidious comparison, because there may be some States whose percentage is lower than that of Ohio. I understand the average in Ohio is about 11 percent.

Mr. TAFT. Eleven and one-half percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whereas the average in the whole country is 23 percent.

Mr. TAFT. The only reason I can see why we have a larger percentage of W. P. A. in Ohio is because there is more unemployment in Ohio. The reason the percentage is low is not because the contribution of the State is small, but it is because of the tremendous need for W. P. A. work in the State of Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be determined on the basis of the aggregate of the contributions made by the local communities.

Mr. TAFT. I said before the Senator came into the Senate Chamber that Ohio contributed $24,000,000 during the last fiscal year. Compared to Illinois, for instance, which contributed $32,000,000, it is approximately the same on the basis of population. Compared to $44,000,000 contributed by New York it is almost exactly the same percentage.

Our contribution has been approximately as large as that of any other State in the United States. The difficulty is that the unemployment is so great. I do not know why that is. I have not been able to discover why we should be the prize unemployment State, but apparently we are. Apparently the city of Cleveland has the highest percentage of unemployment of any city in the United States.

Mr. President, I can think of no reason why every State should be treated the same, why every State should be required to put up 25 percent. Let one State put up 25 percent and another State put up 10 percent because of different needs. But now there must be a flat 25 percent. What reason is there to suppose that every State is in the same position from the standpoint of unemployment? In addition to W. P. A., the actual money spent on direct relief in Ohio is in percentage as high or higher than in any other State.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has mentioned the aggregate amount contributed by Illinois and New York. What is the percentage of contribution locally to the projects?

Mr. TAFT. In Illinois it is 17.7 percent and in New York it is about 19 percent. But there are more people on W. P. A. today and more people unemployed in the State of Ohio than in the State of New York or in the State of Illinois or in the State of Pennsylvania, any one of which has a great deal larger population than has the State of Ohio.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the contribution locally in Pennsylvania?

Mr. TAFT. Fourteen and seven-tenths percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. With States such as Illinois, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania contributing from 11 to 19 percent locally, it must be true that many other States are contributing a great deal more than 23 percent in order to make the average for the whole country 23 percent.

Mr. TAFT. That is true. It is also true, as was pointed out by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], that where unemployment is very heavy and there is the necessity of providing people with sufficient money to live on the money must be made to go further. There must be fewer permanent projects and more digging and other work which provides employment for more persons. Consequently, it is undoubtedly true that the type of projects in the States where unemployment is heavy is not so permanent as in States which contribute more money. The more permanent the project, I think, the more reason there is to ask the State to contribute something to the project; but the justification for relief is to prevent starvation. Relief is an absolute necessity. It is not fundamentally a Federal project at all. It is a necessity; and if the necessity is greater in one place than in another, I do not see why we should require any arbitrary percentage.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think the pending amendments to the amendment are an improvement upon the report of the committee. As I understood the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], he stated that the Administrator had advised him that under the provisions of the committee amendment as amended—in case his pending amendment is adopted—the Administrator could administer these provisions. However, I assume that his statement relates primarily to the question of whether or not it is feasible and practicable from the Administrator's standpoint for him to enforce the requirement. I take it he did not intend by that statement to indicate that the Administrator felt that the provision suggested would be workable so far as the over-all picture of W. P. A. operation is concerned.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive how the 25-percent average sponsor's contribution per State can operate in any way except to impede the program. I think we must bear in mind that the employment of millions of persons is a going operation, scattered all over the United States in practically every community. It is an operation which requires the employment of individuals upon projects if they are to receive the wages which stand between them and destitution.

Mr. President, I am not an expert on the administration of the W. P. A. so far as its technical details are concerned, but it seems to me perfectly clear from the standpoint of a layman that if we lay down an arbitrary requirement of a 25-percent average it will inevitably result in delay in the approval of projects, because the Administration would have to keep a weekly or monthly average—perhaps a daily average—of sponsors' contributions within a State. When a large municipality, for example, puts forward a project and needs that project approved in order that the people who are certified for employment may be transferred to the new project from a project which is coming to completion, it will be necessary, as I see it, for the Administrator to weigh the contribution for the new project as against the State average. Often there may be a situation in which it will be necessary to delay the approval of a project which falls below the 25-percent requirement in order that some community remote from the particular project under consideration may be induced to sponsor a project which will be sufficiently above the 25-percent average so that the project in the first community may be approved and the average maintained.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think the point made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is a sound one. We must remember that urban and industrial communities, as well as the Federal Government, have been carrying a very heavy financial burden over the long economic crisis. I know that in my own State there are industrial communities which are reaching the end of their financial ability, either through taxation or by borrowing, to provide sponsorship in any such proportion as 25 percent. The average of my own State in the average table happens to be 19.1, but that does not mean that some industrial communities where unemployment has been a terrific burden ever since 1929 are not below the 19.1 percentage in providing their share of sponsorship.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that from any aspect we consider the amendment in its entirety, if it shall be adopted we shall impose a very difficult administrative problem. We shall be endangering the continuity of employment, which is so essential for those who need work; and all we shall gain, according to the sponsors of the amendment, is an increase of 3 percent in sponsors' contributions over the present national average.

I submit, Mr. President, that under those circumstances, and in view of the varying incidence of unemployment among industrial communities, we should not fix an arbitrary standard of this kind. I think all will agree that the Works Progress Administration has been bringing all possible pressure upon the communities to increase their percentage of sponsorship; and the record will show, if Senators will take the trouble to examine it, that so far as the Nation as a whole is concerned there has been a constant increase in the contributions of sponsors of W. P. A. programs.

In addition, Mr. President, we must take into consideration the fact that so far as the problem of direct relief is concerned the Federal Government has withdrawn any assistance to the localities, counties, and States. So, in addition to what the localities are putting up in the way of sponsor contributions for W. P. A. projects, they are carrying a tremendous financial burden in the way of meeting, without Federal assistance, the staggering burden of direct relief for unemployables and for those employables who have never been taken on by the W. P. A., although many of them have been certified for months and months as being eligible for such employment.

So I plead with the Senate to reject this amendment and not to impose the difficult administrative problem which I venture to predict, if the amendment is adopted, will slow up the approval of projects in large urban communities to the point where the entire functioning of the W. P. A. program may be endangered, with the result that an increasing load will be dumped upon the communities for the local taxpayers to carry largely through property taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I feel obligated to read a telegram which was not sent directly to me, but was sent to the majority leader, a copy of which was transmitted to me by Mayor LaGuardia, in reference to the same question which is now under consideration. I read the telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 27, 1939.*

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

I have sent the following telegram to Senator BARKLEY:

"W. P. A. appropriation bill as reported will practically make all worth-while projects in cities impossible. Many municipalities simply cannot comply with sponsorship requirements as now provided in committee bill. Art and theater projects cannot be locally sponsored for many reasons well known to committee. Purpose of W. P. A. is to provide work. The pending bill will not do it in its present form. I am speaking for all cities. Do not forsake unemployed now."

F. H. LAGUARDIA, *Mayor.*

The telegram carries out the thought which has been so ably expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I wish to join with those who are urging the rejection of the amendment, because I think the basis of requiring a State to pay an inflexible sum of 25 percent, irrespective of the needs of the particular State, is not in accordance with the philosophy of the W. P. A.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, confirming what the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] says, I have received several similar messages from the mayor of Boston. I find that the general sentiment of officials of the larger cities in the country is that the suggested provision would prove very burdensome. A table which was called to my attention yesterday indicates that the percentage of contributions made in the State of Massachusetts last year was 13 percent. A jump to 25 percent would be extremely burdensome to municipalities which are already overburdened with taxes and which already have a very heavy relief load.

Mr. WAGNER. I will say, Mr. President, that I happened to be present in the Appropriations Committee when the mayor of Boston testified and explained to the committee the difficulties under which he is now laboring. I am not pleading especially for New York, for New York may be able to carry the burden; I do not know; but in some of the other communities such as Boston, in view of the evidence the mayors gave to the committee, how they can possibly contribute 25 percent I do not know. I think that statement will apply to many other communities.

If this inflexible imposition is to be written into the bill, it will be exceedingly burdensome, and will simply mean that many of those now employed will be absolutely uncared for.

I was one of those who were originally associated with the legislation to provide relief, together with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the late Senator Costigan, of Colorado. That was during the Hoover administration when relief legislation was first proposed. Then we did not divide the money so much for each State and provide that each State should contribute so much. We insisted, as the Congress insisted, that the money should be provided where it was needed.

Now, unfortunately, some States are suffering more than others. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asserted a few moments ago that his State is suffering from unemployment to a greater extent perhaps according to population than is any other State in the Union. It would be unfortunate if that State, because of the tremendous unemployment there, and the need that exists there, was not able to make the contribution of 25 percent throughout the State. It would simply mean that they could not sponsor projects. What

the outcome would be, I cannot foresee, unless they should put all the unemployed upon relief, and that would be a burden the State could not carry, for it is necessary to have the cooperation of the Federal Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to sustain what he is saying to the extent of observing that the mayor of Detroit—and I think the mayor of every other industrial city in Michigan—testified precisely as the Senator from New York has stated? I therefore want to join with him in the statement he is making.

Mr. WAGNER. I thank the Senator very much. What I am attempting to urge is that we should not attempt to change the philosophy of the law. It was contemplated that aid should be given according to need. Now it is proposed, irrespective of need, that the States shall be compelled to contribute 25 percent, and if they do not do so they cannot get any aid from the Government at all. I think it would be a very risky proposition, and I hope it will be rejected.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AS SECURITY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take from the calendar and to have considered at this time a bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee at the request of the Federal Reserve Board. The bill permits for 2 years longer the use of United States bonds as security for rediscount at the Federal Reserve banks. It has to pass before Friday night; otherwise, the rediscounting of the banks will be greatly retarded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state by title the bill referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2618) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1939," and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1941."

REGULATION OF COMMERCE IN PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1302) to make permanently effective the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935, as amended, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, to strike out line 8 and insert:

amended by the act approved June 14, 1937 (50 Stat. 257), is further amended so as to read:
"SEC. 13. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 30, 1942."

On page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 18, inclusive; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to continue in effect until June 30, 1942, the act entitled 'An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes,' approved February 22, 1935, as amended."

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I will take a moment of the time of the Senate, if I may, to call attention to a possibility that the pending legislation may not be passed in time to have the President sign it before the expiration of the present law. That situation is causing great worry to millions of W. P. A. workers throughout the country. In addition there are some further worries. In the Works Progress Administration there are a great many employees who have accumulated leave, which, technically, will expire and be wiped out if the pending bill shall not be enacted before Friday night.

So, if it is in order, and if it is not out of order, I ask unanimous consent that I may now introduce a joint resolution which, if adopted, would continue the functions of these agencies in the event that the pending measure should not be passed. I ask that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection I will say to the Senator, if he will yield, that I have conferred with the leaders of the other branch of Congress in respect to the matter to which he refers. In the event that it becomes apparent that the pending bill cannot be enacted and signed by the President by Friday night, a joint resolution has already been drawn and is ready to be introduced and passed, if it becomes necessary. However, we are all hoping it will not become necessary, because if we pass a joint resolution continuing these agencies for another month or 2 months or 6 weeks or even 2 weeks, the Senator realizes that then we may relax our efforts to secure the passage of the pending measure. It is not desirable to pass a continuing resolution unless it is absolutely necessary in order that there may be no lapse of time after midnight on Friday. I think the chances are probably 99 to 1 that we will be able to have the pending measure enacted and signed by the President before Friday night.

Mr. MALONEY. I am very hopeful that the majority leader is correct in his view, and I am quite in accord with what he says. My only interest in the matter was in having a resolution before the Appropriations Committee in the event it was necessary. I shall be guided entirely by the suggestion of the majority leader.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry as to legislative procedure? Can the Senate initiate such a resolution or should it not come from the other House?

Mr. MALONEY. I think we can initiate it, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no question that the Senate can initiate such a resolution if the law in question is not a tax measure, in which event the other House must initiate it.

Mr. ADAMS. Legally, of course, the Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But customarily the House does originate resolutions of this kind, and I will say to both Senators it is already understood that, if it becomes necessary, a resolution will be thus originated in the other House.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to ask the majority leader now what he would prefer I do? Does he desire that I withdraw the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is all right. Of course the Senator may introduce it and have it referred to the Committee on Appropriations if he so desires.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 162) continuing the functions of the Works Progress Administration and certain other agencies beyond June 30, 1939, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire, in connection with the statement I made a few moments ago, to invite the attention of the Senate to page 26 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolution 83. A table appears on that page which is designated as table 8,

which purports to set forth, by States and by sources of funds, the expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated projects through November 30, 1938.

As I scan through this table, I note that approximately 38 States, 2 or 3 of them being very close to a 25-percent contribution, will have an increase in their contributions, and about 10 States will probably have a reduction.

The contributions made by the States vary from 11, 12, and 13 percent to as high as 30 percent. It would seem to indicate that some of the States will have a very substantial increase in their contributions.

I ask that this table be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 8.—*Expenditures on Works Progress Administration operated projects, by States and by sources of funds through Nov. 30, 1938*

| State | Cumulative through Nov. 30, 1938 | | | | 5 months ending Nov. 30, 1938 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total expenditures | Federal funds | Sponsors' funds | | Total expenditures | Federal funds | Sponsors' funds | |
| | | | Amount | Percent of total expenditures | | | Amount | Percent of total expenditures |
| Total | $6,195,050,364 | $5,206,312,670 | $988,737,694 | 16.0 | $1,093,521,558 | $897,892,694 | $195,628,864 | 17.9 |
| Alabama | 67,946,931 | 53,744,645 | 14,202,286 | 20.9 | 13,496,711 | 10,725,337 | 2,771,374 | 20.5 |
| Arizona | 26,006,875 | 19,243,186 | 6,763,689 | 26.0 | 4,457,965 | 3,374,784 | 1,083,181 | 24.3 |
| Arkansas | 54,032,946 | 44,622,390 | 9,410,556 | 17.4 | 10,543,625 | 8,963,121 | 1,580,504 | 15.0 |
| California | 319,970,376 | 268,857,632 | 51,112,744 | 16.0 | 45,114,675 | 36,372,125 | 8,742,550 | 19.4 |
| Colorado | 71,885,189 | 58,672,590 | 13,212,599 | 18.4 | 10,989,501 | 8,886,189 | 2,103,312 | 19.1 |
| Connecticut | 69,334,885 | 56,732,834 | 12,602,051 | 18.2 | 12,493,553 | 10,237,698 | 2,255,855 | 18.1 |
| Delaware | 5,968,386 | 5,184,750 | 783,636 | 13.1 | 1,216,288 | 976,775 | 239,513 | 19.7 |
| District of Columbia | 20,139,667 | 17,370,617 | 2,769,050 | 13.7 | 4,112,805 | 3,541,446 | 571,359 | 13.9 |
| Florida | 62,751,844 | 50,555,122 | 12,196,722 | 19.4 | 13,096,345 | 10,642,366 | 2,453,979 | 18.7 |
| Georgia | 69,684,688 | 56,327,417 | 13,357,271 | 19.2 | 14,288,818 | 11,281,609 | 3,007,209 | 21.0 |
| Idaho | 22,899,371 | 16,411,498 | 6,487,873 | 28.3 | 3,666,446 | 2,640,731 | 1,025,715 | 28.0 |
| Illinois | 462,489,908 | 384,307,671 | 78,182,237 | 16.9 | 94,675,647 | 78,500,384 | 16,175,263 | 17.1 |
| Indiana | 191,693,147 | 162,740,041 | 28,953,106 | 15.1 | 36,657,738 | 29,853,039 | 6,804,699 | 18.6 |
| Iowa | 68,984,079 | 51,953,223 | 17,030,856 | 24.7 | 13,157,554 | 9,292,076 | 3,865,478 | 29.4 |
| Kansas | 83,391,354 | 65,063,008 | 17,328,346 | 21.0 | 11,492,568 | 8,871,517 | 2,621,051 | 22.8 |
| Kentucky | 89,426,684 | 71,022,357 | 18,404,327 | 20.6 | 19,750,483 | 15,861,358 | 3,889,125 | 19.7 |
| Louisiana | 74,443,909 | 60,989,887 | 13,454,022 | 18.1 | 12,532,421 | 10,199,240 | 2,333,181 | 18.6 |
| Maine | 18,706,403 | 14,948,800 | 3,757,603 | 20.1 | 3,233,604 | 2,445,232 | 788,372 | 24.4 |
| Maryland | 36,183,300 | 30,598,393 | 5,584,907 | 15.4 | 5,415,841 | 4,129,872 | 1,285,969 | 23.7 |
| Massachusetts | 266,762,260 | 249,006,370 | 37,755,890 | 13.2 | 49,278,572 | 42,928,371 | 6,350,201 | 12.9 |
| Michigan | 257,036,733 | 214,437,947 | 42,598,786 | 16.6 | 68,002,613 | 59,562,953 | 8,439,660 | 12.4 |
| Minnesota | 151,872,055 | 125,146,242 | 26,725,813 | 17.6 | 28,494,091 | 22,213,379 | 6,280,712 | 22.0 |
| Mississippi | 53,421,627 | 40,104,091 | 13,317,536 | 24.9 | 10,261,383 | 7,837,087 | 2,424,296 | 23.6 |
| Missouri | 172,604,112 | 148,643,807 | 23,960,305 | 13.9 | 33,878,768 | 29,145,682 | 4,733,086 | 14.0 |
| Montana | 41,277,536 | 34,411,245 | 6,866,291 | 16.6 | 8,944,195 | 7,019,248 | 1,924,947 | 21.5 |
| Nebraska | 59,681,807 | 46,272,250 | 13,409,557 | 22.5 | 10,690,754 | 8,356,795 | 2,333,959 | 21.8 |
| Nevada | 6,501,457 | 4,534,309 | 1,967,148 | 30.3 | 1,171,959 | 700,961 | 470,998 | 40.2 |
| New Hampshire | 19,805,649 | 16,044,870 | 3,760,779 | 19.0 | 3,770,713 | 3,075,370 | 695,343 | 18.4 |
| New Jersey | 249,746,408 | 208,701,496 | 41,044,912 | 16.4 | 44,458,161 | 34,677,560 | 9,780,601 | 22.0 |
| New Mexico | 24,036,235 | 19,863,932 | 4,172,303 | 17.4 | 4,248,708 | 3,425,695 | 823,013 | 19.4 |
| New York | 957,897,170 | 846,489,627 | 111,407,543 | 11.6 | 114,695,270 | 95,112,278 | 19,582,992 | 17.1 |
| North Carolina | 52,730,411 | 40,347,484 | 12,382,927 | 23.5 | 11,112,574 | 8,431,837 | 2,680,737 | 24.1 |
| North Dakota | 37,914,201 | 30,428,436 | 7,485,765 | 19.7 | 5,353,859 | 3,839,543 | 1,514,316 | 28.3 |
| Ohio | 452,033,485 | 393,923,650 | 58,109,835 | 12.9 | 104,386,777 | 91,316,129 | 13,070,648 | 12.5 |
| Oklahoma | 108,321,802 | 84,719,322 | 23,602,480 | 21.8 | 17,391,551 | 14,095,880 | 3,295,671 | 18.9 |
| Oregon | 44,858,092 | 36,363,621 | 8,494,471 | 18.9 | 7,066,557 | 5,476,325 | 1,590,232 | 22.5 |
| Pennsylvania | 628,514,369 | 565,058,086 | 63,456,283 | 10.1 | 104,375,269 | 90,737,611 | 13,637,658 | 13.1 |
| Rhode Island | 35,248,891 | 29,181,329 | 6,067,562 | 17.2 | 7,731,210 | 6,716,131 | 1,015,079 | 13.1 |
| South Carolina | 47,172,123 | 37,345,357 | 9,826,766 | 20.8 | 10,340,452 | 8,437,514 | 1,902,938 | 18.4 |
| South Dakota | 42,263,313 | 35,141,026 | 7,122,287 | 16.9 | 5,236,147 | 3,908,201 | 1,327,946 | 25.4 |
| Tennessee | 70,026,648 | 46,791,125 | 23,235,523 | 33.2 | 11,941,851 | 8,683,521 | 3,258,330 | 27.3 |
| Texas | 140,242,552 | 105,513,240 | 34,729,312 | 24.8 | 24,329,529 | 17,726,908 | 6,602,621 | 27.1 |
| Utah | 29,573,286 | 22,034,972 | 7,538,314 | 25.5 | 4,768,460 | 3,429,423 | 1,339,037 | 28.1 |
| Vermont | 10,579,012 | 8,018,757 | 2,560,255 | 24.2 | 2,280,305 | 1,779,897 | 500,408 | 21.9 |
| Virginia | 44,610,890 | 34,930,027 | 9,680,863 | 21.7 | 7,310,169 | 5,360,028 | 1,950,141 | 26.7 |
| Washington | 92,253,260 | 77,044,955 | 15,208,305 | 16.5 | 19,593,237 | 15,145,860 | 4,447,377 | 22.7 |
| West Virginia | 88,011,258 | 74,520,200 | 13,491,058 | 15.3 | 14,760,250 | 11,813,994 | 2,946,256 | 20.0 |
| Wisconsin | 160,317,091 | 132,811,632 | 27,505,459 | 17.2 | 31,276,989 | 25,348,247 | 5,928,742 | 19.0 |
| Wyoming | 11,709,374 | 8,283,691 | 3,425,683 | 29.3 | 1,815,088 | 1,201,318 | 613,770 | 33.8 |
| Alaska | 20,743 | 20,743 | | | −118 | −118 | | |
| Hawaii | 7,349,554 | 5,115,752 | 2,233,802 | 30.4 | 1,436,765 | 867,305 | 569,460 | 39.6 |
| Virgin Islands | 4,015 | 4,015 | | | | | | |
| Central office | 4,944,808 | 4,944,808 | | | 200,845 | 200,845 | | |
| Central textile account | −9,231,805 | −9,231,805 | | | −7,473,983 | −7,473,983 | | |

Source: Federal funds represent voucher payments reported by the Treasury Department, sponsors' funds based on Works Progress Administration State office reports of sponsors' certifications.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have received telegrams from the mayors of the largest cities in the State of Pennsylvania with reference to the pending amendment. The cities include Philadelphia, Reading, Erie, and Pittsburgh. I desire to read to the Senate a telegram I received this morning from the mayor of the city of Pittsburgh. It is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *June 27, 1939.*

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:*

The new W. P. A. bill as reported by your Senate subcommittee is a great improvement over the House bill, but one feature is included which I hope you will use your best efforts to remove from the final enactment. That is the arbitrary setting up of a 25-percent sponsor's contribution on all projects, which the conference of mayors informs me is provided for in the committee's report. There are a great many very useful W. P. A. projects which require a sponsor's contribution of much less than this amount, particularly grading and drainage jobs on streets and playgrounds which constitute the bulk of the city of Pittsburgh's W. P. A. program. I think I can fairly say that if the 25-percent year-round average is included in the bill, that the city of Pittsburgh will be forced to cut very sharply the number of W. P. A. projects which it sponsors and thus the total number of employees on W. P. A. here will be much reduced.

Our financial condition is such that we cannot afford to spend more than $100,000 a month for the sponsorship of W. P. A. projects. We have averaged, roughly, 10 to 12 percent of Federal W. P. A. expenditures and so it is easy to see that if the figure is moved up to 25 percent that the W. P. A. employment on city-sponsored projects will be cut in half or more.

I sincerely hope that in view of this condition confronting your home city that you will do everything within your power to remove this crippling restriction.

CORNELIUS D. SCULLY,
*Mayor, City of Pittsburgh.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the first amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRNES. As I understand, that is the amendment postponing the time when the provision is to take effect?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's statement is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the second amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, line 17, after the word "projects", it is proposed to strike out the word "hereafter" and insert "thereafter."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 23, after the period, it is also proposed to insert the following new sentence:

The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to be sure that I understand this matter. I think perhaps there is a little confusion on the subject in the minds of other Senators also.

On page 16, in section 11, provision is made for the Commissioner to allocate not to exceed $50,000,000 to other Federal agencies for certain purposes there prescribed. That is not dissimilar from the provisons which have been made in all the other relief measures, is it? I address my question to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BYRNES. No; it is practically the same.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the usual provision?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. The next question is, under the existing law it has been possible to have a category of projects to be called Federal projects; that is to say, projects which might be sponsored by the Works Progress Administration alone, without any cosponsor or joint sponsor. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator should amend the amendment he has been discussing and let the 25-percent provision apply only to non-Federal projects, I wish to know whether it would be possible in the future for the W. P. A. to sponsor a project which perhaps would require a cosponsor, but with respect to which the amount to be contributed by the cosponsor should not be prescribed by law or regulation. Would that be possible?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, if I understand what the Senator has in mind, it has reference, of course, to section 25 of the joint resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES. I think the specific prohibition in that section, if it remains, would prevent the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. But the thing I am interested to know is this: Suppose the W. P. A. says, "We will sponsor an arts program. That is to say, we are willing to sponsor it if there will be a cosponsor with us." May not the two or the three, or whatever number may be involved, sponsor that project without its being subject to the 25-percent provision on the previous page?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I do not think so. I think the art projects the Senator has in mind would be on the same basis as all other projects, and that if such a project were desired by the city of Jacksonville, say, Jacksonville would have to sponsor it. It is true that the representative of the Mayors' Conference apparently does not understand this amendment, and he speaks of the individual contributions. The city of Jacksonville could sponsor an art project, and, if the Administrator approved it, could put up 5 percent, or could put up the equivalent of 5 percent—because, in the history of these things, less than 5 percent is now put up—and as long as the State of Florida was putting up 25 percent, as it is now putting up 25 percent, it could go ahead.

Mr. PEPPER. But there is a difference between the city of Jacksonville, Fla., on the one hand, initiating an arts project or any other kind of a project, enlisting the approval of the W. P. A., getting the W. P. A. contribution to be applied and having the project constructed, and on the other hand, the W. P. A. initiating a program or project of broad application, and, before it can operate in any State, requiring that the State shall cooperate in a certain degree with the program.

Mr. BYRNES. There certainly is; but I submit to the Senator that the only way in which he will remedy the situation to which he refers is by striking out the three lines on page 29. So long as those three lines remain in the joint resolution, providing that no funds are available for any project sponsored by W. P. A., it could not be done.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to suggest a technical disagreement with the Senator from South Carolina as to that interpretation of the language. If the project were sponsored solely by the Works Progress Administration, without any cosponsor, that would be true; but the language which the joint resolution already carries says that none of these funds shall be available for projects which are sponsored solely by the W. P. A.

Mr. BYRNES. Let us see if the Senator and I cannot agree. If a project is not sponsored solely by the W. P. A., then the funds in this joint resolution are made available—there is not any question about that—regardless of whether the sponsor is the city, the county, or the State. There is no question about that.

Mr. PEPPER. That is my interpretation. I am very much interested in this subject, and I want to be sure that that interpretation is the one which is understood by the Senate when this amendment is adopted, if it is adopted.

Mr. BYRNES. I do not think there is any question about that; but whenever we reach that stage in the consideration of the joint resolution I shall be glad to express my view about the matter. Apparently some Members are opposing the provision who are opposed to any art project or theater project, and some Members are in favor of Federal projects without any contribution or sponsorship at all; and that is a very controversial matter. As I see it, however, it would not be affected by the pending amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I think if the Senator should perfect his amendment by putting in the words "non-Federal," it would make the matter clear.

Mr. BYRNES. As I have stated heretofore, and stated to the Senator from Florida, that was my interpretation of the amendment, and I thought I asked to modify the amendment some time ago by inserting the word "non-Federal." Certainly I intended to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. On page 5?

Mr. BYRNES. On Page 5, line 16, after the word "all," to insert "non-Federal."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is modified as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. PEPPER. The word "Federal" there is construed to mean a project sponsored solely by the Federal Government?

Mr. BYRNES. That is the way it always has been construed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may I ask a question at that point? I am very much interested in this matter, and I should not want to have any confusion afterward. Providing the requirement for a 25-percent contribution remains in the legislation as it now stands, may a project be sponsored by the W. P. A. jointly with some local authority?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; there would be no change in that respect. When the Senator refers to a project being spon-

sored jointly, I assume that he means in the same manner in which those matters are now conducted.

Mr. WAGNER. There are certain projects which the W. P. A. may itself conduct without any sponsorship from any locality.

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct. That is prohibited by the language on page 25.

Mr. WAGNER. That cannot be done if the joint resolution is passed as it now stands. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES. If it is passed with the section on page 25, it could not be done.

Mr. WAGNER. So if a sponsorship should come from a locality, assuming it to be an art project, would it nevertheless be in the classification of non-Federal projects?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; it would have to be.

Mr. WAGNER. I hope the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is listening to this discussion, because I do not want him to be confused.

Mr. BYRNES. The Senator from Florida, as I understand, is not confused about it. Any project that is sponsored by a State or any subdivision of a State is not a Federal project.

Mr. WAGNER. It is not a Federal project?

Mr. BYRNES. It is a non-Federal project.

Mr. WAGNER. Under this legislation as it now stands, can we have a purely Federal project?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; of the character described in the $50,000,000 section, limited to Federal agencies.

Mr. WAGNER. That is limited to certain Federal agencies?

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct, and that is all.

Mr. WAGNER. That could not include art projects?

Mr. BYRNES. It could not as I interpret it. I talked to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] about the matter a moment ago. It could not be done unless the President allotted to some agency of the Government some department's money for that purpose.

Mr. WAGNER. Some other agency than W. P. A.?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. So that unless section 25 is amended that would be the construction?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not think there is any doubt at all about it, as long as that specific proposition remains in the joint resolution.

Mr. WAGNER. Then such a project would come within the 25-percent requirement?

Mr. BYRNES. It would be on the same footing as all other projects.

Mr. President, I regret very much that I cannot get some features of this matter over to the Mayors' Conference, and, I fear, to some of my colleagues. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] read a telegram from the mayor of Cleveland which clearly indicates that the mayor has read some newspaper statement misleading in character. He says the provision in question will require a municipality to put up 25 percent of the cost of a project; and from two or three telegrams read by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] from mayors of cities in that State, I am sure there is a misunderstanding. We know how such a misunderstanding occurs. The Mayors' Conference now have offices here, and they have a representative. This is not the first time I have found that the representative sends out a telegram, and the mayor of my town telegraphs me, and the mayor of another Senator's town telegraphs him, and if a mistake appears in one telegram it appears in all. It is just a question of whether the gentleman who now represents the mayors for the purpose of getting money out of the Federal Treasury understands the matter. If he does, all right, well and good. If he does not understand it, then we receive the telegrams, and they are all wrong.

This provision does not apply to the municipality. Insofar as the State of Pennsylvania or any other State is concerned, proceeding as the Administrator now does, he may show to Cleveland, as he has shown to Cleveland ever since these programs have been in effect, the favor of not requiring them to put up as large a contribution as is required of other cities in the State of Ohio and as is required of small communities. That is true of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas.

Insofar as this provision goes, the Administrator would proceed as he now does. How does he proceed? He has a sewing-machine project, for instance. He requires a contribution of not more than 10 percent. How is that 10 percent provided? By the rental of a building, or at most by material; not by cash, and because he thinks that project should not be required to put up a large contribution, he does not require it.

Then there may be a schoolhouse to be built, and, because of the ability of the school district, having issued bonds, to put up more, the Administrator will require them—as I know he does in my State—to put up 45 or 50 percent. They put up the 45 or 50 percent in material and in supervision of men. They can take one project and require 50 percent; they can take a white-collar project and require 5 percent; but so long as they provide the total from the State of 25 percent, which is going to be required anyway, according to the Administrator, by December, this provision could be administered.

It is said that the Administrator would have trouble in administering the provision. I discussed that matter with the Administrator this morning. I would not want to misquote him, but I am satisfied he would prefer to have no restraint upon the exercise of discretion by him. He would prefer not to have any amendment at all; which is not unusual. I never have seen the official in the executive department who would not prefer that we hand him an appropriation without requiring that he comply with any restraint directed by the Congress. But when I asked him about the administration, he said that if he had had the language which I have added, he would have had no difficulty in administering the law. The only thing he requested was that I make the effective date 3 months from now, and at the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio I extended it even to the first of the year, because I believe it is important to the Administrator, after all, to put this principle into effect.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to commend the Senator for the amendment he has offered, which I think will be most helpful in the administration of the law. I understood the Senator to say yesterday that the average contribution by the States is now 22 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. Twenty-two and a fraction percent.

Mr. WALSH. And that the Administrator says after December it will be 25 or more, under the present law.

Mr. BYRNES. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. But the pending joint resolution fixes the amount of the contribution at 25 percent. In several States would not that be an increase over present contributions?

Mr. BYRNES. I did not understand the Senator's question clearly, but the present contribution is twenty-two and a fraction percent, and the Administrator says that by December he is going to require a contribution of 25 percent.

Mr. WALSH. Can he do that under existing law?

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; or he can lower it, or he can require one State to put up 10 percent and require of another State 35 percent or 50 percent. In the case of Nevada he requires 34 percent. In the case of Ohio—and I did not bring this out, but the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Kentucky did—he requires 10 percent. It is only a question whether or not, in order to attain some degree of uniformity, we should require that a State shall put up a minimum of 25 percent. Then the State regulates the contributions within the State, as the State administrator sees fit, in order to secure the 25 percent.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has clarified the situation by his statement, but I still am convinced that the amendment would mean to many States an increase over the present contribution.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that it would mean to some States an increase there can be no question, and my contention is that it should mean that. Let us see what occurs. Today we have something we have never had before; we have

an organization of mayors. I do not blame the mayors for their activities. The mayor of any municipality knows that he is going to stand for reelection, and when he stands for reelection, the mayor wants to cite his accomplishments. He tells his people something to this effect: "I put up this building, this stadium. I put up this recreation park. Look at the waterworks I put in this city; and, my fellow citizens, I want to tell you that I got it for nothing. Not one dollar did it cost you. It did not come out of your city taxes. I got it without raising your city taxes. I went down to the city of Washington and put up an argument there to the Administrator, and, with the help of the State administrator, I got them to let me put up only 10 percent. How did we put up the 10 percent? By putting some people on the job to exercise supervisory direction, and we charged up the services of the supervisors at so much a day. That did not cost you any money, because you had the supervisors, anyway.

"What else did I do to put up the 10 percent? I provided the use of some of the city's equipment. I took the concrete mixer and got a credit of $50 a day. Over here in the other city, how did they come out? The mayor did not stand in as I did, and he got but $25 a day for their concrete mixer. I put a tractor on the job. Reelect me, and I will go down to Washington and get something for the city."

Now we are confronted with the situation that when they cannot come in person, telegrams pour in, and they are going to be received from my city and from every other city, saying "Don't hamstring me. Still leave me an opportunity to get this money. I don't want to put up any."

Is that right? Consider the case of the P. W. A. today. They submit us a statement that they have a billion and a half dollars of applications from the municipalities of this country, asking for the privilege of putting up money in order to get a billion and a half dollars out of the United States Treasury, and they say, "If you will give it to us today, if you will write into this measure this P. W. A. provision and let us get the money, we will put up 55 percent in order to get a 45-percent grant." Let them get into a taxicab and ride across this town from one Government office to another, and they get poor on the way, and by the time they reach the Administrator's office they are crying that they cannot put up 10 or 15 percent because of the terrible conditions which exist at home. As a result they get a favor from one Department of the Government, when they are crying for the opportunity to put up 55 percent in order to get 45 percent out of the Treasury.

I want the Senate to decide whether or not we shall endeavor to say how little they must put up. Some of them are not willing to put up equipment and are not willing to provide supervision, and today they are not putting up more than 5 percent, and they do not want to do that.

This provision would result in some uniformity, and make the people of this country more satisfied with the P. W. A., which has done and can do much good. We should write some such provision into the law, instead of leaving it to the Administrator to say, "I like the State of Arizona, and because I like the State of Arizona and like the Senator from Arizona, it has to put up but 11 percent. But I do not like this other State, and that State will have to put up 30 percent."

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, does not the Federal money come from the same place where the cities and towns get their money?

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator could convince the people of that, our difficulties would be greatly lessened, but the people do not believe it. The people believe that when they get money from Washington, it comes from Santa Claus, that they are will never have to do anything about it, and therefore that it is merely a question of saying, "So long as it is going to be spent, I might as well get mine." If I were the mayor of Kalamazoo I would say that I would get more of it, that I knew it was going to be spent, and if I did not get it, the Senator from Massachusetts would be getting it, and therefore I would get as much as the other fellow, or more. No mayor will run for office in a municipality hereafter without bragging about the good bargain he obtained.

In the early days we thought the brake on expenditures was in the Congress of the United States, and that the spending department was in the executive branch. By the high-powered methods now resorted to, that has been changed, so that the only brake to be exercised will be exercised by the executive department, and Congress will be running away with itself to see how much it can give to other people.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I was interested in the Senator's picture of the lobbying mayors. I have been in legislatures, and know something about it myself.

In the case of the city of Cleveland, I do not think his story is a fair statement of what happened. I talked with the mayor of Cleveland this morning for over half an hour, and discussed the whole situation with him. I was familiar all last year with the situation in Cleveland. I know how much they can put up. This is a question of figures, and I say that if we require them today to put up 25 percent, they will have to cut their works projects in half, and that is not because they are not putting up money. The people of the city of Cleveland voted an extra levy of seven mills, which makes their tax rate today the highest in the State of Ohio. The need exists. It is all very well to say that these are general conditions, but I say that here is a specific condition, a condition under which they cannot afford, by any method I can discover today, at least, or the Administrator can discover, so far as that is concerned, to put up 25 percent.

We have introduced a bill on the relief proposition requiring a contribution of one-third. If they have to put up 25 percent on W. P. A. projects, and they pay the whole cost of their relief, which is very considerable, in addition to the W. P. A., they are going to pay nearly half the cost of relief under this plan.

I say that under present conditions of unemployment, under the tremendous expense they are put to in order to take care of unemployment they cannot afford to do it. If we are going to leave it wide open to an administrator to say, "In Cincinnati you have to put up 30 percent and in Cleveland 10 percent," we will have the same conditions existing inside of the States that we are trying to get away from by having uniformity throughout the Nation. The provisions are not carried far enough. If 25 percent is what is wanted, make it 25 percent for everyone.

I think the principle is an unsound one. I think the administrator should go into a case of need and determine what is the actual need in the particular case.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the Senator's question is a long one. First of all I wish to say that the Senator from Ohio has said that the administrator ought to have the right to go into each case. That is what is provided for. I think the Senator still believes that the provision would require the city of Cleveland to put up 25 percent. I have been trying to tell the Senate that the provision applies to the State, and if the administrator of the State of Ohio, who knows more about the condition in the city of Cleveland than anyone in Washington could possibly know, believes its story, then he can permit projects to be undertaken in the city of Cleveland without raising the percentage. If that were done it would lessen the pressure that is brought to bear. Without wishing to say anything about any one city, I will say that that city has been the most active of any that I know of with respect to the general proposal. But the other cities of Ohio make no such complaint, and the other cities of Ohio could pay a little more to make up the 25 percent, pay it in the way I suggest they should pay, by services and by equipment. I know a little about the city of Cleveland. I dislike to go back to

it. The Senator, however, will admit that when they had an election there on the question of changing the constitution so as to permit the city to raise more taxes for relief, the people of Cleveland voted it down.

Mr. TAFT. There is a constitutional limitation, but a city may vote to impose a tax in excess of the constitutional limitation. While we have a 10-mill limitation, Cleveland has voted, and today has a tax rate of 30 mills.

Mr. BYRNES. When was that election?

Mr. TAFT. In 1932, I believe.

Mr. BYRNES. And has not the city of Cleveland voted on it since then and voted against the increase?

Mr. TAFT. Cleveland has nearly always voted for the additional levy. I cannot speak of what has happened since 1932, because I do not know.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. First of all I agree that, through the efforts of the Senator who has the floor, the legislation before us has been considerably liberalized.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes, it has.

Mr. MEAD. I am very much interested in a character of project which would fit into a category which would make it wholly a Federal project. I recognize the fact that the inhibition contained in the joint resolution prevents 100-percent-sponsored P. W. A. projects. But it does not prevent a Federal project if the project can secure Federal sponsorship. For instance, I am speaking of projects on Indian reservations, national parks and reserves, game refuges, emergency airports and projects that have to do with the Army and the Navy. For the RECORD I will say that I recognize the fact that, while we prevent W. P. A. 100-percent-sponsored projects, there is a possibility of some agencies joining in sponsorships, but I am wondering if there are any funds available, and, also for the RECORD, I should like to know how these projects will be prosecuted.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I can only say that the language in the House measure covering the $50,000,000 for Federal projects is the same as has heretofore been used. I think the Senator from New York is interested in the same question about which the Senator from Florida has been interrogating me.

Whether the House language on page 25, which definitely prohibits the projects referred to, or the language now proposed be adopted, I do not see how any part of that $50,000,000 could be appropriated for the arts projects in which the Senator is interested, unless some agency of the Federal Government had the authority to undertake them and could secure approval of the President. That would have to be done, just as it has always been done. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. MEAD. For the RECORD, again I will ask whether the Senator knows of any authorization which would permit an agency of government other than the W. P. A. to sponsor a Federal project?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not believe any such authorization exists. When I was discussing the question with the Senator from Florida this morning I wondered what the effect of the language would be. Even if the President allotted money to the Department, I do not see how the Department could undertake to sponsor the project unless it was authorized by law to do the particular thing.

Mr. MEAD. Would the Senator favor the insertion in the measure of a sum of money earmarked and authorized under specific language for certain Federal projects, limiting it to a reasonable amount?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that has nothing to do with the amendment I have suggested. I have always opposed the absolute prohibition carried in the House provision. I do not believe that the arts projects could be placed on the same footing with all other projects. That is my position with respect to the matter. I find, as I said a while ago, that some Members of the Senate are in favor of Federal art projects and some are opposed to them. I want the language to be more specific. I think they should be treated as all other projects are treated.

Mr. MEAD. If the Senator will yield further, I will say that section 25 (a) on page 29 states that—

> None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be available after October 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

I have in mind the possible earmarking of a reasonable sum of money that would permit W. P. A. to act as a cosponsor of certain projects, and I have in mind accepting from the Federal arts projects, as a contributing share, the revenues derived from the operations of such projects or receipts taken in at the box office.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, while discussing the provision on page 5, a number of questions were asked me about the theater project. I wish to say to the Senator that the Senate will have to vote on that question. The interest displayed by the Senate makes certain that a vote will be taken. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote its convictions one way or the other. The Senate can vote to strike it out, and then it will proceed just as it is now proceeding, or it can amend by inserting a provision such as the Senator indicates.

I do not like to make a suggestion about a matter in which the Senator from New York is interested, but it seems to me the thing to do is to meet the issue and have a vote on it. I can advise the Senator that I have been told by Members who object to the language proposed by the Senate committee that they want to restore the House language, with the positive prohibition against any art project of any kind, and that a vote will be had on that question. The Senator from New York, the Senator from Florida, and others are in favor of it, and they will doubtless present their views, and we will have a vote on the question in a short time.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I recognize the fact that the proposed legislation which has been sponsored by the Senator is far more liberal than the measure that came to the Senate. But I have in mind the jeopardy that not only the Federal art projects will be in but all Federal projects, such as those affecting Indian reservations, national parks, and game refuges.

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President, they are in a different category. I should not want my statement to be misconstrued. The national-park projects are authorized by law. If it is seen fit to appropriate a certain sum out of the Federal $50,000,000 appropriation, to the Interior Department for national parks or anything else, it is made a Federal project. Such projects, I repeat, are authorized by law. If the Senator could find some department which is authorized by law to operate a theater project, it could do so. I do not know of any. The $50,000,000 is available to the departments.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to have that $50,000,000 which is available to the departments, dealt with by language which would make the provision sufficiently liberal to include Federal projects similar to the Federal Arts Project and others in the category that I mentioned, such as emergency airports, which may be covered by existing law.

Mr. BYRNES. Airports are not affected. They are covered by law. I suggest to the Senator from New York that he ought to meet that issue directly. If he wants to meet it, let him offer an amendment to suggest it directly, because I am afraid he will not get at it in any other way. I do not know of any specific law authorizing the other departments to do this thing.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the suggestion, and I really believe we ought to meet it as the Senator suggests, and that we ought to appreciate the fact that the Senator from South Carolina has already liberalized existing law, but that we have in mind a further liberalization of the law.

Mr. BYRNES. The provision does not go as far as the views of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. We ought to have in mind the acceptance of sponsorship by W. P. A., which is now prohibited by law, and that sponsorship might come as the result of receipts which accrue in the prosecution of a project. I think it would cover such a situation as we might find upon investigation that State law or municipal ordinances would not permit sponsorship of the type of project we have in mind. Therefore, to get around that difficulty it occurs to me that we ought to have in the law some validation of that particular type of project.

Mr. BYRNES. We have to do that or knock out the whole of section 25.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to correct the statement of the Senator that the other cities in Ohio are not in the same situation as Cleveland. Akron, Youngstown, and Toledo are in exactly the same situation as is Cleveland. While Cincinnati, Columbus, and Dayton are better off, they are hardly in a position to assume their share of sponsorship.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have listened with peculiar interest to the colloquy which has been carried on between the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. I believe that what the President and all of us have in mind; that is, permission to the W. P. A. to be cosponsor of projects of greater than local significance, may be preserved by an amendment to the committee amendment on page 5, as amended, adding the following proviso at the end of line 23:

*Provided*, That the limitations of this subsection shall not apply to projects on which the Works Progress Administration is a cosponsor.

Mr. President, that proviso would make it possible for the Works Progress Administration to sponsor projects which have a significance broader than State lines or any particular locality; but at the same time there would be imposed a limitation upon the authority of the W. P. A. by requiring, as section 25 does, that no project could be sponsored solely by the W. P. A. That is to say, the W. P. A. would have to obtain some competent cosponsor for every project it initiated, but the amount of the contribution to be made by the cosponsor would be determined by the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. President, I believe that all of us recognize that certain projects have a national significance, and that they could with propriety be initiated and sponsored by the Works Progress Administration, the national agency. I am perfectly willing to concede, as the joint resolution indicates, that there should be some limitations upon that authority, and that in every case the W. P. A. should be required to enlist the cooperation and the aid of some other competent sponsor.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I ask the Senator if he will not offer his amendment to section 25, which he could just as well do.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President. I do not wish to do that, because that would leave the impression that the only thing to which the amendment would be applicable would be the arts program. There are many projects which are truly national in their scope, or certainly regional in their significance, and which as a practical matter could only be initiated with propriety by the W. P. A. I am perfectly willing to agree to any reasonable limitation in amount, if the Senator would care to suggest such a limitation.

Mr. BYRNES. No, Mr. President; I am not interested in it at all.

Mr. PEPPER. We have the safeguard of the President's approval; we have the safeguard of the Administrator's approval, which is required before such projects can be initiated; and we have our past experience to show that the authority to initiate projects has not been abused. Even more important than that, we have the debate which has occurred on the floor of the Senate, which will certainly be a moral admonition, if not a legal suggestion to the Administrator to be limited in the initiation of projects to those which would meet the common approval of the people of the country. Therefore I offer the amendment which I have suggested to the amendment reported by the committee, as amended.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 5, beginning in line 15, as amended, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment, on page 5, beginning in line 15, as amended, was agreed to, is reconsidered. The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, at the end of line 23, in the committee amendment as amended, it is proposed to add the following proviso:

*Provided*, That the limitation of this subsection shall not apply to projects on which the Works Progress Administration is a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 15.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I express the hope that the amendment to the amendment will be rejected. The matter of the theater project can be met, and should be met, in the consideration of section 25. It can be considered and determined by the action upon that section. Having the Administrator of the Works Progress Administration pass upon cosponsorship of the Works Progress Administration and some local government would present an entirely new proposal, which really has no relevancy to the committee amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator aid me in the matter of language? Can one be a cosponsor for himself? Can he be a partner of himself? Can he be his own father?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, that is the point that is bothering me. The amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is not necessary. In a few minutes we shall reach the section under which this thing can be discussed, and Members can vote their convictions on it one way or the other and settle it in a very short time. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment, as amended, will not be agreed to. I hope the committee amendment will not be confused by the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 15.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment on page 5, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the word "thereafter" to add the words "approved to be", so that the line would read, "projects thereafter approved to be undertaken within any State, Territory", and so forth.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I have no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have the committee amendment, as amended, stated in its entirety?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The committee amendment, as amended, reads as follows:

(d) On and after January 1, 1940, in administering the funds appropriated in this section not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all non-Federal projects thereafter approved to be undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used, shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political

subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be. The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, we are about to vote on the question whether or not we will agree to the committee amendment as amended. Some Senators who have expressed views about this amendment are absent from the Chamber. I therefore 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 | Donahey | King | Reed |
| Andrews | Downey | La Follette | Reynolds |
| Ashurst | Frazier | Lee | Russell |
| Austin | Gerry | Lodge | Schwellenbach |
| Bailey | Gibson | Logan | Shipstead |
| Bankhead | Gillette | Lucas | Slattery |
| Barkley | Green | McCarran | Smathers |
| Bilbo | Guffey | McKellar | Stewart |
| Bone | Gurney | Maloney | Taft |
| Borah | Hale | Mead | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bridges | Harrison | Miller | Tobey |
| Bulow | Hatch | Minton | Townsend |
| Burke | Hayden | Murray | Truman |
| Byrd | Herring | Neely | Tydings |
| Byrnes | Hill | Norris | Wagner |
| Capper | Holman | O'Mahoney | Walsh |
| Clark, Idaho | Holt | Overton | Wheeler |
| Connally | Hughes | Pepper | White |
| Danaher | Johnson, Calif. | Pittman | |
| Davis | Johnson, Colo. | Radcliffe | |

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

The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the benefit of those who have just come into the Chamber, may we have the amendment as amended stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as amended.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 15, it is proposed to insert:

On and after January 1, 1940, in administering the funds appropriated in this section, not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all non-Federal projects thereafter approved to be undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia as the case may be. The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determination, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina if I am correct in interpreting that amendment to mean that if all the projects which are possible under this appropriation should be approved by the 1st day of next January, the 25-percent limitation would not apply?

Mr. BYRNES. It would not apply except as to projects approved after January 1.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that, if the approvals prior to that date represented the entire sum available, this amendment would not apply to any of them.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes; assuming the premises to be true.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand, if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. For that reason I feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHONEY (when the name of Mr. SCHWARTZ was called). I announce that my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained from the Senate by reason of illness.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who is absent on account of illness. I understand he would vote as I intend to vote. So I am at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. LOGAN. I have a special pair with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained in various committee meetings.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I am advised that the Senator from North Dakota is temporarily detained on departmental business.

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I am advised that he would vote as I intend to vote on this amendment. I, therefore, feel at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent. On this vote he is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—51

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Connally | Holman | Radcliffe |
| Ashurst | Donahey | Holt | Reed |
| Austin | Gerry | Johnson, Calif. | Reynolds |
| Bailey | Gibson | King | Russell |
| Bankhead | Gillette | Lee | Smathers |
| Barkley | Green | Lodge | Stewart |
| Borah | Gurney | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bridges | Hale | McKellar | Tobey |
| Bulow | Harrison | Miller | Townsend |
| Burke | Hatch | Norris | Tydings |
| Byrd | Hayden | O'Mahoney | Wheeler |
| Byrnes | Herring | Overton | White |
| Capper | Hill | Pittman | |

NAYS—24

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Frazier | Maloney | Schwellenbach |
| Bone | Guffey | Mead | Slattery |
| Clark, Idaho | Hughes | Minton | Taft |
| Danaher | Johnson, Colo. | Murray | Truman |
| Davis | La Follette | Neely | Wagner |
| Downey | Lucas | Pepper | Walsh |

NOT VOTING—21

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Barbour | Ellender | Nye | Vandenberg |
| Bilbo | George | Schwartz | Van Nuys |
| Brown | Glass | Sheppard | Wiley |
| Caraway | Logan | Shipstead | |
| Chavez | Lundeen | Smith | |
| Clark, Mo. | McNary | Thomas, Utah | |

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. OVERTON 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. 5610) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, 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 6, 11, 12, 13, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40, 42, 51, 56, 72, 73, 85, 86, 97, 98, 99, 100, 107, 114, 115, 119, 128, and 137.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 22, 37, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 52, 53, 79, 82, 83, 84, 91, 92, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 112, 113, 116, 118, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, and 136, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$249,960"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "purchase (including exchange) of passenger-carrying automobiles, $10,000; and for purchase (including exchange) of three passenger-carrying automobiles for the executive office, $5,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$78,860"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$689,803"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$189,160"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,191,930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the language stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "$312,500: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be so apportioned and distributed over the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and shall be so administered, during such fiscal year, as to constitute the total amount that will be utilized during such fiscal year for such purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "$3,824; in all, $9,724"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$490,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,186,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$21,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$37,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$21,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$226,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$154,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$144,530"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$290,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$511,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the language stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"For the acquisition by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of approximately one hundred acres of land in Prince Georges County, Maryland, as a site for the National Training School for Girls, $10,000: *Provided*, That the title to said property shall be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, and in case a satisfactory price cannot be agreed upon for the purchase of said land the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land as may be selected in accordance with the laws of the State of Maryland, and expenses of procuring evidences of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation made for the purchase of said land."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,205"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,705"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$29,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "In expending appropriations contained in this Act under the caption 'Public Assistance', not more than the following monthly amounts shall be paid therefrom: Emergency Relief of Residents: Single persons, not more than $24; family of two persons, not more than $30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age not more than $6; and not to exceed a total of $60 to any one family; Home Care for Dependent Children: Family of two persons, not more than $30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age not more than $6; and not to exceed a total of $60 to any one family; Assistance Against Old Age Want, and Aid for Needy Blind Persons: Not more than $30 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SPONSOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

"For amount required by the District of Columbia as sponsor's contributions toward Work Projects Administration nonconstruction projects for free lunches for necessitous school children, sewing, household service, housekeeping aides, adult education, and recreation, including the purchase of food, supplies, materials, streetcar and bus fares, rent, equipment, rental of equipment, personal services, and other necessary expenses, $177,500, together with not to exceed $12,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1939 contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1938."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 15, 20, 21, 34, 39, 41, 50, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 101, 117, 122, 127, 129, and 133.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
CARTER GLASS,
ELMER THOMAS,
EDWARD R. BURKE,
WILLIAM H. KING,
GERALD P. NYE,
STYLES BRIDGES,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

ROSS A. COLLINS,
GEORGE MAHON,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

Mr. OVERTON. I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Louisiana what disposition was made in the conference report of the provisions dealing with old-age assistance.

Mr. OVERTON. In the case of old-age assistance the Senate increased the appropriation over the bill as it came from the House, and in conference the Senate receded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to describe the two provisions? What was the Senate provision and what was the provision of the House which caused the disagreement?

Mr. OVERTON. There was an increase of the appropriation by the Senate. I do not recall the exact amount. The House refused to yield, and the Senate receded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that the provision insisted upon by the House, and to which the Senate conferees have yielded, is such as to make it impossible for aged persons who receive only $30 per month assistance and have no other income of any kind to derive any benefit from the distribution of foodstuffs by the Surplus Commodities Corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I do not so understand the provision of the conference report. There is a limitation, inserted by the House, of $48 per family; and the agreement reached in conference was that there should be a certain limitation on each one of these appropriations—namely, for old-age assistance, dependent children, and the blind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was that limitation a personal limitation or was it a limitation on the total amount?

Mr. OVERTON. It is a personal limitation, beginning with a certain amount set forth in the report, and increasing it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator state what the amounts are?

Mr. OVERTON. I should have to get the conference report to give the Senator that information.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it is worth while knowing. There are a number of persons on the receiving end of this proposition, and the way it is being administered in the District of Columbia is a national disgrace.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May we have that portion of the conference report read?

Mr. OVERTON. I will give the information to the Senator.

The provision as agreed to in the conference is as follows:

In expending appropriations contained in this act under the caption "Public assistance," not more than the following monthly amounts shall be paid therefrom: Emergency Relief of Residents: Single persons, not more than $24; family of 2 persons, not more than $30; and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age, not more than $6; and not to exceed a total of $60 to any one family; Home Care for Dependent Children: Family of 2 persons, not more than $30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age, not more than $6; and not to exceed a total of $60 to any one family; Assistance Against Old Age Want, and Aid for Needy Blind Persons: Not more than $30 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is it not a fact that the provision of law—perhaps in this conference report, I am not sure; perhaps by some other provision—is to the effect that surplus commodity provisions may not be granted to persons who have the sort of assistance now provided by this report?

Mr. OVERTON. That is not my understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the Senator is of opinion that the conference report does not shut out the beneficiaries of this assistance from the distribution of surplus commodities?

Mr. OVERTON. No; my understanding is that it does not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has the Senator before him the provision of the bill itself, as it passed the Senate, which was altered by this arrangement?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator means as to the limitation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What did the bill as passed by the Senate provide?

Mr. OVERTON. The House had provided a limitation of $48 to any one famiy. The Senate had provided as a ceiling that not to exceed $48 per month in the aggregate should be paid to any one family of five or less persons from appropriations contained in the act under the caption "Public Assistance," and not to exceed $6 per month to each beneficiary in excess of such number. Consequently, the House had a ceiling of $48 on any one family. The Senate amendment provided for a ceiling of $48 on any one family of five persons or less, and not to exceed $6 for each additional person, with a ceiling of $60 in all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is paid to aged persons under the present law?

Mr. OVERTON. Under the present law the average is $26.52 per month.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the maximum? If the average is $26.52, it is probably true that the maximum is more than the $30 which is the maximum limit now provided by the conference report.

Mr. OVERTON. The average is what is usually paid out; but occasionally some of the old persons need a new set of false teeth, and an additional allocation will be made for that purpose, and that brings up the allowance for that particular month or particular time. There are not more than two or three grants in the District of Columbia in excess of $48.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe there would be any opportunity of revising the report in this particular if the bill went back to conference?

Mr. OVERTON. We had quite a long discussion about it, and finally we came to the agreement which is now represented in the conference report. We spent some time in discussing it, and this was the best formula we could evolve after thorough consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe it would be useless to attempt to send the bill back to conference?

Mr. OVERTON. I think so, on this particular item. There are some items on which I hope we can reach an agreement. There are three main items on which we are still in disagreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the conferees are in disagreement on some items, and therefore the bill must go back to conference, why would it not be a good plan also to take this item back to conference?

Mr. OVERTON. Before we finally agreed on the formula to which I have referred, and which I read just a moment ago, we called into consultation some of those in charge of the relief agencies, and also the Commissioners, and it was their view, as I understand, that this formula would work out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, numerous representations have been made to me with respect to this provision of the conference report, and it is alleged that it will work a hardship on needy, aged persons in the District of Columbia. As the Senator from Wisconsin has said, the administration of public assistance in the District is not a credit to the Federal Government.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not wish to be understood as referring to the technical administration. What I meant was that Congress, by fixing these arbitrary ceilings without regard to the size of a family, has produced a situation which, in the Nation's Capital, is a national disgrace.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Senator to mean exactly that, that the responsibility for lack of proper care lies at the door of Congress and not at the door of those who are charged with the technical administration of the provision.

Inasmuch as it will be necessary to take the bill back to conference, I ask the Senator if he will not agree that this provision shall also be taken back to conference. I should like to make a motion to that effect.

Mr. OVERTON. We had better take all the items on relief back, if we take anything, because this formula applies to all the items with respect to public assistance. We fought very strongly to get an increase. In the Senate we inserted an increase in the bill of $600,000 for relief, and the House would not yield. They are not willing to increase the amount over the $900,000 provided, and we are still in disagreement on that provision.

The Senate undertook to increase the appropriation for old-age relief, and the House would not yield. Finally the Senate conferees yielded on the increase.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the point. I feel that the Senator did a good day's work.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me interrupt to say that we have worked for many days.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I mean when this provision with respect to old-age assistance was adopted. I am hopeful, therefore, that inasmuch as the whole item in disagreement must go back, the Senator will agree to take back also the provision I have been discussing, particularly in order that some of us who are very much interested in it may have the opportunity of learning exactly what the facts are.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator will agree to my suggestion, and I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. What would be the proper motion to make in order to eliminate this particular item from the motion of the Senator to agree to a portion of the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the conference report cannot be amended; that the only way to correct it would be to disagree to the entire report, which would send it back to conference again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the whole report be sent back to conference.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I trust the motion will not prevail. We have spent hours and hours and days on the report. There were 137 items in dispute, and we have come to an agreement on the overwhelming majority of them. Only three issues are now in dispute, and I hope the whole report will not be sent back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that a motion to recommit would not be in order because the House has already agreed to the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any motion which may now be made from the floor of the Senate by which the Senate may insist upon the position it has taken heretofore?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote rejecting the report would send it back.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So the question arises merely upon the report. Those who want the report to go back to conference should vote to reject the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amount of the Federal contribution to the District is not involved in the report, is it?

Mr. OVERTON. That is in disagreement.

Mr. MILLER. What is the purpose of the Senator from Louisiana in reference to that? Is he going to ask for a conference?

Mr. OVERTON. I intend to ask for another conference.

Mr. MILLER. Of course submitting the matter to the Senate for a vote as to whether or not we will sustain our former position?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; that is my purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5610, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*June 27, 1939.*

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 21, 34, 50, 57, 58, 117, 129, and 133 to the bill (H. R. 5610) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, and at the end thereof, before the period, insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the foregoing appropriation shall be for payment in full for all services heretofore or hereafter rendered in connection with the study for the revision of the organization of the District of Columbia."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the sum stricken out by said amendment, and following such sum insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the activities provided for under this appropriation shall be operated under the joint control, supervision, and direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert a colon and "*Provided*, That such playgrounds shall be kept open for play purposes in accordance with the schedule heretofore maintained for playgrounds while under the jurisdiction of the playground department."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of said amendment insert a comma and "and a report of expenditures for such repairs and improvements to other municipal buildings shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Budget."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "That no appointment shall be made during the fiscal year 1940 in the grade of private until 16 vacancies exist in such grade, and 15 of such vacancies shall not be filled during such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to cause a survey to be made for the purpose of determining what consolidations of present fire department stations can be effected and as a result thereof what, if any, economies may be made in the cost of operating the fire department, and what additional amount would be needed for new construction, a report of such survey to be made and submitted to Congress on the first day of the next regular session of Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the sum stricken out by said amendment and preceding such sum insert "and including an administrative assistant at $4,000 per annum, to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end thereof insert a comma and "except that a permanent type of platform may be constructed from appropriations contained in this act for street improvements when such work is undertaken in connection with roadway paving, repaving or resurfacing, and plans and locations thereof are approved by the Public Utilities Commission and the Director of Vehicles and Traffic: *Provided further*, That the street railway company shall pay the cost of maintenance, marking, and lighting after construction."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, and 101 to said bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 39, 41, 55, 75, 122, and 127.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 1, 59 to 71, inclusive, and 101, and ask for a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Before the motion is acted upon I wish to say that the amendments in disagreement are, first, the amendment in reference to the Federal payment. The House placed the Federal payment at $5,000,000, the Senate at $7,750,000. The second is the amendment in reference to school-building con-

struction and consolidation. The third amendment is in reference to the public-assistance provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair]. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BURKE, Mr. KING, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3325) to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. REED of Illinois, Mr. LARRABEE, and Mr. ANDRESEN of Minnesota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6577) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland, and Mr. BATES of Massachusetts were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 142 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 141 and 158 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that the House further insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

S. 1302. An act to continue in effect until June 30, 1942, the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935, as amended;

S. 1805. An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens;

H. R. 5427. An act making appropriations for the Labor Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6392. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

WORK-RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, in the matter of the order of procedure, the Senator from Florida has asked that we take up some amendments ahead of those immediately pending. I request that we take up the public-works amendment, which will give time for the Senator to conclude his address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate now recur to the amendment on page 35? The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to strike out and insert.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. 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 | Downey | King | Reynolds |
| Andrews | Ellender | La Follette | Russell |
| Ashurst | Frazier | Lee | Schwellenbach |
| Austin | George | Lodge | Shipstead |
| Bailey | Gerry | Logan | Slattery |
| Bankhead | Gibson | Lucas | Smathers |
| Barkley | Gillette | McCarran | Stewart |
| Bilbo | Glass | McKellar | Taft |
| Bone | Green | Maloney | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | Guffey | Mead | Tobey |
| Bridges | Gurney | Miller | Townsend |
| Bulow | Hale | Minton | Truman |
| Burke | Harrison | Murray | Tydings |
| Byrd | Hatch | Neely | Vandenberg |
| Byrnes | Hayden | Norris | Van Nuys |
| Capper | Herring | Nye | Wagner |
| Clark, Idaho | Hill | O'Mahoney | Walsh |
| Clark, Mo. | Holman | Overton | Wheeler |
| Connally | Holt | Pepper | White |
| Danaher | Hughes | Pittman | Wiley |
| Davis | Johnson, Calif. | Radcliffe | |
| Donahey | Johnson, Colo. | Reed | |

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is a vote about to be taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. An endeavor is being made to develop a quorum of the Senate.

Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I wish to make only a very short statement with reference to the position of the Senate committee. The President of the United States did not submit to the Congress any Budget estimates for an appropriation for P. W. A. With his knowledge of the unemployment situation and of the possibilities of furnishing additional jobs through making appropriation, after taking the whole situation into consideration, he did not ask of the Congress that it appropriate any money for Public Works Administration. The House of Representatives provided that of the total amount asked for W. P. A. there should be diverted to P. W. A. $125,000,000. The President has opposed that diversion. The Senate committee thought he was right and struck from the joint resolution, first, the provision diverting $125,000,000 to P. W. A. This the President has announced publicly would mean giving jobs to 165,000 more people through the agency of W. P. A.

The pending amendment seeks to add to the Budget estimate $400,000,000 to carry on P. W. A. The money that has heretofore been appropriated for P. W. A. is still available. It was said 2 months ago that the peak of employment under P. W. A. would not be reached until October. Certainly for months thereafter there will be employment furnished as a result of the appropriation last year of $900,000,000.

The question is whether or not the Congress shall, without regard to the Budget, add $400,000,000 additional at this time for the purpose of carrying on the program of P. W. A.

The Senate committee was of the opinion that the time had come for the Congress to say what should be done with reference to P. W. A. By the action taken by the committee the Works Progress Administration will have more money, by the action taken by the Senate on the amendment that

I introduced certainly more material will be made available, and when more material is made available by the sponsor, more jobs should be available.

In determining whether or not we should add $400,000,000, I wish the Senate to take into consideration the request of the President submitted within the last 2 weeks. In a letter the President said that he believed the time had come for the Congress and the Government to make loans instead of gifts to the States, counties, and municipalities seeking public improvements. He urged that the Congress authorize the lending of as much as $870,000,000 to the States, counties, and cities for various purposes.

One of the purposes is that a loan made by the Government should be to take care of the projects which have been approved by P. W. A. and which are listed in the document with which Members of the Senate are familiar, including projects amounting in all to one and a half billion dollars. Those projects include all kinds of municipal improvements, such as waterworks, sewerage, incinerators, and every imaginable thing for which municipalities expend money. It is the purpose, if the Congress passes the bill which I understand is to be introduced by the Senator from Kentucky, that the rate of interest should not exceed 2 percent.

The making of a loan at 2 percent or less over a period of years is equivalent to a grant of approximately 12½ to 15 percent. The loans now made by W. P. A. are made on the basis of 4 percent, and the difference in interest over a period of years would mean a grant of from 12 to 15 percent.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amount of the grant in effect by a reduced rate of interest would depend upon the length of time covered by the loan.

Mr. BYRNES. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is entirely possible that in many cases it would figure out between 15 and 20 percent.

Mr. BYRNES. It would depend upon the period of the loan. However, there is this great difference, which appeals to me: The question is whether or not we shall say to the people of the country that from this day on we are engaged in a permanent program, and that we shall give 45 percent of the cost of municipal improvements through a P. W. A. program; or, on the other hand, that by lending the credit of the Government we shall lend money to the State of Kansas, or to the State of South Carolina, and say to the States, "When we lend you the money we will accept your securities for its repayment. You will then not be looking for something from the Christmas tree, but will be pledging yourselves to repay to the Government the amount of money borrowed from the Federal Government."

I think that point is all-important. It is the most significant change effected by the committee. The question is whether hereafter we shall indulge in gifts or whether we shall merely lend money and cause the local governments of the country to realize that they must pay back what they borrow.

If $500,000,000, and no more, were loaned to the States, counties, and municipalities by P. W. A. or by the new lending agency, when the securities of the local governments came into the possession of the Government, the head of the lending agency could do what he has heretofore been doing. He could sell those securities and place the money in the Treasury. Only last week or the week before the securities given by the State of California to cover the cost of the Oakland Bridge were disposed of by Mr. Jones at a net profit to the Government. That is a business transaction. The question is whether we shall follow the course suggested by the President or whether we shall determine that from now on we shall continue a gift program which will make every local government look to the Federal Government for one-half the cost of its local improvements.

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

Mr. BYRNES. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I infer from what the Senator said that the committee, in making its recommendation, believed it was carrying out the intent and purpose and policy of the President in this matter.

Mr. BYRNES. Absolutely.

Mr. WALSH. How does the Senator explain the Secretary of the Interior taking another position, as he was quoted as having done by one of the Senators on the floor of the Senate earlier in the day?

Mr. BYRNES. I am very glad the Senator asked me that question. The Secretary of the Interior took that position before the President submitted his views to the Congress and to the country. The President believes that we should have a lending program instead of a gift program.

Mr. WALSH. Many other Senators besides myself feel that if the relief program is generally too complicated and involved, and too difficult for individual Senators to know all the ramifications, we should follow the President in his requests and suggestions of the needs of the country and give him considerable latitude in determining how and where the money shall be spent. I wish to ask the Senator again if in his opinion the action of his committee meets with the approval and favor of the President?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I say "yes" as emphatically as I can say it.

Mr. WALSH. The only reason I pressed the question was not that I doubted the answer, but that only this morning a Senator quoted the Secretary of the Interior as though the quotation were a recent expression on the part of the Secretary.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Arizona was absolutely justified. My friend from Arizona never makes a statement which is not justified. The Secretary of the Interior made the statement referred to to the committee several days before the Chief Executive took the position he did. In my experience I have never quoted anything the Chief Executive has said about any matter. However, in this matter he saw fit to express his views in writing. His views were expressed solely because of my request, I having the same desire as has the Senator from Massachusetts to know the attitude of the President as to this program for the future, in view of the fact that no estimate had been submitted by the administration to the Congress asking for any money.

The statement has been publicly made that so far as the administration is concerned it is not asking for funds for a P. W. A. program. That fact, of course, is not controlling. The Congress may do whatever it pleases about the matter, without regard to the views of the Chief Executive.

I submit to the Senate that the time has come for us to determine whether or not we shall permanently embark upon the program of giving 45 percent of the cost of projects to municipalities.

I admit that there is always something to the suggestions of the Senator from Arizona. The thing which impressed him and actuated him in his attitude, as I gathered in the committee, is that he believes there should be a tapering off in public expenditures. I agree. However, in this case the President asked for the total amount for W. P. A. We know that regardless of the views of men as to the administration, W. P. A. does furnish more jobs than P. W. A. to men on the scene of the job. It can take quick action in relieving unemployment. According to the President 165,000 more jobs would be provided by the action of the committee.

On the other hand, it is said that while P. W. A. does not furnish as many jobs on the project, because it involves contract work and more machinery is used, it does furnish jobs back in the factories. That may be true, but there is one difficulty. Any program of that character cannot get under way for more than 5 or 6 months. If we wish to relieve a condition which now exists, we can relieve it by an appropriation for W. P. A. In addition, we know that only a comparatively small percentage of the total amount available under the P. W. A. program has been spent, and from this day on the amount of money actually going out of the Treasury on account of P. W. A. work will increase until October, when it will reach its peak. It will then gradually be re-

duced. Under W. P. A. we can furnish a sufficient amount of money to take care of unemployment, in the opinion of those who are immediately charged with responsibility for its administration.

I hope the Senate will not, without any Budget estimate, and without any request from those whose responsibility it is in the executive department—not only without any request but with positive opposition to the proposal—add $400,000,000 over and above the Budget by adopting this amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in the first place I disclaim the statement which was made that my amendment involves a gift program. In reality it is a participation program, in which we ask the Federal Government to put up $400,000,000. We likewise ask the participating governments to match that sum by putting up their share, which would be 45 percent of the cost of each of the projects approved by P. W. A. In other words, Mr. President, we are asking the Federal Government to join in a cooperative effort with all the subdivisions of government in the prosecution of a works program involving $1,000,000,000.

Another matter which I desire to develop, Mr. President, is the fact that the Secretary of the Interior has not changed his views. It is my understanding that he presented his views at the solicitation or invitation of the committee. His views are identical with the recommendations contained in my amendment, which is now before the Senate.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. While the Senator was absent from the Chamber a few minutes ago the Senator from South Caroline [Mr. BYRNES] stated, in reply to a direct question from me, that it was his opinion that the views of the Secretary of the Interior to which reference has been made were views entertained by him prior to the message sent to the Congress by the President. The Senator led me, and, I think, others, to believe that the Secretary of the Interior does not now entertain those views.

Mr. BYRNES. If I did that, I would not want to do so. I have not talked to the Secretary of the Interior, but when the Senator asked what was the explanation, I answered specifically that it was a fact that the Secretary of the Interior testified before the President submitted his proposals to the Secretary of the Interior. I wanted it known that he made that statement.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps I derived an incorrect impression, but what are some of us going to do when we receive from the head of the Nation a recommendation in relation to relief of one character and receive from the head of a department another directly opposite view as to what should be the policy of the Congress? It is confusing.

Mr. BYRNES. If the Senator will permit me, I would say that I have never known the head of a department who was very efficient who was not also very enthusiastic about the particular work entrusted to him. I can understand that situation. But the President of the United States is charged with the duty of considering and appraising the value of all projects, and after considering the views of the Secretary of the Interior, with which certainly he was familiar, he submitted his views as the President to the Congress.

Mr. WALSH. To a degree, a member of the Cabinet is an agent of the Chief Executive, and may have all the enthusiasm in the world for his work and for spending money, but it seems to me it is a primary obligation of loyalty when it comes to spending $400,000,000 that he should follow the judgment of the Chief Executive.

Mr. BYRNES. I am not going to dispute that, but I do not know that the Secretary of the Interior has not now changed his position. I have no information about it. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I may explain to the Senator from Massachusetts, the situation is that the Committee on Appropriations called the Secretary of the Interior before it and asked him what, in his opinion, should be done. I quote his own words:

> I am not speaking for the administration. I think we ought to have $500,000,000, of which $100,000,000 should be for Federal projects.

That statement was made 2 days before the President sent his message to the Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Has he made any statement since that time?

Mr. HAYDEN. The only information I have, while not directly from him, is that he is still of the same opinion.

Mr. WALSH. Of course that statement seems to me to amount to saying, "It is my wish; I can spend this money if you give it to me and it is desirable."

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out one other consideration to the Senator which may influence his opinion in this matter; in either provision, the one the President has recommended or the other, after all it depends upon his discretion as to how many projects shall be adopted or whether any projects shall be adopted. That is an executive matter. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York provides exactly the same discretion. Not a single project ever has been approved under the Public Works Administration unless the President himself has approved it. If he desires, we give him a choice. In this case he can follow either rule, but he is not compelled to follow either one of them.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the Senator agree that the policy the President has proposed to the Congress in his recent message is diametrically opposed to the continuation of P. W. A.?

Mr. HAYDEN. On the contrary, I think that the two are entirely supplementary. I argued to the Senate this morning that I thought there should be a cushion between the two, because we do not know when the new program will get under way. The pending amendment would allow something to be assured in the meantime.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator think that any municipality would abandon the opportunity of obtaining a substantial percentage in the way of a gift for a public building for the sake of a loan bearing, say, 2 percent interest?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from South Carolina explained very clearly that the applications under any plan we may adopt will always be much greater than the amount of money available. There are today on file, I dare say, applications for a billion dollars' worth of work. If we appropriated half a billion dollars, they could do half of it; if we appropriated less than that, they could do less. The Senator from South Carolina pointed out that where they cannot get it from one source that a new avenue will be opened, and that all the preliminary work, such as investigating projects, will have been done, and they will be in shape to go ahead. I think that is an entirely sound conclusion.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator for the explanation, but the Senator from South Carolina has with emphasis undertaken to state that, in his opinion, the recommendation of the committee is the President's wish and desire.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no desire to dispute that.

Mr. WALSH. The problem of relief is so involved, I repeat, and so complicated and so extensive, that I and other Senators cannot give the time to study every detail of it and determine how the money should be spent. In the first place, I place the responsibility in the President of the United States above all others. He has the whole picture before him; he has the various relief agencies working under him, and when he asks for relief purposes a certain sum of money, I propose to vote it to him unless there is some sound reason why I should not do so. I do not propose, however, to provide him more than the amount for which he has asked. So if he does not want this money, if he does not desire the money, and prefers another method, I feel obligated to follow that method.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest, as a matter of history, that twice before the President made no recommendation with respect to public works, and 2 years ago as the bill came over from the other House it contained no provision for public works. The Senate, in considering the problem,

established a public-works program without a Budget estimate, without any recommendation of the President, and without any action by the other House.

Mr. WALSH. That is very interesting. Apparently the President was not very strenuous in his objection. I take the position that there is only one human being who can pursue effective leadership in establishing a policy of economy or who can control in the last analysis the expenditures of the Government. In a municipality it is the mayor; in a State it is the Governor; in the Federal Government it is the President of the United States; and whenever he voices—being able to command to an extensive degree the public opinion of the country, to register his veto—any protest against extravagance or waste or excessive appropriations, he will have the support of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Massachusetts, having been a great mayor, a great Governor—and some day he may be a great President—I can understand his point of view; but there are legislative bodies in cities, there are legislative bodies in States, and we have a legislative body here that is a part of the Government.

Mr. WALSH. The compliment of the Senator is appreciated, and I would be very happy to accept the nomination, if I had any ambitions to hold that most burdensome office, which commands almost superhuman qualities from its occupant.

Let me say to the Senator that I have been in public life for 25 years, and I know that in my State of Massachusetts the one man who can largely control the finances of the State is the Governor of the State. The legislature may protest now and then, but the Governor has the power of veto; he is the voice of the people, especially the taxpayers, at this time of excessive taxes. We may say all we want about extravagance and waste on the part of Congress, and about Congress spending too much money, but, in the last analysis—and I do not say this in criticism, as I hope my Republican friends will note when they undertake their campaign—the responsibility is on the Chief Executive, and, if not almost unanimously, then to a very large degree, the people will follow him, as I am now following him, on matters of relief expenditures.

I wish to say that in this relief measure I cannot determine for myself what limitations should be put upon the expenditure of relief money. The President has his agents, he has his employees, he has officials in the departments who are studying the relief question, who know the figures, who know the situation in my State, and in Arizona, and in South Carolina, and in California. Relief is such a human factor, and it is so important and essential that one official, elected by the people, namely the Chief Executive, has control of it, that I want, so far as possible, to follow him in his recommendations; and I regret to see any conflict between a Cabinet officer and the President on the subject.

I thank the Senator from New York for indulging me to such an extent.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. It is true, as the Senator from Arizona pointed out, that if the Congress adopted an amendment providing $400,000,000 for grants, after all, the allotments would have to be approved by the President, and he could reject them all. But, Mr. President, I do not think the Congress wants to do that, because, as has been said, there are a billion and a half dollars worth of applications, and I believe the Congress would not care to say, "We are going to approve these projects so that we can say at home, 'The President does not want this plan; he is opposed to it, but we will approve it'; and the projects will be submitted to the President and he can disapprove." Daily the President could be disapproving projects if the Congress wanted to take that position. But our responsibility, first, must be to determine whether or not when the Chief Executive, charged with this responsibility, says the time has come to abandon making gifts of 45 percent for projects, the Congress shall say, "We are going to adopt legislation to force you to make grants; we are going to put it up to you, and, holding the views that you announce in advance, you will have to disapprove each individual project." I do not think the Congress would want to do that.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, of course, I appreciate the very favorable attitude that has been shown in suppport of the responsibilities, the leadership, and the recommendations of the President. To a very large degree I agree with the philosophy which has just been enunciated on the Senate floor.

Of course, talking about financial leadership and responsibility being placed in the Chief Executive is one thing, and the prerogatives of the legislative body, as indicated in the attitude of the Senate during the last few days with regard to the financial recommendations of the President, is another matter.

The attitude of the Senate with regard to farm parity appropriations is an indication of the assumption of responsibility to a great degree by the legislator. It is true that we look to the President and to the agencies of government under the executive department for guidance in matters of this character; but I do not believe there is a conflict of any major degree between the President of the United States, the suggestions made to the committee by the Secretary of the Interior, and the recommendations contained in the amendment now before the Senate.

The President of the United States, in a letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], proposed a new plan whereby the Government intends eventually to take up the slack and make its contribution to the reemployment of our unemployed. Neither the President nor anyone else intimated that that program could be made effective on July 1. Everybody recognizes the fact that the peak of P. W. A.'s activity will be reached this month, and that it will rapidly and progressively be reduced until July of next year, when there will be only $9,000,000 left, and 500,000 tradesmen and mechanics and workers will be laid off. Everybody recognizes the fact that to conform with the recommendations contained in the letter directed by the President to the Senator from South Carolina it will be necessary for these projects to be, to a degree, self-liquidating. Everybody recognizes the fact that no doubt the Secretary of the Interior had that fact in mind, and had in mind the category of projects that would fit in that scheme; and he also had in mind, when he appeared before the committee, the fact that there are 5,000 projects pending now, at this minute, before the Public Works Administration, many of which could not under any circumstances or by any stretch of the imagination come within the purview of the new agency when it is set up. Not only are 5,000 projects pending, but projects to the extent of $1,600,000,000 are already perfected and awaiting action by the Public Works Administration. The Secretary of the Interior, recognizing the fact that this great reservoir of projects could not be considered under the restrictions and limitations of the new program outlined by the President to the Senator from South Carolina, in order that we might continue this program and select projects that could not conform, in his statement to the committee said that at least $400,000,000 could be allocated at this time for projects in which the Government has a right to participate under the terms of the present P. W. A. program.

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

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New York whether or not the situation in his State is in any way similar to the situation in my State. Last fall, after the appropriation of last year was made, representatives from the Public Works Administration visited various communities in the State, met with committees in those communities, outlined to them the program of the Public Works Administration, and discussed with them possible projects which might be presented by the communities. They actually induced the communities to expend money in the form of engineering expense, architectural expense, or, in many instances, in the form of calling special

elections in order to make it possible to issue bonds for the other 55 percent. A very large percentage of those approved projects, which were really instigated by the Public Works Administration, on which considerable sums of money were spent by the communities, are now standing, and the communities simply have spent the money, and so far as the communities are concerned that money is wasted.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am very glad my distinguished colleague from Washington has developed that point, because, to my knowledge, a great number of the projects contained in this vast list rest in the category he has just described. There are a great many projects which are not only urgent and needed and pressing, but projects which we are to a degree morally, if not legally, bound to consider. There are projects all over the United States in which bond elections have already been held, engineering expenses and costs have already been paid, and in a number of cases contracts contingent upon further action by the Federal Government have already been let. These projects, I believe, come within the category outlined by my distinguished colleague. No doubt the Secretary of the Interior had in mind that minimum program when he appeared before the committee only a few days ago and told them that we were at least in a position to make progress on 25 percent of the vast reservoir of projects, and to leave the other 75 percent for the development of the new agency outlined by the President.

Mr. President, I do not believe it is proper or fitting, or economically justifiable, for the Senate abruptly to end this program at this time. I recognize the fact that it will take time and legislative effort on our part to perfect the new program outlined by the President of the United States. I believe in that program. In my judgment, it is economically sound, and there are many good reasons why it ought to be expedited. I can see, however, how wise and prudent it will be for the Senate of the United States, recognizing the fact that we have this large volume of projects, and appreciating the fact that municipalities have already gone so far as to let contracts and to adjust their budgets, to agree with the suggestion advanced by the Secretary that it is a minimum program that will allow for a continuation of this vast and most successful venture of the Government to the perfection of a privately constructed works program, and that it will avoid, prevent, and obviate the set-back and the peril that will result if the Senate shall immediately discard this program. It is the continuity of the program that this amendment will permit, so that we shall advance from the present status to the new status outlined by the President in proposing his new agency.

Therefore, recognizing the fact that every city in the United States, that every county in America almost without exception, that surely every State in the Union has projects in this advanced and preferential category, in view of the fact that it is only a small effort in comparison with the large number of projects available, and in view also of the fact that it will permit a logical, reasonable transition from the system now in vogue to that outlined by the President, it occurs to me that the Senate would be legislating in a proper and sensible manner, recognizing the condition the country is in and the need for these projects, and the fact that it is not a gift program but is a participation program, if it should adopt the amendment which is at the desk.

Mr. President, what is the situation?

The House, as we all know, earmarked for P. W. A. projects a sum of W. P. A. money amounting to $125,000,000. The Secretary of the Interior very properly explained to the Senate committee that this money ought to be turned back to the W. P. A., and the President of the United States indicated that the Senate ought to take action of that character; and, very wisely, the Senate committee returned the amount of money earmarked by the House for the prosecution of the W. P. A. program.

My amendment will not take any of the moneys allocated to the W. P. A. It leaves the W. P. A. the amount of money allocated to it by the Senate committee, requested for it by the President. It merely sets up a minimum W. P. A. program authorizing the expenditure of $400,000,000 for public-sponsored projects and $100,000,000 for wholly Federal projects. It permits of the continuity of the Public Works program until it can fittingly be absorbed in the new program that was recommended by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, it is not only an aid to the municipalities but it will not increase the taxes of the country in the aggregate. Where it levies a burden upon the Federal Government, it relieves a local government of the full amount of that burden.

It creates work opportunities for labor, gives to contractors and professional men an opportunity to participate in the fruits of the program, and enriches the country by the building of permanent, enduring, wealth-producing projects. It will allow the local taxpayers to enjoy a reduction in taxes by reason of the participation of the Federal Government with the local government in this particular program.

At this point I desire to present the following letter favoring my amendment from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1939.*

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express the approval of the American Federation of Labor of the amendments which you offered to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

In my opinion, the adoption of the amendments you proposed is urgently necessary in order to meet the economic and social needs of the Nation. The Public Works Administration has rendered excellent service and has provided employment for thousands of building-trades workers and others. Its services should be continued. Such an amount of money as you have provided for in your amendments ought to be made available for the use of the Public Works Administration.

I appeal to the Members of Congress, through you, to give a full measure of support to House Joint Resolution 326, which you have offered.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
*President, American Federation of Labor.*

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MINTON in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Senator's amendment make provision for funds to be used to give employment to those on the relief rolls?

Mr. MEAD. Obviously the effect of the operation of my amendment would be to reduce the relief rolls.

Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that elections have been held—bond elections—in support of these programs. Engineering costs have already been appropriated and expended, contracts have been let, and many of these projects are in a classification which would prevent them from participating in the new program which will be launched eventually, and which, when it is launched, will give ample reason to the Senate for a further curtailment, if not for the elimination entirely, of the P. W. A. program.

The P. W. A. program is 6 years old, and for the fifth continuous year building construction, according to Dodge reports, are on the upgrade. This particular industry, shocked as the result of the destructive influences of the depression, is on the way back. That is another reason why this is not the time to suspend this program and to await the coming and development of a program which is not ready at this moment.

Mr. President, the program represented in the amendment which I have at the desk, covering only 25 percent of the entire P. W. A. program, will permit of the orderly development of the new program. It will prevent a drastic let-down in the construction industry; it will continue the upturn, the favorable condition which exists now as a result of P. W. A. in the durable-goods industry.

For these reasons I hope this amendment, which will permit of the development of projects which make contributions to the health, the education, and the safety of our country, will be agreed to and the Administration permitted to carry on until such time as it will no longer be necessary for us to make appropriations in this manner.

Mr. President, it would be inappropriate for the Senate of the United States to turn its back now on the communities of the United States that, with the advice and consent of Federal agencies, perfected and developed and submitted for the approval of the Federal Government this vast program, which now depends upon the action taken by the Senate in connection with the amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior have under no circumstances which recommend themselves to me taken issue one with the other. The Secretary of the Interior, recognizing the fact that he was called upon by a Senate committee for information based upon his experience and his knowledge of conditions, recommended this amendment as the minimum effort to be taken by the Senate at this time.

The President of the United States outlined in a communication to the Senator from South Carolina the plan of action which will be taken, perfected, and refined by the Senate of the United States at a later date, which, when in operation, will permit of the drastic reduction of appropriations of this character.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the reduction of the appropriation recommended for the Works Progress Administration. I congratulate the Senate committee, that very wisely restored the $125,000,000 taken from the W. P. A. by the action of the other body.

I feel that all that is necessary now to make the joint resolution all inclusive, to give opportunity to every agency of the Federal Government which has joined with us in this struggle against unemployment, and opportunity to continue this work, is approval of the amendment I have at the desk.

Subsequent efforts on the part of the Senate and on the part of the Congress in the approval of legislation outlined by the President of the United States may, and I hope will, enable us at some future date to reduce drastically the appropriations contained in the pending joint resolution for all the existing agencies of government; but until that time has come, and in recognition of the comfortable progress we are making, and in consideration of those who are being fully employed on this program, and for the further reason that there are still millions of our people who are looking for work, let us not stop this program in its tracks; let us continue it in this modest, moderate manner, so that we will not deny to the municipalities, to the communities, to the counties, and to the States, which are looking to us for positive action today, that justice which their cooperation in the past in the perfection of these projects, it seems to me is their just due. Let us not make the mistake of throwing out of work some 500,000 tradesmen and artisans now gainfully employed in the prosecution of this program. Let us not bring about hardship to the contractors, the materialmen, the technicians, and the professional men who have found opportunity for employment as the result of this venture of the Government into this most successful private construction program.

Mr. President, I say that in consideration of all the facts and all the circumstances this amendment should receive Senate approval at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimously consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an article by myself entitled "The P. W. A. in New York State."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

THE P. W. A. IN NEW YORK STATE

(By Senator JAMES M. MEAD, of New York)

There are now pending before the Public Works Administration applications from municipalities in the State of New York for 429 projects with an estimated total cost of slightly more than $257,000,000. Cities and towns in almost every county in the State have drawn up plans for permanent and useful public works, and are only awaiting P. W. A. assistance before undertaking this necessary construction.

I am not saying that every single one of these projects is imminently essential to the welfare of the people of my State. There are a few that could possibly be undertaken with funds other than those of P. W. A.; there are a few others that could possibly wait over a year or 2 years; but, after eliminating all these, about 85 percent of all the pending applications are in need of immediate aid if these worth-while works are to be undertaken at all and if thousands of families whose heads work in the construction trades are to remain off the relief rolls.

On the basis of a $125,000,000 appropriation the State of New York could hope to undertake the construction of no more than 5 percent of the projects for which it has applications pending. While this amount would be very helpful, by no means could it be considered sufficient to take care of even a decent proportion of the great need. To take up any reasonable amount of the slack in employment that will be created when the public works now under construction begin to taper off, the Congress must provide a minimum of $400,000,000 to take care of the most worth while of the non-Federal applications pending. Unless such a provision is made there will be under construction on July 1 of next year only $9,000,000 worth of public-works projects. About one-half million men now engaged in the construction of public works financed by P. W. A. will have to look elsewhere for their sustenance. We can provide for them through normal employment on P. W. A. projects or add them to the relief rolls—that is our choice.

P. W. A. projects have the endorsement of communities in almost every county in the United States. In the last P. W. A. program more than 6,000 projects were submitted to voters who were asked to pass on bond issues. About 82 percent of these propositions were approved.

Let me point out the nature of these works for which communities in my State of New York have applied to P. W. A. Applications for school projects lead the list. There are 129 of them. New York State has made great strides in the last several years in modernizing its school curriculum and in bringing its educational facilities up to date. Centralization of school districts and consolidation of schools has been undertaken on a vast scale, not only because such methods bring the children better and fuller opportunities for broader education but also because the method is economical. This is especially true in the rural districts of up-State New York. And this economical and worth-while advance in the educational system of my State has been made largely in the last few years as a result of P. W. A. aid.

Take the case of the school at Corfu, in Genesee County, just to select one out of the great number of P. W. A. school projects. The old school up there had been in use since about 1880. It was dilapidated, obsolete, and terribly overcrowded. It was staggering under a load of 180 pupils. Many more would have gone to school but there was no room. Many more would have gone to school but there were no laboratories, agricultural shops, or other facilities for vocational training and for modern studies. Finally, the school district made application for a P. W. A. allotment for a school to accommodate 300 pupils to take care of future needs. Here was a worth-while—a socially desirable and useful project of permanent value. P. W. A. made the allotment. The school was completed in December 1936. I have been informed that the very next school term the school was filled to capacity. A lot of children who had been on the streets were attracted by the school and enrolled. School districts in neighboring communities shut down their own schools and permitted the children to go to the new school at Corfu. The enrollment jumped to 400. Centralization of the school districts in the area was carried out, and the new consolidated school district applied to P. W. A. for aid in enlarging the Corfu school, and in addition asked for a new school. The new school is now under construction, and the Corfu school is being remodeled—two wings are being added—to bring the total capacity up to 600.

Other school districts would like to do the same. Overcrowding of schools simply compels the construction of new schools and additions and improvements to many of those that are already serving to capacity.

About 75 of New York's pending applications before P. W. A. are for waterworks projects. To protect the health of their citizens, to serve and attract industrial establishments, and to provide a necessary service for the public, communities in every section of my State need to build storage tanks, filtration plants, or extend their water mains. An adequate supply of good water is obviously so essential to life and welfare that there is no need for me to point out the necessity for such projects. Delay in some instances may actually be dangerous. In other cases it may merely serve to retard local economic prosperity.

Take the case of Webster, N. Y. Webster, in Monroe County, is in the midst of a highly developed agricultural and industrial area. The canning industry is one of the backbones of business life in the farming centers. But a lack of water hampered Webster for years. The town outgrew the well-and-bucket system back in 1910, when some springs were found and developed. But the population outgrew the supply, and the situation often became critical, especially in the summers when the springs dried up. For 10 years water had to be brought in by truck from nearby towns, and in some summers trucking the water cost as high as $15,000.

Webster had about given up hope, when an application was sent to P. W. A. for assistance, and was acted upon favorably.

The project was undertaken and the new waterworks system was completed in 1937. Shortly thereafter a nationally known packing plant took option on property and began the construction of a packing plant. That meant more pay rolls for the people of Webster. In addition, other plants have become interested, and neighboring towns have connected mains with Webster's water supply, bringing in additional revenue to the town's treasury.

P. W. A. has already assisted communities in New York in the construction of 92 waterworks projects. Many communities unable to partake in the earlier programs are now asking for an opportunity to cooperate with the Federal Government in bringing an adequate supply of good water to their citizens. No one will deny the value or necessity of such projects, all of which give a high degree of employment and nearly all of which cannot be undertaken without Federal aid.

No less important are the sewerage projects, for which many cities in my State are applying. I notice on the list of pending applications one for North Tonawanda. This seems to be one of the many vital projects that can be undertaken. The application is for a sewage-disposal plant. Cities on both sides of this town have already built such plants in an endeavor to abate stream pollution in the Niagara River. The value of millions of dollars' worth of work already undertaken is jeopardized if this one town which is polluting a stream is permitted to continue dumping its sewage untreated in the river. Funds which aid this town would help a whole area.

I could go on and point out community after community which is making an ardent and sincere effort to take care of its sewage problems in accordance with the recommendations of the State department of health, but which is hampered in its efforts by a lack of funds. P. W. A. assistance is vital to protect the health and welfare of the people.

There are also applications pending for hospitals, homes for the aged, fire departments, jails, libraries, and various other public structures which are important to the people of my State, and which during construction will provide millions of man-hours of work not only at the sites of construction alone but also in factories and mills which make the materials, and on truck lines and railroads which transport the supplies.

Most of the projects which have been applied for are to be built in up-State New York, in cities and towns that are anxious to provide decent employment at decent wages for their citizens. A number of the projects are in New York City. Out of the 10 projects for which the city itself has applied, 8 are school projects, while of the remaining 2, one is for a tunnel and the other for a major highway improvement. Overcrowding in the secondary schools of New York City has created a tremendous problem for the board of education. Only through the construction of adequate school facilities can the city meet its obligations to the young people—the future citizens.

In Bronx County five projects are on the pending list, four of which are for public works in New York City. In Kings County five projects are on the pending list, all of which are in New York City and Brooklyn. In Queens County four projects, of which three are in New York City. In Richmond County four are pending, all of which are in New York City. In New York County 12 projects are pending, all of which are in New York City.

All in all, the need for public-works assistance is so great that an appropriation of less than $400,000,000 for non-Federal projects throughout the Nation would leave many of those now employed on P. W. A. projects jobless, and leave undone the many vital improvements which cities, towns, and counties everywhere need.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret to find myself in disagreement on this proposal with my good friend the Senator from New York.

Heretofore those of us who have been interested in relief and in work programs have labored under the necessity of fighting to get Congress to appropriate as much money as the President asked. Now, by a strange set of circumstances, we are compelled to fight to keep Congress from giving the President more than he asks, for that is what is really involved.

I say without hesitation that the President of the United States is in possession of as much information concerning the details of unemployment and relief, and the need for relief, as is any other man in the United States, and in that statement I am not even willing to except those who are actually in charge of relief work. The President has an amazing amount of detailed information, not only as to the general situation throughout the country, but as to the situation in any State or in any county that is of any consequence where there is unemployment.

I do not believe anyone can gainsay the statement that no man in this country in the last 6 years has displayed a greater interest in the question of unemployment and relief than has the President of the United States, and when he comes forward with a recommendation as to what he wants in the way of money, and what he intends to do with it, and how he thinks it ought to be expended, I think the burden of proof is on those who dispute his figures and his philosophy, to prove that he is wrong about them, and that he does not know what he is talking about.

The President has not asked for the appropriation now proposed. Not only has he not asked for it but he has said that he does not want it.

I grant that in the letter to the Senator from South Carolina he was talking primarily and specifically about the allocation of $125,000,000 in the measure as it passed the House for P. W. A., to be taken out of the appropriation for W. P. A. But the President did not satisfy himself with simply saying that he was opposed to that transfer. He went on in detail to outline an entirely new program, not only comprehending non-Federal building projects but comprehending an extension of activities by the Federal Government in many other lines looking toward the resumption of employment among the unemployed of the United States.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask this question for information. I have heard it said that the grant of 45 percent, which is given under the P. W. A. program, is in substance the lending of money to those who initiate the projects without interest for the ordinary loan period. Is that about correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would not say it was. I think the 45 percent is an outright grant.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I mean is the 45 percent, with interest on the 55 percent which is made in the form of a loan, about the same as the Government lending the whole amount to the applicant without any interest whatever?

Mr. BARKLEY. It probably might figure out that way approximately. But as a matter of fact the lending of the entire amount necessary to construct a building, at a rate of interest not to exceed 2 percent, depending somewhat on the length of the loan and the amount of interest that would accrue during that length of time, would equal approximately a 15- to 20-percent grant.

Mr. PEPPER. That is, on the basis of a 2-percent interest rate?

Mr. BARKLEY. On the basis of a 2-percent interest rate on the entire amount.

Mr. PEPPER. With a 5-percent interest rate, say, or 4-percent interest rate, it would be equivalent to a grant of about 45 percent?

Mr. BARKLEY. Very likely that approximates the comparison as nearly as it can be made.

Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior has been mentioned, and his testimony before the Senate committee has been referred to. I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Secretary of the Interior. I have confidence in his integrity and his ability. I think he has done a fine job in the administration of the P. W. A. There has never been a suspicion of any sort with which I am familiar that in any way connects the administration of the P. W. A. with any impropriety or with any politics or anything else except sound business administration of the Public Works Administration. I think that is the universal opinion not only in the Senate but outside the Senate Chamber.

The Secretary of the Interior will not be in charge of this work after next Friday. He goes out of business as the Administrator of P. W. A. The President, by his reorganization plan No. I, has concentrated all public work agencies under a new authority, and he has appointed Mr. John M. Carmody, who has likewise done a fine job as the head of the Rural Electrification Administration, as the Commissioner or Administrator for the consolidated building programs and agencies which are combined by the President.

I do not know what the new Administrator's attitude would be toward $500,000,000 for P. W. A. I think I know, but I am not authorized to quote him. Neither am I authorized to say what the Secretary of the Interior, who testified before the President recommended his new program, would have said had he testified subsequent to it, or what modifications he would have made in his recommendations

had he testified subsequent to it, or whether he would have made any modifications at all. It may be that he still entertains the view that he entertained on the day he testified.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think I am safe in saying to the Senate that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has not changed his opinion. I can also state to the Senate that Mr. Carmody believes it would be a tragedy for the new administration, of which he becomes the head, to be killed on the 30th day of June.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one wants the new administration of which he is to be the head killed on the 30th day of June. But, inasmuch as the Senator from Arizona has taken the liberty to say how Mr. Carmody feels about it, I will say that I heard Mr. Carmody say that he believed that more money than is provided for even in the amendment of the Senator from New York could be loaned upon self-liquidating projects without any grant whatever. I think he was absolutely sincere about it. He referred to what has happened in the case of self-liquidating projects without any grants whatever. He referred to what had happened in the Rural Electrification Administration, where communities in the rural sections of our country, without a dollar's worth of grants, have borrowed for a long period of time 100 percent of the amount required to install the plants, and are paying rates of interest even higher than the 2 percent required in the present program.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think Mr. Carmody looked at it as I do. Both plans are excellent. It is merely a question of when the new program can be placed in operation. There is no essential conflict between the two.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Arizona says. We always appreciate in every thing and in all ways the sincerity of the Senator from Arizona. I do not believe there is a Member of this body who enjoys more deeply the confidence, as well as the affection, of his colleagues than does the Senator from Arizona. I know I have entertained that feeling, as he has known, for a quarter of a century, and there is no one upon whose judgment I would rely more firmly than on his in nearly everything, and under equal circumstances even in this matter. But I think we are confronted with a different situation than that which we have been confronted with heretofore.

The President in his letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], which I have before me, does not satisfy himself simply with opposing the transfer of $125,000,000 from the W. P. A. to P. W. A., with which Secretary Ickes agreed, and with which the committee agreed, and with which I agreed. If we are to give the P. W. A. $125,000,000, or any other amount, it ought not to be taken out of W. P. A. funds, because, as the President said, it involves the employment of 165,000 American citizens who are on relief or who are certified for relief.

The P. W. A. does not employ relief labor. Senators may say whatever they please about it, but the testimony of all the State directors is that, so far as relief labor is concerned, so far as the 750,000 or 850,000 unemployed men who are now on the list and already certified, an appropriation of $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 for P. W. A. would not employ them all, or any considerable number of them. It has been shown that even when we undertake to require contractors to employ relief labor, they employ some of it for awhile, and then find some excuse for discharging the relief labor and going back to their regular employees whom they employed in their community.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Is it not true, though, that to the extent that the Public Works Administration provides employment there is a reduction in the reservoir of the unemployed who are on the rolls of the Works Progress Administration, thus relieving the load the Works Progress Administration has to carry?

Mr. BARKLEY. It may relieve the situation slightly, but nothing like the extent to which it should be done. I think it is true, by and large throughout the country, that the mere fact that a man goes to a certifying agent and becomes certified as being in need raises the presumption that he is more in need of work than someone who does not go to a certifying agent to be certified for employment. It may be, and I think it is, a matter of pride in some instances. Many men do not like to appear before a certifying agent and admit their need. That is probably more true of skilled workers than of unskilled laborers. It may be that they remain off the lists as long as possible. However, in spite of that fact I think that when there are 100 men in a community, and we may assume all of them to be out of work, if 50 of them go to the certifying agent and present their need for employment and 50 do not, we have the right to assume that the 50 who go are in greater need than the 50 who remain away. So far as unemployment is concerned, I am not so certain that if we were to increase the appropriation it would not be wiser to add $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 to the W. P. A. than to put four or five hundred million dollars at the disposal of the P. W. A. If the $125,000,000 which was transferred in the House provision from the W. P. A. to the P. W. A. involves the employment of 165,000 men who are on the unemployment lists and rolls, then $500,000,000 would employ approximately four times that many, or nearly 700,000 men; and the employment of 700,000 more men who are on the unemployment rolls and have already been certified would almost entirely absorb the 750,000 or 800,000 who are on the waiting list.

So far as the employment of men who are in dire need is concerned, and whose need is presumed to be greater than that of those who have not been certified, giving $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 to the W. P. A. rather than to the P. W. A. would result in greater employment among the needy unemployed. I would not vote for such a proposal, because I think the President, in surveying the situation and taking into account the probabilities of needs during the next fiscal year, has asked for all the money he thinks is necessary. I certainly do not wish to assume that I am wiser than the President by forcing upon him money he does not want and does not think he needs.

It is said that the program outlined by the President is tentative and speculative and may not be adopted. That depends upon Congress. The program involved in the President's recommendation in his letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is a long-term program. There are some items in it which may arouse controversy. Already some controversy has been aroused over the proposal to make loans involving the export of our products to foreign countries, conveniently referred to as loans to foreign governments, which is not at all accurate. There may be some controversy as to the practicability of the toll-road and bridge program suggested by the President; but I dare say nobody will seriously oppose the 2-year program of construction of non-Federal buildings and projects with the $350,000,000 which the President proposes to spend over a 2-year period for the very type of projects involved in the amendment of the Senator from New York.

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

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator inform us when a bill embodying the suggested plan will probably be introduced in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I can assure the Senator that it will be introduced this week. The Senator will recognize the fact that the President made the suggestion only last Wednesday or Thursday. On Friday there was a conference on the matter among various Government officials, including Members of the Senate and House. The bill is now being drafted. If it had not been for the almost continuous obligation to be on the floor of the Senate during the past few days during the consideration of the stabilization bill and of the pending bill, that bill would already have been introduced in the Senate and House.

If I may amplify my reply to the Senator from California, I will say that if it had not been for the exigencies which required us to be in almost continuous session during the whole day and into the night since last Friday, that bill would already have been introduced. I hope it will be introduced not later than Friday. I hope it will be introduced tomorrow. Every effort is being made to get it into shape and to make it as simple as possible, with as few complications as possible, so that it will not involve long delay and discussion.

However, regardless of what anybody may think of any of the rest of the program, that is, the $100,000,000 for farm tenancy, the $100,000,000 for rural electrification, and all the other items in the President's recommendation, I have heard no opposition whatever to the proposal to use $350,000,000 over a period of 2 years for self-liquidating loans to municipalities, counties, and States to carry on the very program outlined in this amendment, at a low rate of interest, so attractive as to induce States, counties, and municipalities to borrow the money and pay it back to the Government of the United States.

In this connection, in all fairness I think we must take into consideration the problem of how long we shall continue to make 45 percent grants or any other grants as gifts to communities, rather than making the proposal sufficiently attractive to induce them to borrow money from the Government, which they can borrow from no other source, placing upon them the obligation of repaying that money to the Treasury and relieving them of the theory that all they have to do is to run to Washington and obtain a gift; that if they can afford to put up, either in bonds or cash, 55 percent, they can obtain from Uncle Sam a gift of the other 45 percent.

We have had to follow such a program. I think our country has made a valuable invesment in all the communities where P. W. A. projects have been carried out; but I think the time has come when we must seriously consider putting the facilities of the United States at their disposal in the matter of credit, but not in the matter of grants and gifts. I believe that every dollar we put at the disposal of the President to carry out the program of long-term loans at a low rate of interest will be taken by the municipalities, counties, and even States. As I stated a while ago, the low rate of interest over a period of years amounts to a gift of 15 or 20 percent. However, the loan would carry with it the obligation to repay the money. The plan does not involve any deficit. It does not involve any appropriation. It involves the use of revolving funds and the credit of the Government to take over local obligations under a form of guarantee which will make it unnecessary for Congress to appropriate any money in order to carry out almost the identical program involved in the amendment.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the Senator's opinion that many of the P. W. A. projects now pending, some of which would be approved and the money for which would be allocated if this appropriation were to be made, would be built anyway under the lending program rather than the 45-55 percent program?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am absolutely certain of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the Senator has no figures; but, in his opinion, what percentage of the projects now pending would be built under the lending program rather than the old P. W. A. program?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that depends on the amount. It may also depend upon the extent to which any city or county can go in issuing bonds if it has already reached its limitation. That restriction would apply even under this amendment, because it would apply to the part which the local government would have to raise locally as well as to the grant. For example, if the 2-year program of the President were carried out, calling for $350,000,000 for this purpose, of course, it would not be sufficient to do $1,000,000,000 worth of work unless the localities, in addition to the amount they borrowed from the Government, put up additional funds, which they could do, and in many cases would do.

Mr. TYDINGS. The reason why I asked the Senator that question is that it has been said—I do not know whether or not the statement is accurate—that there are about one and a half billion dollars' worth of projects pending. Certainly if $300,000,000 were made available, it strikes me that at least 20 percent of the projects would be built anyway, which would consume the $300,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. It seems to me that is a pretty fair deduction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly the Senator is correct about that. If the local communities, in addition to borrowing the amount available for the project, desired to add to it by local taxation or by the expenditure of money from current funds, or in any other way, the total amount available would be enlarged, and might even approximate the $1,000,000,000 which has been mentioned as the probable amount of approved projects for which there has been no money.

Mr. TYDINGS. In any event, 20 percent of the pending projects, it seems to me, would be financed by municipalities and the units forming them, out of the total loans provision, because a great many of them represent pressing needs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt, what would happen to the other 80 percent?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, they would not be constructed.

Mr. TYDINGS. In time they might come in and be constructed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; they might come in, anyway. But if there were a billion dollars for a new program, and they could borrow $350,000,000, that would be 35 percent to start with; and if they could raise additional funds, the percentage might go from 35 percent to 75 percent. Under the amendment as offered, they could only construct, probably, through grants and loans, 50 percent of the projects that are said to have been approved.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield further to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was going to say we cannot furnish money to build every project, anyway.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that $400,000,000 under one proposition and $300,000,000 under the other would more or less level off with the expansion that would come, anyway.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only that, but with reference to the billion dollars, or whatever the amount may be, of projects that have been approved and await action, there will always be a time when there will be a billion dollars or so of such projects, because so long as the door is held open for loans and grants, there is a sort of psychology that takes possession of a community that "while the Government of the United States is granting 45 percent, we will hurry and get ours, get in on the list and have our project approved, and if Congress should thereafter appropriate more money we stand a chance to get our share." So long as we keep P. W. A. open to such applications ready for the time when a billion dollars may be available, approved projects awaiting action on the part of Congress or the Administrator will continue to pile up.

There was a time when the Secretary of the Interior, head of the administration of the P. W. A., told me that he had on his desk $2,000,000,000 worth of projects that had been approved and had come up to him through all the grades—financial, economic, and engineering—and had been sufficiently investigated. He had on his desk $2,000,000,000 worth of projects which could have been undertaken if he had had the money with which to carry them out. Of course, it is not to be assumed that he would have approved all those projects involving $2,000,000,000.

In his letter to the Senator from South Carolina the President goes on to say not only that he does not want $125,000,000, but he thinks there is a better way to deal with the entire non-Federal work program than doing it through the P. W. A. He gives his reasons for his position. I am not

going to read them. The letter is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I presume it has been read by every Member of the Senate.

It seems to me the part of wisdom and of good business to adopt the suggestion of the President with respect to this new program. There will not be any hiatus to speak of between July 1 and the adoption of the new program, unless the Congress is to blame for it. If there should be any delay in the enactment of that legislation, it will be the fault of the Congress. The President has submitted it to us; it is now under consideration; it is being drafted, and will be introduced in a day or two and referred to the appropriate committee. If there shall be any delay after that, it will be the fault of the Congress. I do not believe there will be any appreciable delay. I expect that by the time the program under the amendment of the Senator from New York could get under way, the proposed legislation will be enacted, and it will certainly, in my judgment, set a new and sound program and one the President recommends as a permanent program. Of course, his suggestions carry over a period of 7 years, but this particular work program is only a 2-year program involving $350,000,000. I think we can trust the President in this matter; I think we can trust his wisdom, trust his good faith, and trust his interest in the unemployed men and women in this country. It certainly is entitled to a trial. I, therefore, hope the amendment of the Senator from New York will not be adopted, but that the amendment of the Senate committee eliminating the transfer of the $125,000,000 from W. P. A. to P. W. A. will be agreed to.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, one time there was a visiting preacher who preached in a church of which he was not a member, as he did not live in the community where the church was located. He relied for his pay upon the collection which was taken up. The collection plate came around and he put in a quarter. His little boy was with him. After the service when all the members had gone home, the preacher came out by the vestibule and looked into the collection plate. There was his quarter and nothing else. He picked it up and put it in his pocket. His little boy said, "Daddy, if you had put more in you would have gotten more out." [Laughter.] That is the position we are in relative to this program today. We get out just what we put in.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Had the preacher put more in the collection plate, it would still have been his money; it would not have been added to by anything anybody else put in.

Mr. LEE. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not have been "self-liquidating."

Mr. LEE. That is correct; that is true. No matter whether we vote $350,000,000 or $350,000,000 plus $500,000,000, we do so for the purpose of getting money into the hands of the people who do not have money, for the purpose of setting up Government force pumps that will pump money out into the forks of the creek and out to the grass roots, so that money can go to town in the form of purchasing power and start the wheels of industry and head us back toward real permanent prosperity.

The best evidence concerning any document is the document itself. Discussion has taken place here today which would lead us to believe that the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior are at loggerheads as to relief appropriations. Since the discussion started I obtained a copy of the letter of the President to the Senator from South Carolina and read it. I do not find any such suggestion in it; I do not find any such opposition; I do not find any such disagreement of opinion at all in respect to it. I desire to read a part of that letter to support my belief that the President is not opposed to the Mead amendment. The President is opposed to taking any money from the W. P. A., and that is what he says in the letter. The amendment of the Senator from New York would not take any money from the total of the joint resolution; it would add $500,000,000 to it; the $1,735,600,000 would still remain, but if we should adopt the amendment of the Senator from New York, there would be added $500,000,000, which would make the total $2,235,600,000. What the President says in this letter is that he objects to taking $125,000,000 from the W. P. A.

I desire to read merely a portion of the letter which refers to P. W. A. provisions of the House joint resolution. The President says in this letter:

> DEAR SENATOR BYRNES: I have your letter of the 19th in which you ask my position as to the provision of the Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1939, as passed by the House of Representatives (H. Res. 326), which would allot $125,000,000 to the Public Works Administration for loans and grants for non-Federal public works.
>
> I am opposed to this provision. It means simply that 165,000 men who are badly in need of work will have to be dropped from the Works Progress Administration rolls.

Then he goes on to describe these men and how they depend upon W. P. A. employment, how they have no other means of support.

That indicates to me that the President's only concern was that money which is so badly needed would not be taken from the W. P. A. I cannot see any force in the view expressed by the Senator from Kentucky when he suggested that if we pass this we will be forcing upon the President $500,000,000 that he does not want. He is in this position——

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

Mr. LEE. I will yield in a moment. He must, of course, cut down to the bone. In my opinion, that is what he has done in his recommendation in the first instance; and now if we would be courageous enough to take upon our shoulders some of the responsibility of the relief load in this country and add the sum provided in this amendment I think the President would be very happy over it. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the President was answering specifically the inquiry of the Senator from South Carolina concerning the $125,000,000 transfer, but if that is all the President had in his mind he could have stopped at the end of the second paragraph of his letter. However, he goes on in the letter, not to recommend any additional fund in this measure for P. W. A. but to suggest that all these projects under his suggestion should be "self-liquidating"—the entire amount of them "self-liquidating"—at a lower rate of interest, and he says that various agencies of the Government have been making a survey of projects of that sort which could be carried on and made "self-liquidating" under the plan of loaning at low rates of interest. There is not a syllable or a sentiment or a suggestion or an intimation in the President's letter that he favors a P. W. A. appropriation, because the whole tenor of the letter is to advocate the new plan.

I can certainly say to the Senator from Oklahoma that if he is undertaking to convince himself that the President does not oppose the Mead amendment, he can find out in very short order by conferring directly with the President on the subject.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have no means of knowing the President's attitude on this particular matter except from this letter, added to the President's general attitude on relief. When I put those two together, I do not find any evidence that the President would be opposed to this amendment appropriating $500,000,000 additional for the purpose of taking care of unemployment in this country and stimulating business. Simply because the President has not asked for this money does not mean that he does not want it; it only means that he did not want to ask for it.

The Senator from Kentucky has just said that there is no evidence in this letter, not one line or syllable, showing that the President favors any P. W. A. proposal. I will state the matter in the negative: Neither is there a single line or paragraph which indicates that the President is opposed to the Mead amendment.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's argument and logic remind me of the preacher who preached a long sermon one night at a church and at the conclusion asked, "Does this congregation want me to preach here next Sunday night?" Nobody

said anything, and the preacher said, "Silence gives consent. I will preach here next Sunday night." [Laughter.]

Mr. LEE. That is sometimes a very powerful argument. Silence may thunder; and in this case, so far as I am concerned, it seems to do so, because how do I know that the President is opposed to the amendment? I never heard of a P. W. A. program until the President himself launched one. I have not had any word from the President to the effect that he does not seek a continuation of the P. W. A. program. We voted for P. W. A. money. We have had a P. W. A. program; and all at once I am told here by the majority leader that the President is opposed to a continuation of this program, which is intended simply to fill in a gap.

As the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has well argued, this is simply a supplementary program; and the President even asked for a supplementary program in this letter. I will read that sentence. Over toward the end of the letter he says:

> To give effect to the program outlined above, some supplementary legislation will be necessary.

And this is the cushion that fills in between the expenditure of the funds now available to P. W. A. and the establishment of the new program which is outlined in the President's letter.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose the noun for "facetious" would be "facetiosity." [Laughter.] I admire the facetiosity, as well as the speciosity, which the Senator employs in undertaking to convince us that the President, in that sentence, referred to this particular amendment and this particular fund.

The President was talking about supplementary legislation; not a supplementary appropriation, but supplementary legislation authorizing him to do what he outlined and suggested in this program, not only with respect to non-Federal buildings but with respect to the entire program which he submitted to the Senate, and to the Congress through this letter.

Mr. LEE. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wonder if the Senator would object to adding to the Mead amendment a provision to the effect that no alien may be employed out of any of the moneys appropriated.

Mr. LEE. I refer the Senator to the author of the amendment.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator consider the fact that this $500,000,000 appropriation was omitted from the Budget an indication by the President that he is not in favor of our appropriating it?

Mr. LEE. No; I could not take that as conclusive evidence. The President is under hammer and tongs all the time to reduce, reduce, reduce; and he knows at the same time that we have unemployment in the country. I think he would appreciate our sharing that responsibility by voting a program big enough to carry out the ideas that we have advanced; namely, that if employment is given to all of the unemployed, we will have prosperity.

Mr. TAFT. When the Senate adopted the farm-parity payments in excess of the Budget, does the Senator remember that the President immediately criticized the Congress for such action? Is there anything different about this particular appropriation?

Mr. LEE. Well, that is a matter of guess. I did not see that the President criticized the Senate for that action. I did see where he said that we should have courage enough to provide taxes that would raise the funds appropriated in that bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LEE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think the President is sufficiently diffident that he is not willing to share the responsibility of asking Congress for what he wants? Has the President, during the past 6 years, shown any hesitation in that regard? Has he all at once become so modest that he is not willing to ask us for what he wants, hoping that we shall force it on him anyway?

Mr. LEE. To all of those questions I answer that I do not know.

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

Mr. LEE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Did the Senator read the newspapers of this morning before making that statement?

Mr. LEE. I do not know what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. DOWNEY. The Senator from Kentucky asked the Senator from Oklahoma if the President generally expressed his opinion on what he wanted. I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he read the newspapers this morning?

Mr. LEE. Yes; I read them. The President has not been very faint-hearted about expressing his opinion or taking responsibility, nor has he been lacking in courage in launching this program; but that does not relieve us from any part of our responsibility in this matter.

How much did we appropriate last year for the P. W. A. program? We appropriated nine-hundred-and-sixty-odd million dollars. We have spent, or we will have spent when the time ends, nine-hundred-and-sixty-odd million dollars. If we adopt the Mead amendment, and then pass the program which the President recommends, we will then have only $850,000,000 for P. W. A., and that is over one hundred million less than we appropriated last year for P. W. A., if we have both of them.

Therefore, I cannot agree with those who believe that it is the intent of the President to shut down all of this program. Of course, if we could start this work right away, we could take up the immediate slack; but, as was pointed out by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], if all of the $350,000,000 were subscribed for it might take care of only 20 percent of the projects already approved that have been applied for. Then what would the other 80 percent of them do? Nothing. They would not be built. The labor would not be employed. The material would not be purchased.

Therefore I cannot see why we should not support this year a program almost as large as that of last year; and even if this amendment is adopted we still will not have appropriated as much for this type of work as we did last year.

Now, let us see, what is the difference? The difference in that one proposal is to appropriate $500,000,000 and lend 55 percent of it at 4 percent, and the other proposal is to appropriate $350,000,000 and lend it at 2 percent. In the long run, in my humble opinion, the cost to the Government is not going to be greatly different. There is not going to be a great deal of difference, because, figuring it out over a long period of years, with the 55-percent loan at 4 percent we are not in a greatly different position than if we lend all of the money at 2 percent. There is a slight subsidy in each case.

I have always favored P. W. A. over W. P. A. I grant that P. W. A. does not put to work on the ground so many men visibly, and perhaps not at all, but it puts more men to work farther upstream. We get for the money more in return. We get more permanent improvements. P. W. A. has the approval of the public. The laborers are employed by contract, and the man who hires them can fire them. There is no soldiering on the job, there is no gold-bricking, and there is no unsavory criticism as to the work done by this agency of the Government. As the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] said today, in his State P. W. A. has a clean record. That is true in most of the cases. Therefore, I do not see why we cannot support the Mead amendment, which will leave our total for P. W. A. still less than it was last year, and at the same time support the program which the President outlines in this letter, which is to come later.

I cannot see any conflict at all. It looks to me like a supplementary program. It looks to me like a method of getting into operation the very program the President has

outlined here, one of self-liquidating projects. Under P. W. A. in our State we are building a self-liquidating project, the largest project in the State, and that is a power dam. The cost of the dam will be liquidated over a period of years, or at least partially liquidated, by the returns for electricity. P. W. A. is already building many of these self-liquidating and 'semi-self-liquidating programs. That is something I have always advocated. I think it is sound; and I see no conflict whatever between the Mead amendment and the proposal offered by the President. I see no conflict between the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States in this respect. It simply means, if we add this appropriation, that we share to some extent the President's responsibility in voting enough money to make a real program.

We never have had, since this administration has been in power, enough courage to go far enough to prove our own theory of ending this depression, which is that if all the unemployed are put to work we will have prosperity. If we get buying power in the hands of all the people, prosperity is the result. We have been afraid to go far enough each time; and there has scarcely been a given time, I suppose, when we have not had from 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 persons unemployed in this country.

I was very much in accord when I read in the newspaper the letter that the President wrote to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], in which he outlined a program that looked to me as though it was big enough at least to approach the proposition of taking care of the unemployed in this country. I applauded that program when it came out, and I see no conflict between it and this program or the Mead amendment.

I shall vote for the Mead amendment.

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I make an effort to facilitate the consideration of this joint resolution? I wonder if we cannot enter into some agreement about a limitation of debate on this amendment. I do not want to cut off any Senator, but it is apparent that we shall have to make more progress than we have made up to this time if we are to get through with the joint resolution tonight. I wonder if the Senator from Florida would be willing to consider a limitation of debate on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have nothing to do with it, except in my own case, and I expect to speak for only about 10 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD and ask to have printed page 1 of Senate Document No. 25, which itemizes the projects which have already been approved by the P. W. A. in the several States of the country, and indicates the amount of the loan and the grant which would be required for each State if those projects were approved and actually put under construction.

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

PENDING NON-FEDERAL PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

Summary of list, by counties, of applications for projects pending before the Public Works Administration which might be eligible for allotment if additional appropriation were provided as of January 18, 1939. Primarily, eligibility would be governed by terms of such appropriation act.

| State | Number of projects | Loan | Grant | Total | Estimated cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 47 | $421,500 | $2,537,328 | $2,958,828 | $5,639,114 |
| Arizona | 91 | 8,627,500 | 10,764,093 | 19,391,593 | 23,921,483 |
| Arkansas | 25 | 618,000 | 705,478 | 1,324,478 | 1,569,955 |
| California | 458 | 7,814,000 | 94,045,671 | 101,859,671 | 247,201,156 |
| Colorado | 42 | 324,000 | 2,843,486 | 3,167,486 | 6,319,197 |
| Connecticut | 91 | 31,000 | 10,650,990 | 10,681,990 | 23,668,878 |
| Delaware | 4 | | 203,292 | 203,292 | 451,760 |
| Florida | 92 | 12,997,200 | 17,157,602 | 30,154,802 | 38,128,971 |
| Georgia | 91 | 1,608,875 | 10,000,453 | 11,609,328 | 22,756,023 |
| Idaho | 26 | 179,838 | 1,743,830 | 1,923,668 | 3,875,171 |
| Illinois | 459 | $292,409 | $39,470,438 | $39,762,847 | $88,173,948 |
| Indiana | 61 | | 5,608,698 | 5,608,698 | 12,466,027 |
| Iowa | 213 | | 8,461,095 | 8,461,095 | 18,797,422 |
| Kansas | 87 | 4,637,000 | 7,007,483 | 11,644,483 | 15,595,646 |
| Kentucky | 26 | 275,000 | 1,426,324 | 1,701,324 | 3,169,615 |
| Louisiana | 141 | 1,573,910 | 15,141,213 | 16,715,123 | 33,647,150 |
| Maine | 31 | 28,000 | 828,828 | 856,828 | 1,841,848 |
| Maryland | 34 | 143,000 | 16,346,630 | 16,489,630 | 36,324,846 |
| Massachusetts | 49 | | 4,908,144 | 4,908,144 | 11,038,929 |
| Michigan | 105 | 982,500 | 11,650,027 | 12,632,527 | 25,883,162 |
| Minnesota | 89 | 23,000 | 8,844,047 | 8,867,047 | 19,653,441 |
| Mississippi | 86 | 2,541,568 | 3,483,684 | 6,025,252 | 7,733,644 |
| Missouri | 91 | 11,000 | 9,196,642 | 9,207,642 | 20,452,626 |
| Montana | 41 | 1,086,200 | 4,205,766 | 5,291,966 | 9,346,148 |
| Nebraska | 131 | 3,209,571 | 10,625,264 | 13,834,835 | 23,611,713 |
| Nevada | 20 | 19,000 | 1,029,126 | 1,048,126 | 2,286,956 |
| New Hampshire | 21 | | 1,359,836 | 1,359,836 | 3,021,658 |
| New Jersey | 187 | 11,404,000 | 30,011,254 | 41,415,254 | 68,942,480 |
| New Mexico | 19 | 2,295,500 | 4,496,147 | 6,791,647 | 9,991,446 |
| New York | 429 | 18,375,000 | 114,573,744 | 132,948,744 | 257,090,091 |
| North Carolina | 81 | 962,000 | 4,720,456 | 5,682,456 | 10,489,915 |
| North Dakota | 53 | 33,000 | 2,197,885 | 2,230,885 | 4,884,197 |
| Ohio | 190 | 926,500 | 26,854,233 | 27,780,733 | 59,684,168 |
| Oklahoma | 54 | 1,119,000 | 10,500,092 | 11,619,092 | 23,333,926 |
| Oregon | 34 | 175,700 | 1,400,968 | 1,576,668 | 3,113,265 |
| Pennsylvania | 966 | 64,270,300 | 130,243,047 | 194,513,347 | 289,450,945 |
| Rhode Island | 12 | | 2,420,483 | 2,420,483 | 5,378,850 |
| South Carolina | 57 | 9,554,000 | 13,138,693 | 22,692,693 | 29,197,117 |
| South Dakota | 35 | 43,000 | 2,746,627 | 2,789,627 | 6,099,179 |
| Tennessee | 94 | 4,566,000 | 9,878,500 | 14,444,500 | 21,954,822 |
| Texas | 298 | 33,209,175 | 59,386,383 | 92,595,558 | 134,106,856 |
| Utah | 23 | 195,000 | 2,293,371 | 2,488,371 | 5,096,387 |
| Vermont | 15 | | 760,677 | 760,677 | 1,690,397 |
| Virginia | 150 | 391,000 | 9,831,851 | 10,222,851 | 21,844,622 |
| Washington | 190 | 447,850 | 15,091,915 | 15,539,765 | 33,537,621 |
| West Virginia | 33 | 1,369,000 | 7,738,288 | 9,107,288 | 17,196,198 |
| Wisconsin | 141 | 8,600,000 | 17,739,788 | 26,339,788 | 39,422,935 |
| Wyoming | 41 | 377,000 | 2,045,608 | 2,422,608 | 4,545,435 |
| District of Columbia | 8 | 8,706,500 | 7,123,500 | 15,830,000 | 15,830,000 |
| Alaska | 7 | 210,000 | 233,672 | 443,672 | 519,272 |
| Hawaii | 10 | | 828,225 | 828,225 | 1,840,500 |
| Puerto Rico | 25 | 1,689,000 | 1,484,993 | 3,173,993 | 3,299,993 |
| Virgin Islands | 3 | 173,250 | 176,932 | 350,182 | 393,182 |
| Total | 5,807 | 216,535,846 | 778,163,800 | 994,699,646 | 1,775,510,286 |

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am quite conscious of the fact that I can add nothing of particular note to what has already been said by the able Senators from New York and Oklahoma, except to corroborate the sentiments they have indicated very strongly in favor of the appropriation asked, and in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

I sometimes wonder whether the opponents of the works program are consistent in their attitude. If it is proposed that we have a W. P. A. program, they say that the W. P. A. is an irresponsible agency, that it has had an unsatisfactory record, and that making appropriations to that agency is not the proper way to speed up recovery in this country. Then, if there is proposed a P. W. A. program they have some other excuse for not favoring the proposal. If a loan program is offered, a program based entirely upon the self-liquidating principle, they have some different objection, and probably come back eventually to the conclusion that they actually feel in their hearts that none of those programs should be the policy of the Federal Government.

The only reason why I venture to detain the Senate for even this short length of time is because, in fulfillment of the obligation I owe to my individual conscience, I am never going to miss an opportunity on this floor to offer my humble sentiment to my colleagues that we face frankly, honestly, and candidly the admission of the ugly fact that we are never going to be able to put to work the people of this country who are able to work and want to work, through private enterprise alone in any administration, Democratic, Republican, or anything else.

Within the week an article appeared in the New York Times, written by Mr. Lyon, of the Brookings Institution, and in that article he set out that inevitably, under the organization of our modern-day economy, we have to have work that implements the work which comes from the turning of the wheels of private enterprise. So in one form or another I accept the premise that we have to create work to implement the work that is available in our private economy.

Mr. President, if that premise be admitted, the only thing we have to do is to determine the kind of implemented work, the kind of made jobs, that will be to the public interest.

I do not quarrel with anyone because he prefers W. P. A. over P. W. A., or P. W. A. over W. P. A., or a lending program that is based upon the self-liquidating principle over some other program. I quarrel only with a man who will neither admit the obvious premise nor propose any solution for this challenging problem.

It seems to me, therefore, that the P. W. A. program is perhaps one of those which might meet the rigid conditions of almost anyone who was willing to make new jobs for the people who do not have a chance to work. It has been in operation for several years. Everyone admits that it has been honestly operated. It has been efficiently operated, even in the opinion of its critics, or the critics of the general program.

I have here a list of about a billion dollars' worth of projects which have been subjected to every possible scrutiny of three various examining divisions, and all of them have said these are deserving and meritorious projects. Not only that, but the local people who are the sponsors of those projects are putting up 55 percent of the construction cost and the Federal Government is putting up only 45 percent. That is equivalent in principle to lending them the whole cost of construction of the project, and giving them the interest on it without any charge whatever. So, instead of the lending program to which the Senator from Kentucky referred a few moments ago requiring 2-percent interest, and perhaps giving the recipients some interest, we merely give them all the interest, in substance, upon the money required for the construction program.

I say that it is not an unreasonable thing for the Federal Government to say to any community, "Whatever is for your benefit is for my benefit; whatever is a community asset is a national asset. Therefore, I will match dollar for dollar the money you spend in the construction of useful public works."

The idea that we save money by keeping the obligations of the Federal Government down and pulling the obligations of the local governments up is an obvious fallacy. We have had the experience or proof of it in my own State of Florida. In the real-estate boom days of 1925 and 1926 the various political subdivisions of the State got themselves head over heels in debt. They were very heavily burdened with debt, a higher debt than they could pay. Yet the State government, under constitutional provision, had no debt at all. Were we better off? I say that no State in this Union has as good a taxing system as has the Federal Government, or as adequate a capacity for taxing in a fair way.

Some of the States have principally and primarily the ad valorem tax, which is not a fair method of taxation. That is not a fair measure of ability to pay. Some other States have the sales tax. Nor is that a fair measure of ability to pay. But in those States they sometimes vie with one another to attract residents and to attract capital and attract enterprise. The Federal Government does not have to make a taxation system on that principle. Therefore, I can see no fairer agency that can tax to support a public-works program than the Federal Government.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LEE. If the Government lends all of the money at 2 percent it takes 50 years to have the principal paid back. If the Government lends 55 percent of the money at 4 percent it takes 25 years for the principal to be paid back, and at the end of 50 years, under a 4-percent loan, provided the principal were reloaned after it was paid back at the end of the first 25 years, the Government would have back 110 percent of the original amount of the project which lends 55 percent. Therefore, if we are figuring cost over a long period of years the amount of money returned to the Government would be greater under the P. W. A. than under the lending program outlined in the President's letter. The President stated in his letter that he favored a revolving fund. Therefore, the money which comes in under this proposal would be put in the revolving fund and put out at interest again, no doubt.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. If this policy actually were an absolute experiment, I could understand how there would be a difference of opinion about it, but my colleagues know very well the familiar story of how our economy has reflected the stimulus of a works program and aid by the Federal Government.

I have here an article which appeared in the June 27 issue of the Washington Star this year, and it shows the curve of industrial production in this country, beginning at the bottom at about 58, in July 1932, going up to the top, about 121, in December 1936; then going down to the low mark of 76 in May 1938; then going back up to a little over a hundred in about midsummer 1938, and declining down to 92 in May 1939.

Nearly every one of these rises has been associated with a new spending program of the Federal Government. Nearly every one of the declines has been the inevitable consequence of a program restricting spending by the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the least we can do is to give a man in this country a chance to work. There is no possible excuse for any government or any economy where there are able-bodied men and women who need work and who want work; there is no excuse that can be given by a civilized State to such men and women when they cannot find work to do.

I will say to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber that just as certainly as we do not measurably solve the problem of unemployment, we not only will but we ought to be deprived of the instrumentalities of national power. Whether the other party will exhibit leadership to the Nation by solving that problem will, if it gets in power, determine whether it will continue to hold that power. People are not going to perish in a civilized day due to a specialized economy that has outgrown the way of life which makes it possible for private enterprise to give all of them jobs.

I will say to my colleagues that the one way to avoid regimentation, the one way to avoid Nazi and Fascist principles, is through Federal aid to provide private jobs and to provide work, without having to restrict production on the farm or in the factory. If someone prefers the restriction process, let him do so. I am against it. I believe we should have an economy of plenty, as the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has so often and so eloquently urged upon the Senate floor. The only way to get that is to provide purchasing power, and the only thing that offers any hope of that being supplied is this program of the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, we know that people are unemployed. We know they are going to remain unemployed unless we make it possible for them to get jobs. Get away from the W. P. A. if you want to. I should like to see it all abolished and I should like to see such subsidies given to private enterprise that there would be jobs for all under the operations of private industry. But unless such a plan is proposed, and until it is proposed, I shall keep on voting for W. P. A.

I should like to see an adequate lending program, so that every project in America which could be built upon the self-liquidating principle would be able to get capital and the Southwest and the impoverished South would be able to get the capital with which to develop their neglected resources. It ought to be provided, and some day it will be provided, and I shall have the pleasure, I hope, of voting for it when it is offered. But until it is offered and becomes a reality I shall take W. P. A., I shall take P. W. A.; I will take any other alternative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should state again the view of the committee in its report. The committee was not seeking to pass judgment upon the worth of public-works projects. The committee was reporting a relief measure. The committee was confronted, as the Senate is confronted, with the fact that unless relief measures are

passed and signed by midnight on Friday of this week two and a half million people will go out on the streets, off relief, and the W. P. A. will go out of existence.

No such a situation confronts the public-works program. There is no necessity for speed or for including a public-works program in this measure. We can pass a public-works program next week or week after that or later than that. We do not have the emergent relief situation, and I do not think, and the committee, with few exceptions, did not think that the two matters should be confused.

The committee increased the relief expenditures up to the amount the President requested, by taking out the allocation of $125,000,000 to public-works projects. The committee has followed very closely the recommendation of the President in amount and in purposes. The committee has followed Colonel Harrington's suggestion along that line. I do not believe the Senate should at this time add to the pending measure a public-works section, regardless of the merits of public-works projects. It seems to me that there are a number of things which might be said on the public-works phase of the question. I shall not take time to do so.

Mr. President, I cannot refrain, however, making a comment with respect to one thing that my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], said, because I am one of his admiring and close-listening auditors. He said that if the President would have the courage to spend this much money we ought to have the courage to shoulder the burden and spend another billion dollars. Mr. President, it takes a great deal of courage to spend great sums of money.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. He is an auditor; he audits my books as well as listens to me.

Mr. ADAMS. While I am auditing the Senator's books I will call attention to some statistics. The Senator from Oklahoma said that if the Government were to loan money at 2 percent it would be paid back in 50 years. If it were to loan the money at 4 percent it would be paid back in 25 years. The only fly in that ointment is that 2 percent in 50 years would pay back the principal or the interest, but it would not pay back both the principal and the interest.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from Colorado is criticizing someone else for making a poor argument; he himself is making a poor argument.

Mr. ADAMS. I will admit I am making a poor argument. The Senator does not have to point out that fact.

Mr. FRAZIER. In the measure passed by the House there is a public-works program. The joint resolution will have to go to conference anyway. So it would not entail any additional work. We have in practically every State in the Union projects which have been O. K.'d by the Department and they are waiting for the money. The States have been promised the projects, and they are expecting them. I believe they are entitled to them.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, let me say on that point that the Senator from New York made a similar statement—that there was a moral or a legal obligation to those communities that had projects in mind. When the P. W. A. addition was made to the relief measure a year ago—and I was one of those who helped to do it; it was not put on in the House—we provided definitely the amount of money; we provided the dates when the projects could be approved; we made a definite provision in all ways; and no man, no community, no group has a right to claim a promise. That money was all consumed, and they had fair notice and fair warning that if their project, though approved, was not within the amount appropriated, it could not be included. So there is no obligation beyond that.

Mr. President, I know it is important to vote, and I shall discuss this question no further, except to make one additional statement. I made inquiry of the Secretary of the Interior as to the amount of direct labor on the P. W. A. projects on the ground. The direct labor on the P. W. A. projects is 25 percent on the site, and that is not relief labor. What I am thinking of is the man who is hungry, the man who is cold, the man whose family is in distress. I do not believe that at this time we were making advancement by adding the public works to this relief measure. I am hopeful that it may be kept as a relief measure. Let us meet the public-works program at another time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for a division.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Ellender | King | Reynolds |
| Andrews | Frazier | La Follette | Russell |
| Ashurst | George | Lee | Schwellenbach |
| Austin | Gerry | Lodge | Shipstead |
| Bailey | Gibson | Lucas | Slattery |
| Bankhead | Gillette | McCarran | Smathers |
| Barkley | Green | McKellar | Stewart |
| Bilbo | Guffey | Maloney | Taft |
| Borah | Gurney | Mead | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bridges | Hale | Miller | Tobey |
| Bulow | Harrison | Minton | Townsend |
| Burke | Hatch | Murray | Vandenberg |
| Byrd | Hayden | Neely | Van Nuys |
| Capper | Herring | Norris | Wagner |
| Clark, Idaho | Hill | Nye | Walsh |
| Clark, Mo. | Holman | O'Mahoney | Wheeler |
| Connally | Holt | Pepper | White |
| Danaher | Hughes | Pittman | |
| Donahey | Johnson, Calif. | Radcliffe | |
| Downey | Johnson, Colo. | Reed | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the committee amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to have a word to say about the pending amendment.

It seems to me we are bent upon spending many more millions of dollars. Before the present Congress shall have expired, we probably shall have voted to spend another billion dollars. It is evident to my mind that we have the money to spend; and so long as we have the money to spend we shall continue to spend it.

So long as we have the money to spend, and in view of the fact that we are going to continue to spend money, I am in favor of spending the money in the United States, for the benefit of the 130,000,000 people of the United States and the more than 11,000,000 people who are out of employment at this time.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wonder where the Senator got the idea that we have the money to spend?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Evidently we have it. I obtained the idea through the columns of the press. I learned therefrom that our administration is considering lending $500,000,000 to the countries to the south of us in South America.

If we have $500,000,000 to lend to the dictators in South America or Central America, I say let us take the $500,000,000 and spend it for the benefit of the American laboring men who are out of employment.

For that reason I shall support the Mead amendment, because if we have $500,000,000 to spend, let us grab the $500,000,000 and give it to the people of the United States instead of to the dictators to the south.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the committee amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if he were present and voting, he would vote as I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. Being advised that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. HOLT (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] because of illness. On this question he has a special pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. I am informed that if the junior Senator from Wyoming were present and voting, he would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that those Senators, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business. These Senators, I am advised, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I am advised that he would vote as I intend to vote on this amendment, and I, therefore, feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following pair:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. If present and voting I am informed the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and that the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily absent on departmental business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

Mr. ADAMS. I announce that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has been called out of the city on important matters. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—32

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Green | Mead | Reynolds |
| Bilbo | Hayden | Murray | Schwellenbach |
| Borah | Hughes | Neely | Slattery |
| Clark, Idaho | Johnson, Colo. | Norris | Smathers |
| Donahey | La Follette | Nye | Stewart |
| Downey | Lee | O'Mahoney | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ellender | McCarran | Pepper | Wagner |
| Frazier | Maloney | Pittman | Wheeler |

NAYS—43

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Bridges | Connally | Guffey |
| Andrews | Bulow | Danaher | Gurney |
| Austin | Burke | George | Hale |
| Bailey | Byrd | Gerry | Harrison |
| Bankhead | Capper | Gibson | Hatch |
| Barkley | Clark, Mo. | Gillette | Herring |
| Hill | Lucas | Reed | Vandenberg |
| Holman | McKellar | Russell | Van Nuys |
| Johnson, Calif. | Miller | Taft | Walsh |
| King | Minton | Tobey | White |
| Lodge | Radcliffe | Townsend | |

NOT VOTING—21

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Barbour | Davis | Overton | Truman |
| Bone | Glass | Schwartz | Tydings |
| Brown | Holt | Sheppard | Wiley |
| Byrnes | Logan | Shipstead | |
| Caraway | Lundeen | Smith | |
| Chavez | McNary | Thomas, Utah | |

So Mr. MEAD's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution which I assure the Senate in all substantial particulars is the same as the Mead amendment upon which we have just voted, except that the amount of money is cut in half; that is to say, on page 2 of the amendment the amount for loans and grants is reduced from $400,000,000 to $200,000,000. The amount for administrative expenses is cut in half. The amount for Federal projects is cut from $100,000,000 to $50,000,000. In addition to that, my amendment provides that the grant shall be 30 percent instead of 45 percent.

Senators will remember that in the original public-works program the grant was 30 percent, and the loan was 70 percent. The proposal I am now making is a 50-percent cut all along the line. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has stated today that under the new program the grant will amount to between 15 and 20 percent. It is now 45 percent. I am proposing, for this interim program, to make the grant 30 percent.

I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona desire to have the amendment read?

Mr. HAYDEN. I assure the Senate that it is the same in all substantial particulars as the Mead amendment, except that in all cases the amount of money is one-half that provided by the Mead amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as having been read, and will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYDEN's amendment was, in lieu of the matter in title II, beginning on page 35, proposed to be stricken out by the committee, to insert the following:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

SECTION 201. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful non-Federal public works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, or the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, there is hereby appropriated to the Public Works Administration (herein called the "Administration") in the Federal Works Agency, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $200,000,000, together with the balance of the appropriation made under section 201 of such act of 1938, not reserved for administrative expenses of the Administration and not now or hereafter expended pursuant to allotments heretofore made, which amounts shall be available until June 30, 1941, and may be expended by the Commissioner of Public Works (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner"), subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or other public bodies (herein called "public agencies"), or (2) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

(b) No amount available under this title shall be allotted for any project which, in the determination of the Commissioner, cannot be commenced prior to March 1, 1940, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to July 1, 1941: *Provided*, That this limitation upon time shall not apply to any project involved in litigation in any Federal or State court.

(c) Under the funds available in this title, no grant shall be made in excess of 30 percent of the cost of any project, and no project shall be constructed for lease to any public agency unless the Commissioner shall determine that the nonrecoverable portion of the cost of such project shall not exceed 30 percent of the cost thereof.

(d) No moneys for a non-Federal project shall be paid from the funds made available by this title to any public agency unless and until adequate provision has been made, or in the opinion of

the Commissioner is assured, for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

(e) Not more than $4,875,000 of the amount available under this title may be used for administrative expenses of the Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, in connection with this title; such amount shall be available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth for such Administration in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940. The Commissioner shall reserve from the amount available under this title an adequate sum for administrative expenses of the Administration in connection with this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

SEC. 202. Moneys realized from the sale of securities acquired by the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works or the Public Works Administration, or the proceeds of such securities, may be used by the Commissioner for the making of loans in connection with projects under this title, notwithstanding any previous limitation on the total amount of such securities or proceeds thereof that may be used for loan purposes.

SEC. 203. The Public Works Administration is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform on July 1, 1939. On and after the effective date of reorganization plan numbered I transmitted to the Congress by the President of the United States pursuant to the authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1939, all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Public Works Administration, and all laws, Executive orders, and other documents referring to the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works shall be deemed to refer to the Commissioner of Public Works.

SEC. 204. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, as amended by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. No new applications for loans or grants for non-Federal projects shall be received by the Administration after September 30, 1939: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to applications amendatory of applications for projects received prior to October 1, 1939, and such amendatory applications shall be confined to projects which, in the determination of the Commissioner, can be started and completed within the time limits specified in section 201 (b) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

That portion of section 201 (f) of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 which reads "for the completion (except liquidation) of the activities of such Administration," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 205. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Administration, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until June 30, 1941, the sum of $50,000,000, to be expended at the direction of the Commissioner, for the making of allotments to Federal agencies for the financing of Federal construction projects (including projects for making surveys and maps) in continental United States outside of the District of Columbia, and the acquisition of land for sites therefor, such projects to be selected from (1) projects authorized by law and (2) projects for the enlargement, extension, or remodeling of existing Federal plants, institutions, or facilities.

(b) No Federal construction project, except flood control and water conservation or utilization projects now under actual construction, shall be undertaken or prosecuted with funds made available by this section unless and until moneys sufficient for the completion thereof shall have been irrevocably allocated or appropriated therefor.

SEC. 206. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1939."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if I correctly understand that under the amendment as he has now presented it the proportion of public-works cost to be borne by the municipalities, cities, and other public bodies will be 70 percent instead of 55 percent, as under the present plan?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am returning to the original public-works program which we adopted in 1933, when the grant was 30 percent and the loan feature was 70 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand that under the terms of this amendment it would also be perfectly possible for the Public Works Administration to undertake public works without any grant at all?

Mr. HAYDEN. Without any grant at all?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; just by loaning the money necessary for the project.

Mr. HAYDEN. In each case the amount has been a maximum. That is, the law first provided that the grant should not be more than 30 percent. Then the law was amended so as to provide that it should not be more than 45 percent. The grant might be anywhere from those figures down, of course.

I offer this amendment because the original proposal made by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was submitted in the Committee on Appropriations. It did not prevail. This proposal also was submitted, and it received much more substantial support in the committee, as I hope it will in the Senate.

I think the proposal is thoroughly understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate except to say that this is the same proposition on which we have just voted, except as to the change in the amounts and the relationship between grant and loan.

Personally, I do not see that there is any advantage in the proposal of the Senator from Arizona over the program which we have been talking about today, and which we all hope to have inaugurated within a very short time. So it seems to me there is no advantage to the communities in voting this amendment up, whereas under the program which has been projected and which we have discussed there would be a loan of 15 to 20 percent, but it would be at a lower rate of interest, and all of it would be returned to the Government of the United States, and no grant at all would be involved.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me point out one advantage to the communities. Under the terms of the House bill, new projects may be considered until next October. The gate is closed now. That will allow the Public Works Agency to consider all these projects; and, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] so ably pointed out earlier in the day, that is a positive advantage in connection with the new plan which the President proposes, because the projects are worked out, and if the money cannot be obtained in one way it can be obtained in another.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it has been demonstrated here beyond cavil that more than a billion dollars' worth of projects are already worked up, and are now ready for action.

Mr. HAYDEN. If they can get 45 percent.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Arizona? If we do not adopt this amendment and appropriate more money, the P. W. A. will fold up. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; it definitely expires 1 year from now. No new projects will be considered, and none could be considered since last October.

Mr. LEE. This $200,000,000 would not be taken from the W. P. A. appropriation; would it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator I suggest that if the amendment is not adopted, the P. W. A. does not fold up. It still goes on for another year, but it is a new program. The proposal that has been made, if adopted, will constitute practically a permanent law whenever the exigencies require the advance of credit by the Government of the United States to the local communities. So not only would the P. W. A. not fold up, but it would be indefinitely extended.

Mr. LEE. The new program contemplates loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no!

Mr. LEE. The Public Works Administration is wiped out.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is the new Work Administration or Authority which is set up in Plan No. I of the President. Its name is changed, but that is all. It still goes on.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona one other question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is going to recognize the Senator from Oklahoma, in order that some Senator may have the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. LEE. I am about to yield to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I wish to ask just one other question. If we should adopt the amendment which the Senator has offered, and should also adopt the new proposed program, we should then have appropriated for W. P. A. only approximately half the amount that we appropriated last year. Is not that true?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I think it ought to be made perfectly clear in the RECORD that the answer made by the Senator from Arizona to the Senator from Oklahoma may be very misleading. So far as concerns its being true that if this amendment is voted down the P. W. A. will fold up, the records of the Appropriations Committee show that the peak of the P. W. A. work will not be reached until some time in October of this year, and it will not be folding up at all. Those projects are just getting under way; and, as already brought out, at least half of the amount contained in the very large appropriation we made last year is still unexpended. It has been allocated; the work has been started on some of it; but we shall not reach the peak for some months in the future. New projects, however, will not be undertaken.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I referred to.

Mr. BURKE. Of course, that is what the Senator from Arizona meant.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not see how what I said could be construed in any other way.

Mr. BURKE. I wanted it to be clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the amendment reported by the committee. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. HOLT (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this question. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if present he would vote "nay." If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] because of illness. He has, however, a special pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present, my colleague would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are unavoidably detained. I am advised that those Senators if present and voting would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business. These Senators, I am advised, if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I am advised that he would vote as I intend to vote on this amendment, and I, therefore, feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the pair on this question of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. If present, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Frazier | Maloney | Russell |
| Ashurst | Green | Mead | Schwellenbach |
| Bilbo | Hatch | Murray | Slattery |
| Borah | Hayden | Neely | Smathers |
| Clark, Idaho | Hill | Norris | Stewart |
| Connally | Hughes | Nye | Thomas, Okla. |
| Danaher | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney | Wagner |
| Donahey | La Follette | Pepper | Wheeler |
| Downey | Lee | Pittman | |
| Ellender | McCarran | Reynolds | |

NAYS—38

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Clark, Mo. | Herring | Reed |
| Austin | Davis | Holman | Taft |
| Bailey | George | Johnson, Calif. | Tobey |
| Bankhead | Gerry | King | Townsend |
| Barkley | Gibson | Lodge | Vandenberg |
| Bridges | Gillette | Lucas | Van Nuys |
| Bulow | Guffey | McKellar | Walsh |
| Burke | Gurney | Miller | White |
| Byrd | Hale | Minton | |
| Capper | Harrison | Radcliffe | |

NOT VOTING—20

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Barbour | Chavez | McNary | Smith |
| Bone | Glass | Overton | Thomas, Utah |
| Brown | Holt | Schwartz | Truman |
| Byrnes | Logan | Sheppard | Tydings |
| Caraway | Lundeen | Shipstead | Wiley |

So Mr. HAYDEN's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, 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 amendment numbered 114.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$203,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "$13,769,418"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "$14,697,732"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "$26,704,297"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$681,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the

sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$40,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "$46,965,730"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32, 33, 141, 142, and 158.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

M. C. TARVER,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
DAVID D. TERRY,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5269, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*June 28, 1939.*

*Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 32 and 142 to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For research and demonstration work in soil-conservation control measures, including research and demonstration work in fire-control and irrigation-construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $75,000: *Provided,* That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida for the same purposes."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert a period and "Notwithstanding any such determination by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, this provision shall not be construed to prevent any criminal process against any person who was a party to or had guilty knowledge of such fraud or misrepresentation."

That the House further insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to said bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, to what bill does this action of the House relate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have just submitted the second conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. This concludes legislative action on the bill, if the Senate will agree to the motion I am about to make.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 33, 141, and 158.

The motion was agreed to.

## WORK-RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, last evening the amendment on page 21, beginning in line 14, was passed over in order that I might prepare an amendment to it. I have prepared it and will submit it to the Senator from Colorado, and I think he will accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, at the end of line 19, it is proposed to insert

*Provided, however,* That such preference need not apply when it results in undue hardship.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the proviso merely softens somewhat the provision of the committee amendment, which makes it automatically necessary to discharge one who has been employed 18 months if someone who has been on the roll 3 months applies for employment. It seems to me there ought to be some discretion in the Commissioner, that if such a contingency should arise which would result in undue hardship, the Commissioner should not be compelled to discharge a man under those circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, we could not hear what the amendment was.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the amendment offered by the Senate committee, on page 21, those who have been employed on projects for 18 months must give way to any on the certified list for 3 months who have not been able to secure positions with the W. P. A. I interpret this provision to be almost mandatory, in the event some one on the certified list for as much as 3 months applies for a position held by someone else who has been on the job for 18 months.

My amendment merely provides that when the discharge of the man employed would result in undue hardship, the Commissioner shall not be compelled to give preference to the new man who is seeking the position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over is at the top of page 6, and will be reported by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 6, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "in the aggregate the sum of $45,000,000 during the fiscal year 1940, of which sum the amounts so to be obligated for the following respective purposes shall not exceed these sums: Salaries, $40,000,000; communication service, $600,000; travel, $4,200,000; and printing and binding $500,000", and to insert "4 percent of the total amount made available in this section to such Administration."

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, it was because of an amendment I desire to submit that I asked the Senator from Colorado to have the amendment passed over. I understand that there may be some question of administration.

The amendment I am about to submit to the Senate reads as follows:

The Administrator shall furnish upon request to any Member of Congress the names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose wage or pay is a thousand or more dollars annually.

Mr. President, let us find out where the money is going, and what they consider to be "administration." I believe they are hiding over a hundred million dollars under the term "project supervision," which is actually administration, and they say that it is none of our business to know how it is spent. I read one letter this morning. Let me read another letter from the W. P. A. Administrator in reply to my request for the pay roll. He said:

We have not made it a practice to give out information concerning the individual salaries and addresses of employees except those in a position to formulate policy or direct major portions of the operations. We have felt that the public could have no legitimate interest in such information and that its release would very possibly result in these persons being subjected to solicitation from salesmen and the gossip of neighbors.

This is the only pay roll of a Government department that is not open to public inspection. City pay rolls are open, county pay rolls are open, State pay rolls are open, all Federal pay rolls are open except the W. P. A. pay rolls, and they are not open even to a Member of the Senate, who must pass upon the appropriations. For this reason I feel that Congress should put this amendment into the law,

so that the W. P. A. cannot get around it, so that it will be stated as the actual legislative policy that the Administrator shall be required to give the information to Congress when it desires to have it.

Mr. ADAMS and Mr. REED addressed the chair.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. If I heard the amendment correctly, it would enable any Member of Congress to get the complete list of employees drawing more than a certain sum throughout the United States. It is not limited to the District of a Representative or the State of a Senator, as I understood it.

Mr. HOLT. I am perfectly willing to limit it.

Mr. ADAMS. There are 38,000 employees, roughly, and I am thinking of the clerical work which might be involved.

Mr. HOLT. I can appreciate that, and I shall be glad to confine it to the names, positions, addresses and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration in the State of the Congressman.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the Senator from West Virginia. I merely wanted to inquire the date of the letter he read.

Mr. HOLT. I do not have the exact date of the one I just read. The last one was dated October 20, 1938. I read it in reply to the Senator from Michigan this morning.

Mr. REED. Who signed that letter?

Mr. HOLT. The one I read relating to gossipy neighbors was signed by Mr. Hopkins. The other was signed by Mr. Williams. Both of them refused the information.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator very much. I heartily agree with the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, if he will confine it perhaps so as to make the administration simpler, according to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HOLT. I think the suggestion is wise.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am perfectly in sympathy with the idea that these records should be available, but it seems to me a little unusual that the entire pay rolls should be available upon the request of any Member of Congress. Why not have a mandatory provision in the law that a report should be made to Congress periodically, every month, let us say, or at any convenient time, so that the information will be available to Members of Congress? It is a little unusual to provide that individual Members of Congress may call upon any department for a list of its employees, so that they could get them for their own individual benefit. The information ought to be reported to Congress, it seems to me, and we could make such use of it as we saw fit.

I make the suggestion to the Senator because I think it is an unusual precedent to provide that any Member of Congress can, upon writing a letter, get a list of all the employees in any department of the Government drawing more than $1,000 a year. Would the Senator be willing to modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. HOLT. The reason why I do not think that answers the problem is that the W. P. A. has taken an unusual attitude toward this matter. It is the only department of the Government that refuses the pay roll. I hope so, at least.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. I am not so certain that I could write a letter to the Interior Department, or to any other department, and get a list of the employees drawing a certain salary. I have never attempted it, and I am not certain that I would not get the same sort of reply the Senator received. Regardless of all that, however, it seems to me unusual to put such a list at the disposal of any individual Member of Congress. We might as well say that any Member of Congress could write to the Secretary of the Treasury and get a list of all those who pay income taxes over a certain amount. Those lists are available to Congress.

Mr. HOLT. That is entirely different, because that is a private record, but this is information as to an expenditure of public money.

Mr. BARKLEY. The income-tax record is a private record, but it is a private record with reference to a public matter, that is, the payment of taxes. There is an analogy between the two. I am just suggesting this to the Senator in the interest of good, orderly legislation, because I think, after all, it is going quite far. I am not going to oppose the amendment in its present form, if it is voted on in this form, but I do think it would be better to provide a mandatory provision that the reports should be sent to Congress. Then any Congressman could obtain them for any use.

Mr. HOLT. That would entail decidedly more work on the W. P. A., because some Senators might not want the information.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose all of them did want it, and they wrote separate letters; the W. P. A. would have to make 96 separate replies.

Mr. HOLT. It certainly would not hurt them to make reports on the expenditure of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. They might have to employ more W. P. A. workers to get the reports out, if we made the request.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HOLT. With pleasure.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from West Virginia, and also to the Senator from Kentucky, that it seems to me either one of the proposals is too broad and that to carry either proposal into effect would be too expensive. To carry out the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia would take a great deal of time; it would consume the time probably of one or more clerks in each division, wherever there was a large number, and under the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky there would be someone making reports regularly right along every 2 weeks or every month, and that would consume much time.

There is another objection, however, which it seems to me is more important than what I have suggested. I believe these lists ought to be public, that anyone ought to be able to have access to a public record. If we leave it as the Senator from West Virginia has it, we will subject Members of Congress to very serious criticism. It will be claimed at once, it seems to me, that they are building up a fence around themselves, and that access inside will be denied to the public. Conceive the result. It seems to me that hundreds of times, in very election where a Member of Congress will be running for reelection and someone is opposing him who is not a Member of Congress, there will be available a list of names, a list of voters, in the State or in the district where the election is held. That list will be worth something. It will be accessible to the Member of Congress and not accessible to his opponent, and there will be criticism, which it seems to me will be justified.

We cannot afford to pass a law providing that there shall be furnished to us a list of names of voters which we do not permit our opponents to have. Why could not the Senator modify his amendment so as to provide that the list shall be made public, so as to give access to the list to anyone interested in getting the names? I think the Senator's idea is a good one. I am in favor of his proposal. However, I do not wish to surround it with what seems to me to be a dangerous limitation, in that we would have available a list of names which our opponents could not obtain.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I feel that every individual should have a right to know how every penny of relief money is spent, but I do not know of any way the information can be made public except in the manner suggested. Other agencies publish such information, but the emergency agencies do not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it would be easy to provide by law that these records shall be public records.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all that has to be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is really all that is necessary, and then anyone who is interested could go and look at them.

In addition to what the Senator from Nebraska has said, we heard in connection with the tax bill the other day about a sort of a racket. It was called to our attention by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. Someone was selling at so much per page or per list the names of those who made over $15,000 a year as salaries in private industry. We adopted an amendment to the measure which prohibited the publication of any such information.

I am afraid that someone who may want to sell a list of W. P. A. workers could get hold of it and sell it to someone who wants to advertise or to write letters to those on the list, or even use the list for political or other purposes. They might be in a position to impose upon the very men and women who are employed. They might even obtain such a list, and then send out an advertisement asking, "How much will you pay me for it?" We know that lists of voters are obtained from the registration books in every courthouse in the Unted States by those interested in getting them, and then are sold for some purpose, either to mail-order houses or to somebody running for office or someone else.

Mr. President, I certainly would not want to see W. P. A. workers harassed and imposed upon in such a manner.

Mr. HOLT. The W. P. A. workers will not come under the provisions of the amendment. It refers to those who are above the security wage.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know it refers to those making above a thousand dollars. However, they are on W. P. A., and if they are on W. P. A. they would be working for that particular branch of Government. However great the value of the information may be, however much we may be entitled to it and the public may be entitled to it, I do not want to see an amendment put into the measure which would make W. P. A. workers victims of men who might wish to harass them simply because they could get a list of their names.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know whether or not I heard the Senator from Kentucky correctly. I merely wish to be sure. Did the Senator say that he was afraid that the W. P. A. and W. P. A. workers might be used for political purposes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; I did not say that; because I am satisfied that probably some of them have already been used in the way of voting. I do not know of any rule which would deny a man running for office the right to electioneer with a W. P. A. worker who is a voter. What I said was that I did not want a list created in such a manner as to give to some advertising company or some mail-order house or somebody running for office an exclusive right to have such a list or obtain it and harass W. P. A. workers.

Mr. BAILEY. I merely want to say that I very much regret that I did not hear the Senator say that he had become afraid that the W. P. A. might be used for political purposes. I was hoping that he was becoming a little fearful on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not catch the Senator's remark. He was hoping what?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said that he was hoping something. I did not catch the word.

Mr. BAILEY. I was hoping the Senator was becoming a little fearful that the W. P. A. might be used for political purposes. I regret that the Senator did not say it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know just what implication the Senator has in his mind when he says he hopes I was beginning to become fearful. From the time the W. P. A. was established by Congress, I have here and elsewhere advocated openly and aboveboard that the W. P. A should not be used for political purposes, and that no man who works for it should be harassed or intimidated or coerced or in any way dealt with by reason of the fact that he had such employment. I have never approved of or in any way sanctioned such practices.

Mr. BAILEY. I had reference to the Senator's impassioned appeal to us just as we were about to adjourn last year on the subject of allowing those on W. P. A. the same freedom that was enjoyed by those who worked for the road commission or the highway commission in his State.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no apology for the statement I then made, and I do not retract what I then said—that a man working for the W. P. A. or any other branch of the Government ought to be as free in the exercise of his political rights as any other man working for anyone else in the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and that the Congress ought not to pass a measure, as we then intended to do and were about to pass, known as the Hatch measure. I wish to say that the statement made by the Senator that an annual report made about the matter that the Senator from West Virginia has in mind will not cover the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not say annual report only. I said we can compel them to make it as often as we want to.

Mr. BAILEY. We have very many temporary projects. It would not do us any good at the end of the year to know that on certain temporary projects more persons had been employed than were necessary. Mr. President, we are responsible for the administration of the work projects.

I am not disposed to bring up matters of this kind, but I happen to know of a small project in my State. I think its cost was $85,000. A friend in the city who had been working on the project filed with me a letter giving the names of 12 different persons serving on that project in the capacity of supervisors and in other positions. There were 12 of them supervising one small project. It happened to be on the eve of a local election. I filed a letter with the Administrator. I do not know what happened. He said he would investigate. I have never heard anything more about it. But that is happening in America. When a little project to provide work for people who are destitute is undertaken local politicians as well as Members of Congress and other men who undertake to manage this thing politically step right in and get one man appointed at $1,200 a year and another one at $1,400 a year; one is a timekeeper, the other is a supervisor, the other is an overseer. One looks after the ditching; the other looks after the banking; and the other looks after the woodwork. Senators will find that the W. P. A. has been loaded down from the beginning with that sort of thing.

The Senator from West Virginia is now simply asking that we adopt an amendment which will enable the Members of the Congress, who are responsible for the appropriation of this money, and ought to be responsible for its wise expenditure, to obtain the necessary information when they want it. A great furor is raised about this and that in order to prevent that being done. I am in favor of the amendment. I am in favor of the reformers standing for reform. They are on the inside now, but they should not cover up.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am a new Member of this body, Mr. President, and the first discussion in which I participated had to do with the confirmation of a former Administrator of the W. P. A. There was available the report of the committee of this body, which investigated the W. P. A. last year, the chairman of which committee was the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD]. That report divulged a great deal of mismanagement and corruption in the W. P. A. From that day to this every additional disclosure has shown more waste, more extravagance, more corruption.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] stood on the Senate floor and said it was the fault of Congress, and that the W. P. A. Administrator, who is now Secretary of Commerce, should not be held responsible, because the Congress had failed in its duty to prevent corruption in the administration of W. P. A.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate—and I beg the pardon of the Senator from West Virginia for taking up his time——

Mr. HOLT. Go right ahead, Senator.

Mr. REED. I call attention to the language on page 31, section 29, in the measure we are now considering, where it is provided:

(a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to solicit, or knowingly be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the campaign expenses of any individual or political party from any person receiving compensation or employment provided for by this joint resolution.

On page 32 in section 30 is some additional language dealing with that phase.

I say to the Senate that here is its opportunity to put a final stop to this extravagance and waste of W. P. A. funds appropriated by the Congress. The amendment possibly may not be in the most perfect shape that could be conceived, but if the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia should be adopted, and any Member of Congress could obtain this information at any time, it is my belief, Mr. President, that it would be made public quickly enough, and be available for public purposes, and would put a stop to these abuses. If the Senate is fair with itself and fair with the public it will adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to point out to the Senator with reference to the comment made by the senior Senator from Kentucky that the provision which was adopted the other day by way of amendment to the tax bill, provided that there was to be no sale of the information contained in the list in question. It did not prohibit publication by newspapers or magazines or any other legitimate or proper sources, for the dissemination of public information. I thought that perhaps should be recalled to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Senator. I wish to make a further statement about this matter. The Senator from Kentucky said that certain persons will procure the lists and sell them to others. I have always felt that the expenditure of public money is a public business, and whenever any person starts to hide public business we had better watch that individual, regardless of who he may be or where he may be employed. My amendment does not seek to have divulged the names of individuals on relief. All it seeks to do is to make available the names of individuals who make over $1,000 a year out of the relief funds. If the amendment should be adopted, Congress would save the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars because that is where they are hiding the waste in the W. P. A., and getting away with it.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my approval of the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. I am reminded of the expression used by President Woodrow Wilson. He said, "Let light into the dark places." That is what this amendment would do.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that this matter be taken to conference. Perhaps it can be worked out so that the language would be more scientific. I see no harm in taking it to conference and trying to work it out.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to point out further that we can limit the sale of this information.

Mr. HOLT. I do not think there has been any question about the use of the information. The information has been limited to only a few. It has not been available to the public. If one is on the inside, he can obtain it. I know it has been done just that way. Nevertheless, I wish to have the Senate go on record in a roll-call vote on this question, so that there will be no excuse for the conferees to say, "We accepted it as a matter of course. We do not care about it." Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the clerks did not get his amendment as he read it. If the Senator will send it to the desk, it will be very helpful.

Mr. HOLT. I shall be glad to send my amendment to the desk.

Now, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the proper place, it is proposed to insert:

The Administrator shall furnish upon request to any Member of Congress the names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose wage or pay is $1,000 or more annually.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from West Virginia, who has thought about the matter, would modify his amendment, I believe a serious objection to it could be met. I am in favor of publicity. I should like to have not only the salaries of $1,000 and more but all salaries made public records, which anybody could obtain if he were interested enough to inquire. We talk about publicity and the great good it does. Here we have an amendment which does not give publicity. I admit that the Senator from West Virginia and other Senators in good faith have taken the view that it does provide publicity. However, such an amendment would place a handicap upon Members of Congress. If such an amendment were adopted, we should see flaming headlines announcing that Members of Congress have shielded themselves; that they are able to obtain information which is denied to the public. Technically that objection applies to the amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to permit me to modify my amendment so as to provide that such salary lists shall be matters of public record?

Mr. NORRIS. Absolutely.

Mr. HOLT. Then I shall add that provision to the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator does not need to do that.

Mr. HOLT. I should like to have the amendment specific and then add the provision that such lists shall be matters of public record.

Mr. NORRIS. That would greatly help.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that if I write to the W. P. A. to obtain these lists and they are sent to me in a letter, then they become public records? How are we going to make them public records unless we provide by law that they shall be public records?

Mr. NORRIS. If we had the right kind of an amendment that would be the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. The information ought not to have to be sent to me as an individual Senator in order to be a public record. That is the point I am trying to impress upon the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is a valid objection. The amendment ought to provide that the lists shall be public records, accessible to all persons at any reasonable hour. Everybody would not want to obtain them; but persons who were interested could obtain them. If I were running for Congress in a certain district, perhaps I would want the lists. I could obtain them. The Administrator would have to send them to me. However, my opponent could not obtain them. What would the public say to that? What would any honest man say to that?

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I should simply say that the lists shall be available to any citizen of the United States at any reasonable hour.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; as all public records are. These lists are not any different from any other public records. It seems to me that would not only be fair to everybody but it would shield Members of Congress themselves from the charge which would be made if we should provide by law that we shall be entitled to such lists, but nobody else shall be.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I agree entirely with the Senator from Nebraska. About a year ago complaint was made to me about the large number of persons in the Works Progress Administration who were receiving large salaries. I went to the Administrator. Of course, he knew the names of all those individuals and the salaries they were paid. I suggested to the Administrator that he ought to have in his office a list of such persons, available to any person who desired to inquire. I think the Administrator in every State or every district ought to make available to any person the list of those who are on the W. P. A.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I accept the modifications suggested by the Senator, that such information shall also be available to any citizen of the United States during office hours at the Works Progress Administration headquarters.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think that provision ought to be in the amendment. I do not believe the Administrator should be required to send such lists to Members of Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to accept a substitute in the following language:

> The names, addresses, positions, and salaries of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose wage, salary, or pay is $1,000 or more annually, shall be public records and available to any citizen of the United States.

Mr. HOLT. That is satisfactory. I want it to be understood that that information is not hidden.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be a public record and available to any citizen. It could not be hidden.

Mr. HOLT. I think that language would be satisfactory.

Mr. President, I accept the modification, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the yeas and nays have been ordered upon the amendment first tendered by the Senator from West Virginia. The rules of the Senate require unanimous consent in order to modify it thereafter. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from West Virginia. He can obtain a writ of non exeat faciendum, or a writ of some other sort and compel the disclosure to him of those names, under the language used by the Senator from Kentucky. If the Senator wishes to accomplish the result he seeks, he should keep his amendment in the form in which it was in the beginning, and go ahead and fight it out.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suppose I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not yielded the floor to any other Senator. However, no one has paid any attention to me or the fact that I have the floor. Since I have the floor, I should like to say just one word in reply.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is not the only one.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I did not know the Senator had the floor. I thought the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] had the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not complaining about that. However, Mr. President, I am complaining about Senators who intimate or suggest that anyone is trying to cover something up. I do not think that it is in the mind of any Senator. The Senator from West Virginia has opened up a question which I think is important. I believe his ideas are correct about it.

All I care for is that the amendment should be broad enough so as not to injure anybody, and so that the charge may not be made that we are trying to cover up our own tracks. I think that charge would lie against the amendment as originally framed. If we said to any department of the Government, "You must give us a list whenever we write for it, and nobody else may obtain it," we would be open to such a charge. In a campaign for the House of Representatives or the Senate, lists are very important. They are used by all candidates and all parties for all kinds of purposes. The purposes may be honorable or dishonorable. But if the lists are public records, whatever the purpose may be, any citizen is entitled to obtain them. I do not wish to cover up these lists. Any insinuation that because we want a modification of the amendment we are trying to cover up something or we are not trying to do our duty is unjustified and uncalled for, so far as I am able to see.

The Senator from West Virginia has offered an amendment on a very important subject. It is an important amendment. He is entitled to credit for offering it, and he is entitled to credit for the manly way in which he has received any constructive suggestions to improve it. It seems to me there is no need for us to do anything but to get the amendment in proper shape so that it will apply to everybody and give no one an advantage.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky read the amendment as he feels it should be?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have reduced it to writing. Let me see if it does not satisfy the situation:

> The names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all employees of the Works Progress Administration whose compensation is $1,000 per annum or more shall be public records and available to any citizen of the United States, and shall be reported on the 1st of each month to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOLT. I think that is satisfactory.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion? I suggest that the Senator strike out the words "$1,000 or more" so that it would apply to everybody.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the opinion of the author of the amendment, whoever is the author. If the words "$1,000 or more" were stricken out, would not a person on work relief be considered an employee within the meaning of the amendment? Is that the desire of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator repeat his question.

Mr. HATCH. It was suggested that the words "$1,000 or more" be stricken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that if we include everybody——

Mr. NORRIS. That may be going too far.

Mr. BARKLEY. It means the name of every laboring man in a ditch somewhere digging a trench to lay a pipe; and it means everybody who works as much as a week. I think what the Senator from West Virginia is trying to get at is the salary lists of those who receive $1,000 or more from the W. P. A.

Mr. HOLT. The bosses.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that would include the bosses. I am sure they draw more than $1,000 a year. I think the amendment ought to be limited to $1,000, because otherwise it would include every man who works for a day or a week on some project.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. May I inquire from the Senator from Kentucky whether or not the amendment, in the shape he now has it, would require waiting until the end of the year to determine whether or not a man had received $1,000 or more? If the Senator from West Virginia is going to change the original form of his amendment and adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky, should not the language be "at the rate of $1,000 or more annually"?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it might be; but if the words "at the rate of" are used, that means that if a man is working for a dollar and a half a day—of course, it would be impossible for that to amount to a thousand dollars a year—but if he is working only for a day for $5 a day, or $2.50 a day, whatever the rate is, if he works only a day or a week he is working at the rate of something a year in case he works all the year at that rate; so we do not get away from the difficulty to which I called attention.

I do not think it is worth while to be too technical over this matter. What the Senator from West Virginia is trying to do, and what we are all trying to do, is to get a list that is public property of those who are getting $1,000 a year or more. It seems to me that is sufficient.

Mr. HOLT. I think the Senator is wise in that suggestion, because after the adoption of the amendment we should have to wait for a year to determine the compensation. I think "at the rate of" would specifically give us a list at the end of July; and I think the amendment should be modified to that effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will modify the amendment by putting in the words "at the rate of $1,000 per annum or more," so that it can be worked out. I have no objection to that modification. I think, though, it probably would require a report on a man who worked a month and never worked any more.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it seems to me that would be all right. The authorities might conceivably put on the employees just before election and work them for a month. I think the expression should be "at the rate of."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD and Mr. REED addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. HOLT. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota. Then I will yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Has the Senator accepted an amendment striking out the words "one thousand"?

Mr. HOLT. No; I did not do that, because I do not want it said that I am trying to get the names of relief clients. I do not care about the names of relief clients. I want to know who the bosses are.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLT. I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I do think it is advisable, if the Senator from Kentucky will permit me, to insert in the amendment the words "at the rate of."

Mr. BARKLEY. I have done it, and I am hoping we may vote.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, let the clerk read the amendment so that we may have a yea-and-nay vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I may modify my own amendment, of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may show the substitute which I am offering, and which I understand the Senator from West Virginia accepts, I will read it and let the Official Reporter take it:

The names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all employees of the Work Projects Administration whose compensation is at the rate of $1,000 per annum or more, shall be public records, and shall be available to any citizen of the United States on request, and shall be reported on the first of each month to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] to the amendment reported by the committee. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, it seems to me it ought to be made plain that the amendment is not meant to include those on the relief rolls. As a matter of fact, at the present time there are on the relief rolls persons who are paid at the rate of more than $1,000 a year.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment is a modification of my amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a substitute for it.

Mr. HOLT. I should like to accept it as a modification of my amendment, if the Senator from Kentucky does not object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no. Does the Senator desire to have it as a modification of his amendment?

Mr. HOLT. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kentucky if the language of his substitute provides for furnishing information about the amount of the compensation?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it provides for furnishing the names, addresses, positions, and compensation of all such employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment having been accepted by the Senator from West Virginia, the question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] to the amendment reported by the committee. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if that Senator were present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. O'MAHONEY (when Mr. SCHWARTZ's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained because of illness.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if that Senator were present he would vote as I shall vote, so I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. Making the same announcement as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], if present, would vote "yea" on this question.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—66

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Gerry | Lee | Schwellenbach |
| Ashurst | Gibson | Lodge | Shipstead |
| Austin | Gillette | Lucas | Slattery |
| Bailey | Green | McCarran | Stewart |
| Bankhead | Guffey | McKellar | Taft |
| Barkley | Gurney | Maloney | Tobey |
| Bridges | Hale | Mead | Townsend |
| Burke | Harrison | Miller | Truman |
| Byrd | Hatch | Minton | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Hayden | Norris | Van Nuys |
| Connally | Herring | Nye | Wagner |
| Danaher | Holman | O'Mahoney | Walsh |
| Davis | Holt | Pittman | Wheeler |
| Downey | Johnson, Calif. | Radcliffe | White |
| Ellender | Johnson, Colo. | Reed | Wiley |
| Frazier | King | Reynolds | |
| George | La Follette | Russell | |

NAYS—3

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adams | Murray | Smathers |

NOT VOTING—27

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Barbour | Capper | Hughes | Schwartz |
| Bilbo | Caraway | Logan | Sheppard |
| Bone | Chavez | Lundeen | Smith |
| Borah | Clark, Idaho | McNary | Thomas, Okla. |
| Brown | Donahey | Neely | Thomas, Utah |
| Bulow | Glass | Overton | Tydings |
| Byrnes | Hill | Pepper | |

So Mr. HOLT's modified amendment to the amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to ascertain if we cannot enter into an agreement for the limitation of debate. There are only two or three more committee amendments, and I think they are not of a major character.

I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the consideration of the joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the joint resolution or more than once or longer than 10 minutes on any amendment.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 13, after the words "shall be", to strike out:

available—
(a) After June 30, 1939, for the operation of any theater project; or
(b) After August 31, 1939,.

And insert "available after October 31, 1939," so as to read:

SEC. 25. None of the funds made available by this title shall be available after October 31, 1939, for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Works Project Administration.

And so forth.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I have a textual amendment, merely changing a date to conform to changes which have been made in the text, which I should like to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to strike out "July 1, 1939, or September 1, 1939, as the case may be," and to insert in lieu thereof "November 1, 1939."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, since it relates to the House text; and, without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The amendment simply provides that not more than 1 percent of the entire amount may be set aside to be available for projects exclusively sponsored by the Works Progress Administration. I have conferred with the Senator in charge of the bill, and, while he has not stated that he favors the amendment, he has no objection to its going to conference.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the amendment relates to theaters, does it?

Mr. WAGNER. It does. It is purely discretionary.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would relate also to musical and art projects.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes; or any other project which cannot possibly be locally sponsored. The amount is very small.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be considered to be in order, since it amends certain portions of the House text.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I understand the amendment calls for an expenditure of not more than 1 percent of the entire amount to be appropriated for the benefit of W. P. A. I should like to inquire as to what that 1 percent of the entire amount would be?

Mr. WAGNER. About $14,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like at this time to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate one phase of the relief bill we now have under consideration about which many have perhaps forgotten, that is, the W. P. A. theater project, which the Senator from New York just mentioned, and how it is being used by clever Communists to spread throughout the land their doctrine of destruction of American institutions.

It is with regret that I express my opposition to the theater project, particularly because some really worth-while things have been done in that activity. But they are far overshadowed by the damage done and the danger to America from the "red" propaganda being broadcast by the majority of the plays and the presentations of the theater project.

Among the worth-while accomplishments is the dramatization of events in America's glorious history, such as that of the Lost Colony of Roanoke Island, which has been put on several years past in my State of North Carolina, a very excellent picturization of American history. I wish every man here might see that presentation. The President of the United States was in North Carolina several years ago, at which time he was provided an opportunity of seeing that play. I am sure there must be a few others as meritorious as this project, but I very seriously doubt it.

By and large, however, the control of the W. P. A. theater project and most of its plays is in the hands of Communists, spreading the doctrine of communism at the expense of the American taxpayer. If the American taxpayers are desirous of paying for the spreading of communistic propaganda and literature all over this country, that is their business, but I am sure that the Members of this body know enough about the sentiments of their constituents to have already ascertained as to whether or not they are desirous of voting funds to continue to spread the communistic propaganda at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, this fact alone should compel us to condemn the W. P. A. theater project to the ashcan of oblivion. Its sins far outweigh its good deeds.

We are now asked to dip deeper into every American taxpayer's pocket so that the Government can continue in the show business, losing millions upon millions of dollars, and paying the bills for the dissemination of the revolution made in Russia by the hundreds of radicals who have chiseled into the control of the project at the expense of the Treasury.

According to the amendment just offered, the author of which is the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], he is asking us to vote $14,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to those in this country who are spreading the doctrines of communism and who are bent upon either changing our form of government or overthrowing the present Government of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the Senator does not mean to imply that everyone engaged in the theater business is a Communist?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. I take it that the Senator realizes that there are many splendid citizens of America who are engaged in that line of business.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Unquestionably, absolutely.

Mr. McCARRAN. If, perchance, there may be on the relief rolls men or women who are inclined to favor communism, but who are American citizens, nevertheless, should we deny relief to unemployed and starving Americans simply because here and there there may arise something which savors of communism?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. My thought, following my question, is that the more we bring communism out into the open, the more America understands it, the more it will know what it is condemning.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Quite so.

Mr. McCARRAN. America should condemn communism, but it should know what it is condemning before it condemns. Therefore if, perchance, there might be a play put on somewhere which had a communistic trend, would the Senator thereby condemn every actor?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Or every musician?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly not.

Mr. McCARRAN. Every artist; everyone of those who might benefit by the 1 percent of this appropriation?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator agrees with me, then I say that we cannot condemn the whole project because there may be some within it who are wrong.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am quite in accord with the Senator, but I wish to say to the Senator at this juncture that I oppose the expenditure of $14,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of this country for the purpose of spreading doctrines which are un-American.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the American people do not need to be taught, through the theater or through any other instrumentality, what communism is. We know what it is. We know its evil propensities, we know its objectives, and if any of the theaters which are being subsidized are engaged in propaganda in favor of communism, I think we ought not to go into the Treasury of the United States and aid them in their comunistic activities.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator. Now, in reference to the statement made by the Senator from Nevada, permit me to say that at the outset this evening I spoke of the lost colony at Manteo, Roanoke Island, N. C. There is nothing with reference to the play picturing that incident which pertains to communism, and I am absolutely confident and positive that no one with communistic leanings is now, ever has been, or ever will be connected with that project, and I should dislike very much indeed to see that project interfered with as a result of what I now present for the attention of Senators.

But I will say to the Senator that if the project has to be hampered as a result of lack of appropriations it would be best to hamper it rather than to permit projects all over the United States to continue as they have been going, under the direction of those who are spreading communistic propaganda. I say that the time has come when the representatives of the American people should say to them whether they are for those who are supposed to represent our form of government or whether they are for the Communists. The American people are demanding that we let them know where we stand, and I am trying now to let them know where I stand.

Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that I am standing in the rear of the Chamber; and when it is convenient for him to look back this way, I should like to have him consider me.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should be very happy to consider the Senator from Florida, but at the time he arose my attention was attracted by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am very much in sympathy with the contentions of the Senator from North Carolina, but I call his attention to page 25 of the committee print, paragraph (b) of section 18, which I supported in the committee. It is as follows:

> No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates * * * the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

It may be that that protects the appropriation along the line where the Senator is looking for protection.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution, and I will say to him that I am in high hopes that that portion of the paragraph he read will provide protection for those who are engaged in projects if they are continued. That is for the protection of American citizens who are not preaching the doctrine of communism.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the very fine utterance of the Senator from North Carolina is concurred in by me, but the Senator from North Carolina cannot brand me, and I do not believe he can brand other Members of the Senate, as being in sympathy with communism because we may vote to feed some hungry people who practice a particular art or follow a particular vocation. We deprecate and we despise anything which would tear down American institutions. I do not belong to a class which ever yielded on that subject. We fought for and we will die for American institutions. But because there might be here or there someone who might express himself as he saw fit does not justify branding a great class of hungry people who have given themselves to a particular art as being all communistic. So that I am not ready to say that those who are hungry and out of employment but, nevertheless, belong to the theater class or the musician class, are all Communists. I am going to vote for the amendment, because I want the hungry fed, not because I want to encourage communism.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, the Senator knows that it was furthest from my thought to infer that anyone here was in sympathy with the Communists. I know that there is no one in this body who is in sympathy with them. As for feeding the hungry, I have voted for every appropriation for the W. P. A., to help the unfortunate men and women who are out of employment, to provide them with food and shelter and clothing, and the only time I have failed to vote for appropriations was when recently we were asked to appropriate $150,000,000, and appropriated only $100,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say that I am going to continue to vote for appropriations from the Treasury of the United States so long as there is a hungry man or so long as there is a hungry woman in the United States. We can get money to do other things, and we can get money to do that. I am directing my remarks toward those workers of the Federal theater project who are allied and associated with and are members of the Communist Party. I know, as others know, that there are thousands of fine men and women in the W. P. A. project who are bitterly opposed to the Communists who are associated therein with them, and many Communists have charge of the W. P. A. projects.

I gladly yield now to my distinguished colleague the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator from North Carolina aware of the fact that beginning on page 24 of the joint resolution there appears the following provision?—

> SEC. 18. (a) No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless such person before engaging in such employment (or prior to August 1, 1939, in the case of any person employed before such

date who has not taken an oath of office) subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am familiar with it. In addition to that, I think the measure requires that every person securing work on W. P. A. must of necessity have made an affidavit to the effect that he is a citizen of the United States of America.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator also aware that immediately succeeding that provision there is the following subsection (b) on page 25:

(b) No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is not the Senator satisfied that those two provisions contain an adequate safeguard against Communists, as the Senator describes them, being the recipients of the appropriations provided for in this measure?

Mr. REYNOLDS. A safeguard to a certain extent, quite true. In addition to providing certain safeguards, I will state to the Senator that I have prepared an amendment to the section on page 22 which will require every person to state in an affidavit his place of birth—if not born in the United States, then in his native country—the date of birth and place of entry into the United States.

The point I make is this: According to the amendment the Senator proposes, that we make expenditure of not more than 1 percent of the entire amount, which, I have been informed by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], will amount to about $14,000,000. I am opposed to making an expenditure of $14,000,000 for something from which the American people will not benefit, and I say that the American people have received less from their expenditures on W. P. A. as the result of the Federal theater project than anything else, and I do not see why we should be called upon to spend millions of dollars for a project merely for the purpose of protecting perhaps a minority element in this project, as mentioned by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator from North Carolina aware that there are approximately 7,000 persons now engaged in the theater project, and that that kind of work is the normal means of those people for making a livelihood, and if they are diverted into some other kind of work it is taking them out of the work they are fitted to do?

Mr. REYNOLDS. But the difficulty about the theater project is that real actors are not employed. Most of them are "hams." They play to empty houses. The receipts from the Federal theater projects will evidence to the minds of all who have read the hearings that the greater number of them, according to my recollection, are not real actors.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the other day when hearings were in progress before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee some of the most eminent actors and producers in this country upon the legitimate stage came here at their own expense, and they took a day to ask the Appropriations Committee, and through the Appropriations Committee the Senate, not to destroy the arts program that was being presented to the American people through the theater project?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am aware of that, but I am also aware of the fact that those gentlemen and ladies who testified are not working for the W. P. A. theater project.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator also aware that some of the most eminent actors in Hollywood, who are not working for the W. P. A., but such persons as Tallulah Bankhead and other eminent actors and actresses who came down here, do appreciate the contribution that this arts program is making to the American people? Is the Senator also aware of the fact that all these eminent artists who derive no personal benefit from the project, but who ought to know something of the legitimate stage, came here to testify about its worth to the American people, and not one of them receives any money from it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I read in the newspapers that they were here to testify in regard to the matter, but I did not read their testimony before the committee. I base my opinion upon certain pages of testimony that I have here from the record, which I will read in a moment.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I will say that I have a break-down of the affiliation of the personnel of the Federal theater project in my home State. While I agree with the Senator in his desire to rid this and other projects and the country, so far as that is concerned, of the so-called "red" menace, I know the Senator will appreciate the affiliation of the personnel and recognize in it a bulwark against communism.

A break-down of the 3,222 people employed on the New York City Federal theater project as of the month of May 1939 reveals two things: That the vast majority belong to old-line and officially accredited union groups and that the belief that they are not professionally qualified theater people is untrue.

From this total of 3,222, let me cite a few figures: One thousand one hundred and fifty actors, 85 percent of whom belong to one or another theatrical union of long standing and the majority of them to Actors' Equity, an affiliate of the A. F. of L.; 417 stage hands, who are 100 percent members of the I. A. T. S. E., also an affiliate of the A. F. of L; 300 musicians, all of them members of Local 302, American Federation of Musicians, an A. F. of L. affiliate; 200 shop employees, divided among 9 unions which, with the exception of the unaffiliated Public Address System Operators Union, are all A. F. of L. organizations; 23 box-office cashiers, all of them members of the Theatrical Managers, Agents, and Treasurers Union, affiliated with the A. F. of L.

The remainder, or 1,132, belonging to such groups as technicians, designers, promotion workers, and so forth, are to a large degree not affiliated with any professional union.

It is apparent that employees of the Federal theater project owe their allegiance to regular and professional A. F. of L. theatrical unions. The A. F. of L. unions in the theater can be accused neither of subversive actions nor of unprofessionalism.

The sponsorship would further indicate the removal of this project from alien or communistic influence. The cosponsors in my State include public and parochial schools, Seamen's Home, Salvation Army, Ingleside Home, Twentieth Century Club, St. Giles Home, St. John's Church, Westminster House, American Legion, Adult Education Centers, Wheel-Chair Home, Mount St. Joseph's Normal School.

I know the Senator, in his lofty desire to put down communism, will agree at once that the sponsorship in the union affiliation, so far as my State is concerned, indicates that it squares with the high ideals of Americanism that the Senator is trying to bring out, and is bringing out, in the debate today. They want the Senator's help in order that they may vindicate rather than vitiate the high and lofty ideals for which they are fighting. The only way that can be brought about by such limiting and restricting amendments as the Senator from Florida has read to us,

is by way of acquiescence in the suggestion of the Senator that the matter may go to conference, and in order that Americanism, which I know is uppermost in the Senator's mind, may prove itself by the help and the assistance we shall give, by the adoption of the amendment, to the right-minded people, who outnumber all the others, as the Senator from Nevada well said, and who are included in this relief measure, and who need our succor, and our support.

I hope the Senator from North Carolina will continue his fight, and at the same time allow the amendment of the senior Senator from my State [Mr. WAGNER] to go to conference so that the Senator's program may be developed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the junior Senator from the State of New York for his fine contribution. I was particularly happy to have him read the names of those excellent organizations a moment ago, and I was vividly impressed by the mention of the American Federation of Labor and the American Legion, for the reason that I know, as most of us know, that the American Federation of Labor will not permit a Communist in its ranks, and the American Federation of Labor is fighting communism, as are the junior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from New York and all other Senators.

I recall with much pride that the junior Senator from New York has but recently returned from my State of North Carolina, where he delivered a marvelous address before the members of the American Legion at Raleigh, our State capital, at the convention of the American Legion, and I know and the Senator from New York knows that the American Legion is another one of those outstanding organizations of America which is constantly fighting communism.

I have been told and I have read and I have learned from some of the reports that the Workers Alliance, a subsidiary of the Communist Party in this country, is directing the activities of the theater projects; and I have received information in regard to this matter relative to activities of the Communists in our Government, under Government control, and that is the thing I am fighting.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain that I want to help the actors and the writers and others of similar professions who are unfortunate and are not able to find work, and in that respect are like plumbers and carpenters and bricklayers. A writer, however, cannot go out with a pick and shovel, as can those who have been accustomed to such work. My only idea and the only thing I have in mind is that which is uppermost in the minds of the junior Senator from New York, that if there is any part of this Government in which we find Communists actively engaged we want to get rid of that activity on the part of the Government.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the able Senator from North Carolina, because he has the floor, that I should like to express my views. America has nothing to fear from the standpoint of communism. The democracy that was born in this country was born to endure by reason of a knowledge of democracy. What we in America have to fear is fear itself produced by someone who forever and always talks about the bugbear of communism. If we will only bring communism out in the open, take it by the two ears and look into the eyes of the thing we shall have nothing to fear.

Communism is a protoplasm that lives in a media of fear, and nothing else, and so long as we have fear, so long will communism prevail, but so soon as we disperse fear and communism comes out into the open, then American democracy in all its grandeur, which has put communism down since the day it first arose, will put communism down again. The trouble is that there are those who forever use the bugbear of communism to scare someone in order that they themselves may rise up and thus be held up as the champions against the so-called danger of communism.

I wish more of communism could be brought into the open, so that the boys of America might learn to despise the thing from the cradle up. If we could only bring it out or forget our fear of it, and damn it, and crush it, it would go out of existence so fast that the able Senator from North Carolina would not have to put forth the splendid energy he has displayed today.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say to the Senator, in partial answer to what he has said, that I was very happy a moment ago that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] brought to the attention of the Members of this body an amendment to the joint resolution which provides that one who is opposed to the Government in thought or activity shall not be given any sort of employment under the appropriation we are about to make. I wish to say to the Senator that I am in perfect accord with what he has to say. I do not believe communism will ever reach the point in this country where Communists will take charge of the Government, as they have in Russia. They will never be able to make the progress in this country that they did in Spain. There was a tremendous tussle in old historic Spain; and during the trials and tribulations of that internal revolution, which lasted from July 1936 until only a few months ago, more than 2,000,000 people were slaughtered. I hope that communism will never gain the foothold in this country that it did in Spain, where it brought about the murder of hundreds of thousands of Christian people. I say that communism will never gain a foothold in this country to the extent of taking charge of the Government for the reason that Communists do not believe in God. Communists believe in the destruction of places of worship, and the American people will never be brought around to that viewpoint.

Mr. HOLT and Mr. HUGHES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANAHER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator from West Virginia has been endeavoring to obtain the floor for some purpose. I yield first to him, and then I shall be glad to yield to the able Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HOLT. Speaking of communism, the statement has been made that it appears only here and there in the theater project. In April 1936 the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the work of Mrs. Flanagan, who is in charge of theater projects, according to the Senator from Pennsylvania. Mrs. Flanagan wrote the play in which the leading character was a Communist by the name of Wardell. I read from the play. This is Wardell speaking:

> Don't you see, Rose, it ain't Purcell that's wrong. It's the plan we live under; it's the whole system. Listen! Maybe I think, like you, that there'll come a time when there'll be shootin'. But today ain't the time. Maybe there'll come a time when we can stand on our feet like free men, instead of crawlin' on our bellies askin' for help. But that time ain't come yet. Some of us believe in a time comin' when everybody will have to work, and there'll be enough work for everybody. Some of us believe that the land and the crops and the cattle and the factories belong to the men that work 'em. But we ain't strong enough yet to take 'em. And that's why some of us think it's more important to work for that time than to shoot up a few rich guys now.

That is from the head of the theater project, according to the Senator from Pennsylvania; and he quotes his authority in Mrs. Flanagan's own words.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What was the name of the play? Was that the one called Barking for Your Supper?

Mr. HOLT. No; according to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the name of the play is Can You Hear Their Voices? I did not hear them.

Mr. REYNOLDS. To which Senator from Pennsylvania does the Senator refer?

Mr. HOLT. I refer to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] who put the material into the RECORD.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I see the senior Senator from Pennsylvania in the Chamber.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to yield. Has the Senator from West Virginia finished?

Mr. HOLT. Yes. I merely wanted to call attention to the head of the project, who says the plan is all wrong. "It is not yet time to kill them. We will kill them later, when we

have enough strength." That is the theory of the head of the theater project.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on April 20, 1936, I placed in the RECORD the material which was read by the junior Senator from West Virginia. I was thoroughly convinced at that particular time that those who were of the extreme radical type had practical control of the theater in New York. Since that time, and since we have begun to talk about this communistic group in the theater, a change has come about, and I believe it is a change for the better. The joint resolution now provides that W. P. A. administrators must take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. I think we are just now on the eve of taking these theatrical projects from the extremists. There have been, and there are now, some very fine people working in the W. P. A. theatrical projects.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely.

Mr. DAVIS. They are the finest people in the theatrical world. I was more or less connected with the show business in my younger day; and today I see the men of my age in that field unable to find work anywhere. If we did not provide for them under this project they would be out looking for a place with a pick and shovel, or some other kind of work, which would take away work from those accustomed to manual labor. I wish to read a letter which came to me under date of June 20:

I am writing to you to urge you to do what you can on behalf of the Federal theater W. P. A. project. I agree that this project has heretofore been manhandled by radicals in and around it. No doubt they could and should be eliminated in any new Federal theater project. Further changes could be provided to eliminate all those in the project who are not bona fide actors of long standing. This class of people, made up of individuals unsuited for manual labor, have spent their lifetime in the work of relieving us of our daily care once in a while, and are as much entitled to the provisions of W. P. A. as any other group of artisans or laborers who are in an impossible position at this time.

He goes on to say:

Frankly, I condemn many of the practices and abuses which have grown out of the W. P. A. system in this country. However, as long as we are having a W. P. A. I believe that this class of people to whom I have referred above ought to be provided for.

So do I. I believe in this project. I believe it could be administered in such a way as to give satisfaction to the people generally.

Let me read a letter from the other side of the question. Here is a letter from a young married woman who has had children:

MY DEAR SIR: I am not quite sure I could be most fervent in my plea for the retention of the Federal theater in W. P. A. and spending program now sent to the Senate. I cannot be explosive, nor can I beg. Perhaps it might better to state the story of the one typical Federal theater worker I know best—my father. All his life has been spent in the theater. He is now beyond the age where he is welcome in any other trade. He knows no other.

He has contributed much to the theater in the United States. At one time he was considered the very top as a director of stock. Radio, talking pictures, and the depression robbed him of his profession.

Mr. President, in my State today thousands of men have been robbed of their positions because of the machine age, and they are marching by the hundreds to get on the W. P. A. I see this actor, as I see others with whom I worked, marching today to try to get a job on W. P. A.

Listen to what this good woman says, speaking of her father:

He comes from an old family that settled in this country in 1623. Among his ancestors was a Governor of one of the earliest colonies. He is an American through and through.

I can see that actor in his younger days pleading for every charitable venture in my community, and doing his part. Now, he comes asking us to continue a project which might keep him from misery and want, the Federal theater.

This good woman goes on to say:

The Federal theater was a godsend to my father, after his workless years, just as it was to the thousands of actors everywhere, and they proved it by their subsequent records of achievement. They were not youngsters. They were seasoned professionals. What are people to do now? How are their families to live? My father has a child still dependent upon him. My husband and I can help but very little. We have a family of our own. I have always done my best and I shall continue to do so, but that can be very little, and will prove unsatisfactory.

O Mr. President, I know the time and the energy and the money he has contributed toward the cause which the Senator from North Carolina is advocating today. He has gone all over the country condemning those who are trying to undermine the Constitution of the United States. I do not know of a Senator who would not join with him to help crush communism in our midst. I agree with the Senator from Nevada that the sooner we bring it out in the open the better for us. But let us not throw these men of the stage out on the street. Let us not drive men to do things that they are not competent to do. Let us go ahead and clean our house of this communistic element, whether it be in the theater, in the factory, in the countinghouse, or wherever it may be. Let us wipe it out here in America, and not have a deserving man denied what he received under the W. P. A.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have been seeking to obtain an agreement with respect to debate during the further consideration of the joint resolution. With the permission of the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH], who objected to my previous request, I now modify the request I made a while ago. I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of this measure no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes on the joint resolution, nor more than once or longer than 15 minutes on any amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the senior Senator from Pennsylvania for his fine contribution to this debate. But let me once again make myself clear. I am in favor of providing employment for all actors, actresses, artists, and writers, so long as they are Americans; but I am opposed to spending any of the taxpayers' money to spread the propaganda of the Communists in this country.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. There was much ado a moment ago about the oath that was required to be taken. In the July issue of National Issues, published monthly by the National Committee of the Communist Party, on page 17, I find the following:

The much-referred-to oath that workers on W. P. A. would be required to take, a section in the bill apparently intended for face saving to WOODRUM and his friends, makes the whole affair still more ridiculous. Communists will surely take that oath and take it with genuine sincerity.

In other words, it does not bother the Communists themselves.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What magazine is that from?

Mr. HOLT. It is from National Issues, for July 1939, on page 17.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Is that a communistic publication?

Mr. HOLT. On the inside cover it says:

Editor: Gene Dennis. Published monthly by national committee, Communist Party, U. S. A.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator. I believe no one will say that the Communists are not making headway in this country.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say that the expression which the able Senator from West Virginia has read is undoubtedly true. Communism, as we understand it, has no regard for God, so any oath may be taken.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In reference to the spread of communism, I desire to remind the Members of this body that there are 168,000,000 inhabitants of Russia. I dare say

that the greater portion of them do not believe in communism, but nevertheless the minorities there are controlling the majority.

In addition to that, we know the headway they have made in Spain, the difficulties they caused there, and we know, in reference to the Asiatic situation, that about two-thirds of China is communistic and controlled by the Communists. At least we certainly know that both Inner Mongolia and Outer Mongolia are under the direction of independent soviet states.

Mr. President, we all have learned from the great works of the theater; we all have enjoyed the splendid and dramatic portrayals of life as presented across the stage. But, Mr. President, I ask the attention of every colleague for the moment to weigh carefully the tripe being served across the footlights by the W. P. A.

It is bad enough to have to put up with ham actors—actors of whom the New York newspapers say in their reviews that they "have not acted and never will," hundreds of whom have had only the thespian experience you and I got in going through high school, or maybe it was in Sunday school playlets when we were children.

But it is worse, Mr. President, when we look over the bill of fare the W. P. A. offers to sell its unsavory collection of communistic, un-American doctrines, its assortment of insidious and vicious ideologies, to the audiences drawn to W. P. A. presentations. Of course, we can thank God that the audiences are small, judging from the box-office records of W. P. A., which show a loss that would drive insane any ordinary theatrical producer.

A few years ago our colleague, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], speaking in the Senate on useless expenditures by the Federal Government, made one of the most entertaining speeches ever made in this Chamber, I believe. He read the titles of a mess of barnyard literature being issued by the Department of Agriculture. I recall that speech, which I read prior to the time I came to the United States Senate. My recollection is that it was in 1931. I recall that one bore the title "Love Life of a Bullfrog," but it did not have the label, "Written by and paid for with money from the pockets of the American taxpayer."

These putrid plays being presented by the W. P. A., Mr. President, are even more ludicrous than the booklets about which the Senator from Mississippi spoke. There is one great difference. The booklets were inane and comparatively harmless. All they did was to waste some of the money of the taxpayers. But that is not the case with the plays being presented by the W. P. A. theater project—plays that definitely bear the trade-mark of "red" Russia in their titles; plays that were spewed from the gutters of the Kremlin and directed by Communists, so that there could be no weakening of the ideas being spread through the American public. Let us take up a few, the kind that one would not find in the list of "shows you must see" in any reputable publication; the kind, however, that every Senator should see or study, so as to convince himself that the Communists mean business in their efforts to take over America by hook or crook, and are using to the fullest extent the funds of the American taxpayer to put themselves in a position to strangle the taxpayer when they have finished rifling his pockets.

Here is Up in Mabel's Room, which is comparatively clear. Then there is A New Deal for Mary, who probably needed some sort of deal, just as we need to deal out of the game such costs as keeping up with Mary's deal. Mother Goose Goes to Town is another. From looking at the losses of the W. P. A. theater project, I should say that Mother Goose had been sold down the river instead of going to town.

The only persons who have been going to town have been the Communists who are disguising their red pills with salacious coverings so as to lure, like a siren, all who can hear. The titles of the plays speak for themselves; and I judge that the only literature ever read by those in charge of the W. P. A. theater project was written by Boccacio, or bore the name of Cassanova.

We will start off with The Mayor and the Manicure before going to see A New Kind of Love; and, if we are not careful, according to the W. P. A. play schedule, we can Be Sure Your Sex Will Find You Out. Then, after we are found out, we can be A Boudoir Diplomat, from which we can go to Cheating Husbands; and, once this palls, we probably might enjoy Companionate Maggie.

Of course, one play presented by the theater project might come under the heading of necessary historical, Biblical, and cultural research. That is the question posed in the title, Did Adam Sin?

Once we have settled this question, we might take in any of the following, or perhaps all of them if we chose, and round out the evening in a manner which, if we were to describe it on paper, might violate the postal regulations against obscene material:

Go Easy, Mabel; Just a Love Nest; Love 'Em and Leave 'Em; and then we have Mary's Other Husband by way of diversion.

I join my colleagues in saying that some of these titles perhaps may be a little bit misleading; but there is a side far more serious in the fact that through such material the cardinal keystone of communism—free love and racial equality—is being spread at the expense of the God-fearing, home-loving American taxpayer who must pay the bills for all this dangerous business.

Recently there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 7234, a lengthy statement showing that the directors of a W. P. A. theater project attempted to persuade an actress to have a date with a Negro who had visited the project. Mind you, this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those of you who desire to check up on it may find it on page 7234. One Trudy Goodrich, secretary of the "red-handed" Workers Alliance which has been issuing great floods of propaganda to prevent congressional elimination of the theater-project fund, told this actress:

I personally encourage Negro attention on all occasions, and go out with them—

Any time she was asked. Trudy, as an employee of the Workers Alliance, which fattens on the dues paid by relief employees from money received from the United States Treasury, is helping us spend whatever we appropriate for a theater project. Trudy told this girl who refused to go out with a Negro, and one of her supervisors named Harold Hecht said to her that the Negro was entitled just as much to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as was the girl. The girl, however, felt that she herself should choose what constituted the pursuit of happiness.

Do you think the American taxpayers would approve of our financing Trudy in her pursuit of happiness with whatever men of whatever color she might choose, under whatever condition and in whichever gutter might please her?

The Workers Alliance is functioning as the buzzard that picks the bones of the unfortunates on relief everywhere. But in the Federal theater project this communistic-controlled organization is even more active, because through the stage the propaganda of Stalin may be widely spread, and the American taxpayer pays the bill.

A few moments ago I mentioned the fact that the majority of the "actors" employed by the W. P. A. in its theater project were not really actors, but were amateurs trying to acquire some sort of status, or they were misfits and failures who had been unable to meet the rigid requirements of the profession for survival.

An investigation conducted by the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, and set forth in some detail on page 2682 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows that of some 12,000 theater workers some 50 percent, or 6,000, were qualified as actors by W. P. A. That is what our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] stated a moment ago. I desire to state again that I was delighted to have his contribution in reference to the amendment of the Senator from Florida. I believe the report shows that the proportion was about 50 percent, and that 50 percent I want to take care of. I know that the

senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] wants to take care of them, and so does the junior Senator from the State of California [Mr. DOWNEY]. I know that these Senators want to take care of those who are deserving of help, but I know that they do not want to take care of anybody who is preaching the overthrow of our Government, or who is not in sympathy with the form of government that we have.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WAGNER. I expect later to say a little more about this matter; but I desire again to call the attention of the Senator to a provision of the pending title which says that—

> No portion of the appropriation made under this joint resolution shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

That is an absolute prohibition against the payment of any compensation by W. P. A. to any person of the type to which the Senator refers. So absolute protection is provided against the employment by the United States on W. P. A. of any of these persons who preach communism, or who are believers in communism. What else can we do?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator from New York for calling that provision to my attention.

Mr. WAGNER. I am wondering whether we are to leave hungry and without employment the 7,000 men and women who are workers, who are stage hands in the theaters. I am going to say something about the plays a little later. One or two or three persons may have been guilty of subversive activities, but they have been cleaned out.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I desire to repeat, I do not want any real actor or artist or writer to go hungry, and I want to see that they are cared for, just like the bricklayer, or the mason, or the plumber, or the carpenter, or anyone else. But I am bringing these things to the attention of the Senate because I want the American people to know what has been going on in the Federal theater project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANAHER in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. REYNOLDS. O Mr. President, it was my understanding with the majority leader that the agreement would apply only after I had finished speaking. The majority leader came over and spoke to me and wanted to know if I would object to the agreement after I had finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will accept the statement of the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator from New York, for my information, whether the language which he just read describes a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know; but we were talking about those engaged in subversive activities in this country, and I assume that this is a definition which applies to the type of person who advocates the overthrow of the United States by force or violence. If there is any language which may improve or perhaps make more comprehensive this prohibition, I am quite willing to accept it. I am not the author of this language, but it was undoubtedly inserted to protect us against employing anyone who advocates any of these subversive doctrines.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have great respect for the Senator's opinion, and I am asking solely whether he would consider that membership in the Communist Party falls within the inhibition.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not thoroughly enough acquainted with the doctrines of the Communist Party in this country, but when we have been talking about Communists I think as a rule we are referring to those individuals who are advocating the overthrow of our Government by force or violence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the course of his observations the Senator said that this applied to Communists, and I am trying to determine whether he would consider membership in the Communist Party as being within the inhibition.

Mr. WAGNER. I am not an authority upon the subject of Communists at all.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator from New York has stated in regard to the oath, I desire again to bring to the attention of the Senate a communistic publication, one article entitled "Politics in W. P. A." This is from the pen of Mr. George Morris. Mr. Morris says:

> The much-referred-to oath that workers on W. P. A. would be required to take, a section in the bill apparently intended for face saving to WOODRUM and his friends, makes the whole affair still more ridiculous. Communists will surely take that oath and take it with genuine sincerity. In the oath the worker will swear to defend the Constitution "against all enemies, foreign and domestic"; and state that this obligation is taken "freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion," and that the duties on W. P. A. will be "faithfully discharged."

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. This was brought to my attention by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT]. It appears in the magazine called "National Issues," for July 1939, and this is the first time I have ever seen a copy of it.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WAGNER. I wish to correct the Senator to this extent. At the time I read from the bill I was not referring particularly to the oath that was required to be taken, although that is also a protection, but I was referring to an absolute prohibition in the joint resolution against paying anyone any compensation out of the funds here provided who advocates, or is a member of an organization which advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence. So, in addition to the taking of the oath, there is the absolute direction to those administering the fund that they cannot pay any of the money appropriated to anyone who entertains any such subversive doctrines. Therefore, there is a double-barreled protection. If the Senator can propose anything else to cover the matter, I should be glad to have him do so.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Irrespective of whether the plays about which the Senator has been reading teach communistic doctrines or not, I am wondering, if we are to spend our money to provide labor for unemployed artists—and I am in favor of the idea of taking care of the unemployed actors and actresses in this way—whether we are not overlooking one thing which we really have an obligation to look after. We are spending the people's money, and apparently a good many of these plays, if they do not teach communism, teach anything but morality. It is the people's money we are spending. Whose business is it, if we spend the money in this way, to see that that money is spent so that the morale of this country shall not be shot to pieces?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is the business of the Director of the W. P. A.

Mr. WILEY. Then why should we not put our finger there and say, "Hereafter when you spend that money you will spend it in such and such a way or you shall not get the money for that purpose"?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Why should we not designate someone to pass upon the plays?

Mr. WILEY. I have just seen a list of the plays, which was exhibited to me by the Senator from West Virginia, and they are supplemental to what the Senator has already read into the RECORD. An examination of them indicates that the plays are very malodorous. America's money should not be used to encourage such productions.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much for that contribution.

Mr. President, the Equity Association, the actors' union, has a total membership of only 4,500, and I dare say they are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. I stated a moment ago that the American Federation of Labor does not have any Communists in it. They will not stand for Communists in their organization. The American Legion was mentioned by the junior Senator from New York. We all know that the American Legion has been fighting communism, as we find the Veterans of Foreign Wars fighting it. The American Federation of Labor, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are the three outstanding organizations, amongst others, which are fighting all the time the spread of communism.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator knows that the American Federation of Labor is strongly supporting the amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, yes; I understand that, and I say that there are no Communists belonging to the American Federation of Labor. I am with the American Federation of Labor in its effort to support actors who belong to their union, but I am not willing to support Communists and those affiliated with the Workers Alliance, who are in this.

By the way, I wonder whether the Senator would accept an amendment to the paragraph carrying the prohibition relative to those who should receive pay, that any one who has ever been affiliated with the Workers Alliance, or who is now affiliated with the Workers Alliance, will be barred from participation. I wonder if that would be accepted. I ask that it be accepted as a part of the amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. I suggest that the Senator offer it as a separate amendment.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would have it apply to anyone who has belonged or belongs now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will wait until the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] returns to the Chamber.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I hope the Senator from Colorado will accept the amendment. I am sure he will because everyone knows that the Workers Alliance is a part and portion of the Communist Party in this country.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I wonder whether it would help any from the Senator's point of view with respect to the Communists to whom he refers, if we inserted in line 21, page 24, the phrase "or as a worker." At present the language reads:

> No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position—

And so forth. At that point I would add "or as a worker on any project." Would not that help?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Who advocates the overthrow of the Government?

Mr. LEE. No; make him take the oath the same as those who work in administrative or supervisory positions—make the provision as to taking the oath apply to the workers as well.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think it should apply to them, and I shall be very glad if the Senator from Oklahoma will offer such an amendment.

Mr. President, I see in the Chamber now the able senior Senator from Colorado, and I will say for his information that we were discussing the matter of those affiliated with the Federal theater project. The able Senator from New York has brought to my attention again the matter of the oath which has to be taken by those securing employment with the W. P. A. I mentioned the fact that the Workers Alliance seems to be in control of this project, and everyone knows that the Workers Alliance is in alliance with the Communist Party, and I wondered whether the Senator from Colorado would be good enough, in the interest of the American people and the taxpayers, to accept an amendment providing that anyone who has ever been affiliated with the Workers Alliance or who is affiliated with the Workers Alliance be barred from participating in the W. P. A. theater project.

Mr. ADAMS. No, Mr. President, I would not, because, while there may be Communists in the Workers Alliance, I would not be willing to join in condemnation of everyone who belongs to that association, because there are many in it who do not come within that characterization.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, I know hundreds of people in the State of Indiana who belong to the Workers Alliance who do not know that there is such a thing as the Communist Party.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I know a great many people who belong to the Workers Alliance, and I have never seen or heard of one who has not heard of the Communist Party. As a matter of fact, I do not know of anyone in the United States who has not heard of the Communist Party. I know there is no one in North Carolina who has not heard of the Communist Party, because the North Carolina people are well read and up and doing about everything. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, to repeat, the Equity Association, the actors union, has a total membership of only 4,500 and requires that to be a member the applicant must have had at least 2 years on the professional stage.

It would seem as though groups of young people who are eligible or partly eligible for relief were told to register as actors and were given salaries by the Federal theater. This amazing discrepancy between acting and actors probably is attributable to Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, director of the Federal theater project, and who formerly was connected with the drama department of Vassar College. I doubt that Mrs. Flanagan has ever had any real experience in the cold practicalities of presenting dramatic productions.

This would be indicated by the fact that the W. P. A. theater even hires understudies for actors who even have nothing to say in a play—the actors who make the noises off stage, and so on. Not satisfied with these extras, the W. P. A. theater project gives its actors vacations with pay at the rate of 2⅓ days' vacation for each month of work. That is more than the Federal Government gives its regular employees and considerably more than private industry can afford to give.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator was speaking about his amendment providing that anyone who belonged to the Workers Alliance should not be permitted to obtain relief. I have no doubt that there are some of the leaders of the Workers Alliance who belong to the Communist Party, but, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has pointed out, there are thousands of people, there are thousands in my State, who belong to the Workers Alliance——

Mr. REYNOLDS. Who are not affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. WHEELER. Who are not Communists.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is no doubt true.

Mr. WHEELER. Who would not in any sense join the Communist Party. Frankly, I rather doubt the wisdom of inserting a provision in reference to taking the oath before a man can get relief. I do not like the idea of saying to a man, "You have to take an oath and swear allegiance to the United States before you can get a little pittance or get on relief."

I think the committee really went too far.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, the Senator knows that some of the outstanding leaders in the Workers Alliance are Communists, and members of the Communist Party.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no doubt of that. I know that some of the leaders of the Workers Alliance in Montana belong to the Communist Party, and openly admit they do.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. Nevertheless, it seems to me a man ought not to be discriminated against simply because he belongs to the Workers Alliance. The Senator from North Carolina a moment ago said that no Communist belongs to the American Federation of Labor. Let me say that Communists will be found in the American Federation of Labor, to my certain knowledge. I have known of Communists belonging to the A. F. of L.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator does not mean to infer that the American Federation of Labor will knowingly admit Communists to its ranks.

Mr. WHEELER. No; but, as a matter of fact, Communists may be found in all sorts of organizations. The organizations cannot be condemned simply for that reason. Communists will be found among the Masons, among the Knights of Columbus, in patriotic organizations, and in churches; but we cannot condemn a church or any organization simply because there may be some bad people in them. We cannot condemn fraternal and patriotic organizations simply because some bad persons belong to them. Good people and bad people are found in every walk of life.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to say in that connection that I condemn the Communist Party regardless of the fact that there are some good people in it.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but when the Senator says that persons are all Communists simply because they belong to the Workers Alliance I think he is mistaken.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say that I know many persons who belong to the Workers Alliance who are not identified with the Communist Party.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the Senator that some of the things that the W. P. A. has permitted the theaters to produce are idiotic and have brought discredit upon the W. P. A. I say that when the W. P. A. permits persons to ridicule certain Senators, as they have done, so I have been told, and ridicule other public officials, that is a very silly and a very foolish thing for them to do. Notwithstanding the fact that they may have ridiculed some of our colleagues, or have ridiculed the courts, I must say that I believe that is no reason why we should deny relief to needy persons. What we ought to do is to hold responsible those who permit money to be spent for such purposes. I condemn the heads who are responsible for permitting such things to be done. I do not know who is responsible for it, whether it is the head of the W. P. A. in Washington, the head of the W. P. A. in New York, or the head of the W. P. A. somewhere else. Whoever permits such things to occur should be held strictly responsible. In the first place, it is not the right thing to do. In the second place, it is a very short-sighted policy. I do not wish to go so far as to keep persons from obtaining such work simply because there may be some fools belonging to the organization.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I may say to the Senator from Montana that I assume that he has read in virtually every magazine in the country and virtually every daily and weekly newspaper criticism of the W. P. A. theater project. And may I say to the Senator that I likewise will go further in assuming that these newspapers and magazines, many of them, have condemned the W. P. A. theater project because of the fact as they allege, that it was spreading communistic propaganda. What I am trying to do is to get those who are spreading communism in the theater project out of it. I say that those who are responsible for the spread of communism thus far through the instrumentality of the various avenues of the W. P. A. theater project should be discharged. They should not any longer be permitted to direct the activities of the W. P. A.

Mr. WHEELER. I am entirely in accord with the Senator in believing that those directing the W. P. A. theater project in whatever community, whether at the top here in Washington or in various cities, who permit such things to continue, should be held responsible. They may not necessarily encourage the spread of communism, but if they permit such things, and are spreading communism and using public funds to do so, then they ought to be discharged from the job.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; I yield to the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator just a few moments ago read the name of a young woman. I have met that young lady but once. She is a graduate of Vassar. Her name is Mrs. Flanagan. The able Senator from North Carolina used her name in his manuscript. I wish to say that from my very brief visit in my office with this young woman I would testify, if I were required to under oath, that she is a loyal upstanding American citizen of the very highest type. I regret exceedingly that her name should have been brought into this discussion in such a way as to be at all denounced in connection with communism.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, evidently the junior Senator from Nevada was not in the Senate Chamber when I made mention of Mrs. Flanagan's name. I want to go back and read what I said to the Senator. There is no reflection made upon her whatever. I never even mentioned Mrs. Flanagan in connection with communism. I wish to repeat exactly what I stated:

> Mrs. Hallie Flanagan, director of the Federal theater project, and who formerly was connected with the drama department of Vassar College. I doubt that Mrs. Flanagan has ever had any real experience in the cold practicalities of presenting dramatic productions.

I made that statement because the information I have is that Mrs. Flanagan was the head of the department of dramatics at Vassar College, but never was connected with the legitimate theater itself outside the college.

I would have the Senators know that I have not reflected upon Mrs. Flanagan, and I would not think of reflecting upon her. Mrs. Flanagan is well known. She is a lady of the very highest type. There is no finer woman in America than is Mrs. Flanagan. That is all I said. I did not mean to infer that she was a Communist. I said that the only experience she had, insofar as I could learn, was that she had been at the head of the department of dramatics at Vassar College.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. If Mrs. Flanagan is interested in those who are in this particular art, to which she has given all her life work, if she is interested to the extent that she wants them to have a living in their particular inclination, in their particular bent in life, then I say that the mere fact that she was never herself a star nor assumed to be a star, nor went on the professional stage, should not be a matter of criticism.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am going to take issue with the Senator right there, Mr. President. I think that those who are in charge of the theater project should be sufficiently experienced to handle the matter in the way it should be handled. Let us read the statistics in reference to the Federal theater project, and we find that it has not been at all successful.

So far as the business management of the W. P. A. theater project is concerned, no one will deny that it is terrible. I did not attend any of the meetings of the committee. I did not read all of the hearings, but I read a part of them last night. In the investigation by the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives we find that W. P. A. projects were in rehearsal for from anywhere from 3 months to 2 years. Months and years in which terrific costs were being piled up, whereas the average theatrical production, according to qualified experts, is seldom in rehearsal more than 4 or 5 weeks, in which time the play is made ready for public appearance.

I say that there has been mismanagement. We ought to have had people at the head of the W. P. A. theater project who had had practical experience in the field. That is the trouble about many things that are going on today. We are getting many persons from colleges that have never had any practical experience. It would have been better had we taken some person with old-fashioned common horse sense.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, Representative DEMPSEY, in speaking of the director of the theater project, recently said:

> In connection with the Federal theater project the Dies committee investigated that situation very thoroughly. So far as the director of that project is concerned, she came voluntarily to the committee and gave us free, clear testimony. She is not a Communist nor a "fellow traveler." She is a highly efficient, splendid American woman.
>
> This testimony is amply borne out by the record of background and attainments of the national director, a director for 10 years of a theater which became famous here and abroad for its imaginative productions of both the classic and new plays; the winner of the first Guggenheim scholarship ever awarded to a woman; sent by this foundation to make a study of government in relation to theaters in 12 different European countries.

Mr. President, this distinguished woman is Mrs. Flanagan, who has undoubtedly had much valuable experience and

apparently has all the qualifications necessary to enable her to perform her official duties in a most satisfactory manner.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, of whom is the Senator speaking?

Mr. NEELY. Mrs. Flanagan.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Please, I want the Senator to understand, and I am sure the Senator would not leave the wrong impression so far as my attitude is concerned. I have not reflected upon the character of Mrs. Flanagan. She is a lady of the finest character. I am only making mention of the fact that she never had any practical experience, judging from the report of the committee who made the examination.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, what I have said was submitted for the purpose of refuting the insinuation that the management of the theater project is tainted with communism——

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have not even suggested to the slightest degree that Mrs. Flanagan is in sympathy with communism. I do not want to leave a false impression.

Mr. NEELY. I did not mean to charge the eloquent Senator with having accused Miss Flanagan of being a Communist.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have the highest respect for Mrs. Flanagan, and there is no lady in all America of higher character than Mrs. Flanagan. I say only that from the investigation made it was found that there has been mismanagement in the W. P. A.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, what I read tends to prove that Mrs. Flanagan is entitled to all the compliments that have been paid her both by the Senator from North Carolina and by the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], in all of which I enthusiastically concur. It also demonstrates the fact that she is eminently qualified to perform the important duties of the office which she now holds. The efficient Mrs. Flanagan constitutes one of the many unanswerable arguments in favor of the adoption of the pending amendment, proposed by Senators WAGNER, DOWNEY, and PEPPER, for which my vote will be cast.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I was present in the committee room when Mrs. Flanagan appeared and gave testimony in support of the theater project. I have also talked to many of the theatrical people who are interested in the maintenance of this project. My understanding is that Mrs. Flanagan is regarded by all of them as a lady of outstanding ability in the theatrical profession. That she has been trained and has a knowledge of the theatrical work these people are doing beyond anyone else who could possibly have been obtained for that position.

There is much misrepresentation with reference to the program they have been carrying out. Tonight on the floor of the Senate a paragraph was read from a play which purported to have been given by the theater project in which the spokesman was supposed to be advocating communism. As a matter of fact, that was a play that was produced at Vassar College. I have before me a statement with reference to it. A single sentence was picked out which created the impression that the whole purport of the play was to advocate communism, whereas if the play had been read further it would have appeared that the purpose of the play was to bring out the subject and to prove that communism was a bad thing for the country, and that the proper course for Americans to follow was good, patriotic, democratic principles.

Here are other sentences from the same play, which I should like to read into the RECORD, in reply to what was read from the floor of the Senate a short time ago.

FRANK. What do you want us to do? Have a revolution, like in Russia?

WARDELL. No, Frank; that's just what Davis and I want to prevent.

DRDLA. What did the revolution do for Russia? Once people laughed in the fields. Everyone was gay. Now, people are hungry there. No one laughs any more.

ANNE. This is the United States of America we live in, and we got a President and a Congress and a Government to look after our interests, and I want my boys should respect that Government and know that that Government ain't goin' to let us down.

So, if one reads the play in its entirety, it is obvious that the whole purport of the play was to denounce communism rather than to support it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? What I have to say deals with what the Senator from Montana has said.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Montana says that I was the one who put the material into the RECORD. He said that I said it was a W. P. A. project. I said no such thing. I said it was a play by Mrs. Flanagan which was read by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I wish to say to the Senator from Montana that he also has not read the play, but it was sent in to him in order that he might try to correct it.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. HOLT. The Senator from Pennsylvania says that the hero of the play was a Communist. I have not read the play. All I said was what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said about it, that it was a W. P. A. project.

Mr. MURRAY. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield in order that I may answer the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REYNOLDS. My time is rather limited.

Mr. MURRAY. As a matter of fact, all the theatrical newspapers of the country which commented on the play have supported it as a good play, and have said that it was not a play advocating communism. The book which I have here quotes from the New York World Telegram, from the Theater Guild magazine, the Austin Post, and the Theater Arts, showing that the play is not at all a play advocating communism, and that even though it was written by Mrs. Flanagan, it was a good sound American play.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. A few moments ago the inference was made that this group had not made a very substantial return; that is, the contribution which this group has made was referred to as being very meager. I happened to come into the Chamber at that time. I have before me a copy of the New York Times for Sunday, May 28, 1939, containing an article by Brooks Atkinson, probably the leading theatrical critic of the country, and certainly reporting in one of the most outstanding newspapers of the country. He says:

Two million six hundred thousand people are employed on W. P. A. projects throughout the country. Only 8,040 of them are employed in the Federal theater, between one-third and one-quarter of 1 percent. Among the 2,600,000 it would be hard to find another group of 8,040 that has accomplished so much and given so rich a social return on the money.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I shall not at this hour attempt to give my colleagues all the statistics which are available in the document I have before me, the record of hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations under House Resolution 130, part 1, pages 179, 276, 997, 1013, 1067, and 1115. These statistics show the tremendous wastes and extravagances of the theater project, which aggregated a cost of $5,000,000 from July 1938 to May 1939.

The Senator from New York has just brought to the attention of the Senate and of all those on the W. P. A. throughout the length and breadth of the land that, according to the records, between July of 1938 and May 1939 only 8,040 persons were employed in the Federal theater. They cost the taxpayers of the country more than $5,000,000. That being the case, they cost about 100 times more than the cost of maintaining the same number of men on any other W. P. A. project in this country. We can truly say, in the language of the theater, that Uncle Sam has been an "angel." When it is not known whether or not a show is going to be a success, the financial backer is called an "angel."

Approximately 99.99 percent of this expenditure was a dead loss, as the box-office receipts were virtually nothing.

Incidentally, a tremendous portion of the expenditure went for rental of theaters in which to present these so-called dramatic productions. For example, as indicative of the percentages found throughout all the individual presentations, one example shows rent of $8,156, telephone $2,866, miscellaneous $2,715, travel $589.

The record of the House committee hearing was filled with evidence of waste, such as purchasing 9,000 feet of a very expensive lighting cable for one play and leaving idle in another theater 7,000 feet of the same kind of cable.

I have my doubt as to the necessity of some of these people working on a W. P. A. project of any kind, such as Mrs. Audrey McMahon, who was the head of the art project in New York City. Mrs. Audrey McMahon was paid $300 a month. In addition, her husband was a professor at New York University. She is also the editor of a magazine. That good lady, a lady of excellent character and fine attainments and social standing, whose husband was a professor at the University of New York, and who was the editor of a magazine, was receiving $300 a month. I thought W. P. A. projects were for the purpose of helping people who did not have any money and could not get a job. At one time Mrs. McMahon made a trip from New York to a number of cities in the North and Middle West, costing $203 in mileage alone, paid by W. P. A. travel voucher; and the sole purpose of the trip was to stir up protests against reducing appropriations for the W. P. A.

Mr. President, I have previously referred to the fact that one actress was informed she should have gone out to supper to encourage the pursuit of happiness by a Negro, as indicative of some of the things that go on in the W. P. A. theater project. The investigation to which I have referred gives the record of play after play in which the theater project used a mixed cast of whites and Negroes, a practice never followed in the legitimate theater for reasons we can all understand.

I now again refer to the Workers Alliance, a witness of which, Mr. Charles B. Walton, in the theatrical business since 1907, stated before the House committee that—

> The Workers Alliance have absolutely dominated the Federal theater, and the present set-up, in my estimation, is nothing more or less than a very clever fence to sow the seeds of communism.

That is what Mr. Charles Walton said in giving testimony before the House committee. That statement is not mine, Mr. President.

Remember that a play by Voltaire caused the French Revolution. That is why the Communists have "muscled" into the theater project until they now control it, from all I can understand. From statements I have heard this afternoon there is no such thing as communism in the Federal theater project. I hope there is not.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to another thing of interest concerning the Federal theater project, and that is that the W. P. A. theater project and the Communist headquarters are in the same building. The Workers Alliance functions from the same building. There can be no doubt about the communistic control of the Workers Alliance, as the records of the Department of Justice show members of the executive board to be members of the Communist Party of America, as I stated a moment ago in reply to the statement of the senior Senator from Montana.

There is no doubt furthermore of the far-reaching campaign of the Communists through the Workers Alliance to spread their alien doctrines of ruin and destruction, their antichrist ideology by means of the theater project of the United States Government's Works Progress Administration.

Courses in Russian language were given in quarters donated by the Workers Alliance. Why should anybody be willing to spend money to spread knowledge of the Russian language in a country that has spoken English since its foundation? Why should the W. P. A. permit this to be done and why should the W. P. A. accept such services and facilities when offered by the Workers Alliance and anybody else?

Why should the Workers Alliance and other organizations of similar nature buy huge blocks of tickets to W. P. A. theater plays—and buy them at a discount of from 30 to 40 percent less than the regular box-office price? The tickets were then sold by these organizations at a profit—so we find the W. P. A. theater project financing organizations dedicated to tearing down the American Government.

Mr. President, in the theater business the glass roof over the entrance to a theater and which contains the names of the play and the stars is called the marquee. On the strength of the record established by the theater projects of the W. P. A. the only lights for which there has been any demand in the past for use on W. P. A. theater marquees are red. Rather than try to make them white, Mr. President, we should eliminate the lights entirely, the marquee entirely, and the Federal theater project entirely.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in connection with my remarks an extract from remarks delivered in the House of Representatives on June 15, 1939, by the gentleman from Michigan, Representative HOFFMAN, and found on pages 7234 and 7235 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. * * * Let me quote for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and for the benefit of the House the sworn testimony given on the 20th day of August 1938 before the Dies committee, under oath.

Miss Sallie Saunders, born in Vienna, Austria, a citizen of the United States since 1920, a resident of New York City since 1930, and an employee since March 3, 1936, with the exception of 90 days when she was on leave of absence, of the Federal theater project as an actress, testified, among other things, to the following, and I quote from her testimony, beginning on page 858, volume I, of the hearings:

"The CHAIRMAN. You are on the project now?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is the work that you are doing now?

"Miss SAUNDERS. As an actress.

"The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen with your eyes evidence of communistic or subversive activities on this particular project?

"Miss SAUNDERS. I can only say that literature has been sent around to me personally.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know that Communist literature has been distributed on the premises?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Surely.

"The CHAIRMAN. On one occasion you were called on the telephone. Will you go into the details of that without going too much into it?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir. On Decoration Day I received a phone call from Mr. Van Cleave.

"The CHAIRMAN. This year?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir; and he asked me for a date. I lived at the Fraternity Club, and there are a great many men there. I thought it was someone I met at the Fraternity Club. I said, 'Mr. Van Cleave, I do not remember you; when did I meet you?' He said, 'I was the gentleman who sketched you in Sing for Your Supper.' I said, 'There were 289 people down there, and I do not know more than 25 of them.' He said, 'I am the fellow who was sketching you.' The day before I had noticed a Negro making a sketch of me as I was dancing. He shoved the sketch in my face. I did not know his name and did not know anything about him. All I knew was that a Negro had sketched me. I signed out and left the building. At first I thought it was someone trying to play a joke on me, and I became very angry about it and asked how he got my telephone number. He said that he took it from a petition blank, or a petition to President Roosevelt which we all signed regarding the $1,000 pay cut. He took my name and address from that petition.

"Mr. MOSIER. How did he know that was your address?

"Miss SAUNDERS. He was one of the committee passing it around.

"The CHAIRMAN. After that time, when he asked permission to make a date with you, did you report it to the supervisor?

"Miss SAUNDERS. I reported it to Mr. Hecht.

"The CHAIRMAN. What did Mr. Hecht say to you?

"Miss SAUNDERS. He said, 'Sallie, I am surprised at you. He has just as much right to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness as you have.' He said, 'It is in the Constitution.' I said, 'Mr. Hecht, that happens to be in the preamble to the Constitution.'

"The CHAIRMAN. Let us not go into that. We know there is feeling in the matter, and we have to be very cautious about race feelings. You reported it to him, and he advised you, in effect, that he was in favor of social equality?

"Miss SAUNDERS. According to the Constitution, and there was some press clipping about equal social rights.

"The CHAIRMAN. Did you report it to anyone else?

"Miss SAUNDERS. I talked it over with Miss Coonan, and she was appalled. I requested for an immediate transfer, which was granted. I then reported the matter through a personal friend to Senator PAT HARRISON.

"The CHAIRMAN. Who was Mr. Hecht?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Mr. Hecht is in Sing for Your Supper.

"The CHAIRMAN. An employee of the Federal project?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. I think that is far enough. Is he connected with the Workers Alliance?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Mr. Hecht is of split nationality. He has a card in every organization which has the most power at the moment.

"Mr. MOSIER. What is his full name?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Harold Hecht.

"The CHAIRMAN. Did you report it to Trudy Goodrich?

"Miss SAUNDERS. She is a secretary of a Workers Alliance division, and she came to me of her own accord. She said she felt very sorry that I felt that way about it, because she personally encouraged Negro attention on all occasions and went out with them or with any Negro who asked her to.

"Mr. STARNES. Did she say that it was the policy of the Workers Alliance to do that?

"Miss SAUNDERS. She did not say that; but she is a representative of that party, and they hobnob indiscriminately with them, throwing parties with them right and left.

"Mr. STARNES. Is that a part of the Communist program?

"Miss SAUNDERS. Yes, sir; social equality and race merging.

"The CHAIRMAN. I think that is all. I thank you for your testimony."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to occupy about 10 minutes, but do not wish to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the Senator, with the understanding we have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not know what understandings may have been entered into.

Mr. ASHURST. I have no understanding, Mr. President. I am asking the Senator to yield to me.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield the floor to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized in his own right. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to speak on the bill or the amendment?

Mr. ASHURST. On the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall not require half that time.

Mr. President, much has been said here today about communism; and all Senators will appreciate the earnestness with which learned Senators have addressed themselves to the subject of communism. If a bill using the word "Communist" or the word "communism" should be passed by the Congress and should be signed by the President, the courts, in construing it, would have recourse to the dictionary to see what Congress meant by "communism." I now quote from Webster's New International Dictionary, published in 1927, the definition of communism.

Communism: A system of social organizations in which goods are held in common, the opposite of a system of private property.

That is one definition.

2. A system of social organization where large powers are given to small political units or to communes; communalism.

3. Any theory or system of social organization involving common ownership of the agents of production and some approach to equality in the distribution of the products of industry. Informally, socialism.

Next, the definition of "Communist."

One who believes in communism in any of the first three senses named, or attempts to put its principles into practice.

Therefore, we may fairly say a Communist is a person who is devoted to, or is propagating, the theory of extirpating and doing away with the right of men to hold property, and is maintaining the principle that all property shall be held in common. I see before me the learned Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who would adorn the Supreme Bench of the United States. I am quite sure if he were handing down an opinion he would say that what I have suggested is a fair definition of "Communist" and "communism."

Why, indeed, are the people of the United States so much opposed to communism? There is in an American an inborn, ineradicable, and sometimes inexplicable fear and dread of communism. No man in America is more opposed to communism, as I understand it, than am I, for the reason that communism would deprive an American citizen of what I believe to be one of his most precious rights, to wit, the right to hold property.

When the 10 amendments to the Constitution, called the Bill of Rights, were adopted, they set up, mark you, certain rights which inhere in all men, which belong to freemen. Even if they were not enumerated in any Bill of Rights, these rights and immunities would be a part of the liberty of a free person. The fifth amendment provides:

No person shall be * * * deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Further, in order to protect what I call a great human right, the right to hold property, the seventh amendment provides:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars the right of trial by jury shall be preserved.

It is provided in the fourteenth amendment:

Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

These provisions indicate that those who laid the foundations of American liberty realized that the right to acquire and hold property, large and small, the right to own a home, a farm, and to earn wages, was as dear as the right to jury trial, free speech, and the right to freedom of religion.

Indeed, of what avail would be jury trial, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion if this other great immunity, to wit, the right to earn wages and acquire property, which adds to the dignity of a human being, did not inhere in the free citizen?

I should not care a fig for a government which, forsooth, granted freedom of speech, and yet ironically deprived men and women of that other great human right, the right to earn wages and to own property. That is the reason why so many earnest, upstanding, sincere American citizens are opposed to communism. They know that communism strikes at one of their vital rights. They know that communism strikes at what I believe to be an——

Mr. WALSH. Inalienable.

Mr. ASHURST. Inalienable—I thank the Senator from Massachusetts—an inalienable right.

A President of the United States more than 34 years ago, in a speech, said he "always put human rights above property rights." Property has no rights. Think of a President using language such as that, putting human rights above property rights. A human right is the right to acquire property. A slab of paving stone is an insensate piece of rock. It has no rights. The right of men to acquire and hold property, large and small, and the right of men to earn wages, is not a property right—it is a human right.

Having said this much with respect to my view of communism, I agree that no person should be employed by or subsisted by the United States, or paid from its Treasury, who would strike a blow at those great rights of citizens, to wit, the right of free speech, freedom of religion, trial by jury, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, and to dignify himself by earning wages and owning property. I am against the Communists because they seek to deprive American citizens of a right that is as important as any other human right—the right to hold property.

We should preclude from being employed at the public expense any person who seeks to deprive human beings of this great right, the right to earn wages and hold property. Therefore I shall support any motion which will prevent the payment of Federal money to any person who says he is opposed to this American, this human, right.

Now, as to the stage and the employment of certain artists, I shall support any reasonable sum which has for its purpose the employment of actors and artists. Some Senators fear or believe some actors or artists may have taught communism.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], in appropriate phrase, said that the way to destroy communism is to draw it out into the public light and expose it to the public view; for when people learn by the exposure of this un-American thing, communism, what it really means and what it proposes to do, the American people will be against communism.

Citizens have a right under our form of government peaceably to advocate a system depriving you, sir, of the right of free speech. They have a right to advocate a law depriving you, sir, of your immunities as a free man. Citizens have a

right to advocate a system under which no man shall earn wages, and I oppose such a doctrine. Known to zoology are communal birds, birds that all occupy the same nest. In zoology there are communal or communistic birds. We have in America too many communistic birds. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. As I gather, the Senator is against communism. He is not in favor of paying any Communists from the Public Treasury.

Mr. ASHURST. Not from the Public Treasury.

Mr. REED. Unless they are artists?

Mr. ASHURST. No, sir; not at all. I would not employ at the public expense an artist who is a Communist.

Mr. REED. Perhaps I misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Arizona, whose attention was called to the fact that Communists had been employed and communism taught and communism spread, to which the Senator from Arizona is opposed, unless it is done by artists?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I would not employ at the public expense a Communist, but I would not be afraid to go and see an artist who was a Communist produce or act in a play. I am not afraid of any contingency of that kind, because I agree with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] that only by exposing the folly of communism can we cope with it.

Mr. REED. May I impose on the Senator again?

Mr. ASHURST. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. REED. That is to say, communism shall not be taught unless it is through the theater projects?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not say that.

Mr. REED. But, if communism is taught and the doctrine of communism is spread through these W. P. A. theater projects, the Senator is in favor of continuing them?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I say now for the third time—and the Senator is too keen in intellect to fail to grasp what I say—that I do not want anyone paid from the Public Treasury, whether he be artist, mechanic, or what not, who teaches communism. If one wishes to employ a Communist privately, I have no objection. That is his right and his business. If a Communist, at his own expense, desires to write a play and produce it, he has that right. If a man wants to urge that we should no longer have free speech, that is his right; but I do not want him employed at the public expense.

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

Mr. ASHURST. I propose to limit myself to 10 minutes, but I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Merely for a question. I take it that if some one advocated a deprivation of the right of free speech, the Senator from Arizona would not be afraid to listen to him.

Mr. ASHURST. I would not be afraid to listen to him, because I believe I could answer him.

I now want to say a word about the stage. I am probably not competent fairly to discuss the stage because of my tremendous bias in its favor. My body and my brain, if any, are in the Senate, but my heart has from boyhood been in the keeping of those princes and princesses of the House of Thespia.

The stage artists, the screen artists, and the vaudeville artists hold the mirror up to nature, and only through them do we ever see ourselves as others see us.

On the stage and on the screen we see our weaknesses, foibles, and pretensions made plain and then corrected. On the stage and on the screen the richness of human experience is laid before us, and all that is beautiful, all that is tragic, and all that is mournful in man's destiny is clearly shown.

The penetrating skill, the Attic salt, and the humor of the screen artist and the stage artist expose the shams and frivolities of a particular epoch, and not infrequently teach a nation the way of truth.

The comedies of Shakespeare enriched England, softened the cruelties of his time, and gave seasonable advice and admonition to monarch, to lords, and commons. There would have been no polished Elizabethan England except for Shakespeare.

Unnumbered thousands of our own generation have been charmed by the melodious airs and clever rhymes of the Gilbert and Sullivan light operas and the talent of those two gentlemen was so exceptional and their criticisms of official smugness and complacency were so deft and subtle that their productions were given audition and applause by the most prim and rigid of the mid-Victorians.

The drama is coextensive with the people and of all the arts, save music, it is probably the dearest to the human race. The stage is akin to poetry in that it is a great expression of human emotion. The stage is a vision of the romance inseparable from every human life; it is a magical place, breathing the inspiration of color and sound; a place for high thoughts, splendid truths, and beautiful words, for objects vividly observed and gorgeously imagined.

I hope the Senate will not go on record as censoring art. The stage is art. Art is truth, and in the final sum of worldly things, only art endures; the sculptures outlast the dynasty, the colors outlive Da Vinci, "the coin outlasts Tiberius."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] a while ago, I think in response to a question, stated that the 1 percent provided for in his amendment would provide approximately $14,000,000 free from any local contribution. I find from an examination of his amendment that the 1 percent applies to the entire amount appropriated in the joint resolution, which is one billion seven hundred and some odd million dollars, which would mean that seventeen million and a fraction dollars would be exempted from any local contribution.

I appreciate fully, and I sympathize entirely with the position of the Senator from North Carolina, and I will say to him frankly that when we vote on the 1-percent provision, I shall support his amendment. But I am wondering whether the Senator would not agree to modify his amendment by making it one-half of 1 percent instead of 1 percent, which would provide about $9,000,000 out of this fund, which would not have to be matched by any local contribution whatever. I have talked with Senators about it, and I think if the Senator could consistently accept such an amendment, it would facilitate the adoption of his amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I should like to give the Senator from Kentucky some figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator asked me awhile ago if I had the figures regarding the total expenditures on these projects from July 1, 1938, to May 31, 1939, which is practically the past year, on the various art projects. The expenditures for the theater project amounted to $9,947,000. The aggregate art project expenditures amounted to $5,000,000, the expenditures on the writers project amounted to $4,000,000, and on the historical records project $5,668,000. So there was a total expenditure in these various art projects of $35,503,000.

I am merely giving the figures so that the Senator can see the extent to which the half of 1 percent would go.

Mr. BARKLEY. When I asked the Senator for the figures I asked him for the 5-year period, and I understood him to reply that the amount expended for the theater, art, and writers projects amounted to a little less than $40,000,000 for the 5-year period. Evidently that was a mistake.

Mr. ADAMS. I was in error, because the figures I have given are the exact tabulations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon the total amount of the appropriation to which this amendment is applicable, it would provide approximately seventeen and one-half million dollars instead of the fourteen million the Senator from New York suggested awhile ago.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes. Of course, I bow to the statement of the majority leader of the Senate; but when the proposal is made to reduce the amount to one-half of 1 percent,

I call attention to the fact that the expenditure was reduced last year for these different projects, not only for the theater project, as was pointed out by the Senator from Colorado, but also the art projects. So even 1 percent would be about half of what was expended last year upon these projects. If we further cut the amount, it will represent practically one-fourth of what was spent last year.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems that the crux of this proposition revolves around the theater project. I am wondering whether it would not be possible to have local communities make a contribution, if necessary, in regard to musical and art projects. The suggestion I am making would permit the W. P. A. to go ahead with the theater projects. I realize that while the theater and the musical and similar projects are all grouped together, it seems to me there is a difference between the theater projects and others which are local and which are more or less stationary. They are rather fixed to the locality, more so than is the theater project. I wonder whether, if the Senator should accede to that suggestion—and I am not pressing it, but I am making it after some discussion here informally—it would not be possible for the W. P. A. to carry out the theater project without serious impairment and at the same time probably receive some local contribution for the musical and art projects, which are more stationary and more fixed to sites than are the theater projects.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me suggest, Mr. President, that there are a number of groups—I understand from the Senator from Florida about five—and I suggest that we eliminate from the groups the musicians. I do not think the local communities ought to be called upon to provide any percentage of expenditure for the musicians. The musicians have been harder hit in this country than have any of the other groups. I am perfectly willing, insofar as I am individually concerned, to eliminate the musicians, because we all know that the musicians, as a matter of fact, have been hit harder than any other group. I think the musicians ought to be eliminated.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator does not mean "eliminated."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I mean they ought to be eliminated from this phase of the legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt the wisdom of undertaking to mention in the amendment any particular class. It will be largely in the discretion of the authorities who administer the provision whether nine million or seventeen and one-half million or eighteen million dollars will be exempt from the requirements of local contribution.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In respect to that, I am suggesting that we exempt the musicians from the making of any local contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt very much whether it would be wise to exempt anyone in the law itself.

Mr. WAGNER. Let me suggest to the Senator from Kentucky, who has been in such a kind way attempting to assist in this matter, that if the thought of the Senator from North Carolina should be carried out, and the musicians should be cared for as they have been in the past, that alone would require the expenditure of $10,000,000. That was the expenditure last year for the musicians on W. P. A. So, if we will leave the 1 percent in the bill, as the amendment provides, and assume that reasonable care will be taken of the musicians, say by $7,000,000, instead of $10,000,000, we will be able to take care of the musicians as the Senator from North Carolina wishes to do, and have some money left—not so much as heretofore, but I am quite satisfied with that—and also take care of both the theater and the art projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is difficult to draw a distinction between actors and musicians and artists and sculptors. They all come in the same category. It is difficult to draw a line of distinction and say one shall be excluded and another included.

Mr. WAGNER. I was thinking of the total sum we would allow to be used for purely Federal projects. If we allow $17,000,000, that will take care of the musicians and will take care of the theater and art projects, though not to the same extent, of course.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I think there is, perhaps, some confusion in this situation. What we are dealing with is a provision in the joint resolution which prohibits the use of any of these funds for the operation of projects sponsored solely by the Works Progress Administration. If we did not have another provision, any form of sponsorship relatively small would meet the requirements. The problem is that we now have a 25-percent provision in the joint resolution, so that sponsorship is only required to meet the 25 percent. The P. W. A. takes care of the 75 percent, in any event; that is, there is no occasion to talk about sponsoring to the extent of 50 percent, because it comes out of the same pocket. It is merely a matter of making a provision which will meet the limitation that there may be no projects which are solely sponsored by the W. P. A.

Mr. WAGNER. Except those——

Mr. ADAMS. There is no exception. This provision does not refer only to the art projects. Here is a flat provision that no projects may be constructed which are solely sponsored by the W. P. A., so that if we are thinking only in terms of these projects, we need only 25 percent of the projects which the Senator thinks should have Government help in sponsorship.

There may be other projects which might require sponsorship. The percentage provided is not tied down by the amendment, as I have read it, to the art projects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator from New York and to the Senator from Colorado that under the provisions of the joint resolution requiring an average contribution of 25 percent in each State it will be possible for the W. P. A. Administrator to approve a project which requires only 1 percent of local contribution. Of course that would mean that some other project, probably a much larger one, would have to pay more than 25 percent, perhaps 30 or 35 percent. So that some of the artistic projects could still get by on a very nominal contribution.

It occurred to me, in view of the feeling I have been encountering, that if the Senator will make practically $9,000,000 exempt from any local contribution at all, with the possibility of making only 1 percent contribution, or 2 percent, or 3 percent, for these similar projects, even under the 25-percent average, it probably would be possible to work out a much better situation than is possible under the joint resolution as it passed the House, which bars all of them from any consideration unless there is local contribution.

I make that suggestion to the Senator from New York. Of course, it is entirely in his discretion whether or not he will accept it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a word of comment, the mechanics of the matter are somewhat difficult, it seems, but the Senator would not think it fair if we reduced by 50 percent the appropriation which was made last year for the whole arts program?

Mr. BARKLEY. If we were considering that all by itself, that would be one thing, but here we have a joint resolution which eliminates altogether, according to the House text, any project altogether sponsored by the Federal Government. So that all theater, art, musical, and other projects of that character are out unless there is a local contribution.

In view of that situation, it occurred to me that it might be well to try to work out a fair average which might make it possible for some of the more important and more emergent categories to be considered without regard to a local contribution, having in mind the possibility that, even under the 25-percent average, it still would be possible to provide some of these projects with a very nominal contribution.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to say in reference to what our leader has just stated that I am exceedingly anxious to have the musicians taken care of as they were cared for last year. I suggest that it might be agreeable to this body to provide for the musicians of

America as we did last year without any reduced appropriation insofar as their benefits would be concerned, and that we reduce the appropriation for the Federal theater project by 50 percent. I think that would be agreeable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the amendment applies not only to theater projects, but to all sorts of artists and musical projects. The 1 percent applies to all of them. I doubt the wisdom from a legislative standpoint of mentioning any particular one of these as being exempt or included. I think we have to leave that for the Administrator to work out. I sympathize with the Senator from North Carolina in this matter, because, as the Senator from Arizona has suggested, I would not like to see Congress or this Government say to men or women engaged in music as a career, to men and women engaged in acting as a career, which have been recognized professions from time immemorial, that they shall be barred from consideration. I realize that because of the nature of their employment it is frequently impossible to work up any local contribution for them. I appreciate all that.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator. There is another reason. Many of the theater projects have produced plays in more than one State, and the question might arise as to what State ought to sponsor a particular project. That is the reason why it seems to me to be unfair to put them in a class where they will have to have a contribution of 25 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree, because the cost of production may have occurred in one State altogether, and if they go around to various States that might require that each State make a contribution of its proportional share of the original cost of production, which would be impracticable.

Mr. WAGNER. That is so with the musicians. I am sure that those who are lovers of music have heard the symphony concerts of the Federal projects orchestras. These musicians have been going around to different sections of the country where it was impossible to organize a local orchestra, and the country has received the benefit of great cultural advantages. I say it would also be difficult to call that a local project, because a number of States receive the benefit of the music. That is the reason I think they ought to be treated somewhat differently than the projects we were discussing under the 25-percent contribution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that. Can we make it three-quarters of 1 percent? I am not offering it as an amendment to the Senator's amendment, but I think three-quarters percent would probably be a fair compromise. That would amount to about twelve million or fourteen million dollars, which would be earmarked as not requiring any local contribution.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment as modified stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 23, inclusive, and to insert the following:

SEC. 25. After October 31, 1939, not more than three-fourths of 1 percent of the funds appropriated under this joint resolution shall be available for projects sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Kansas comes too late. The decision of the Chair was announced after a long pause.

Mr. REED. I beg the pardon of the Chair, but there were several requests for a division which the Chair perhaps did not hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there were any suggestions made, they were not sufficiently audible to be heard here in the chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 11, it is proposed to strike out all of section 15 and to insert in lieu thereof the following——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that the amendment of the Senator from Nevada is not yet in order. It is an amendment to the House text.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understood that the committee amendments had been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not as yet been completed.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment, on page 38, line 24, which was passed over.

The amendment passed over was, on page 38, in line 24, after the word "establish", to insert "relocate", and on page 39, line 1, after the word "products", to insert "(other than those derived from the first processing of agricultural products)", so as to read:

SEC. 34. No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, or plants which would manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of agricultural products) in competition with existing industries.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I dislike very much to interrupt at this point, but I did intend to say something in answer to what the Senator from North Carolina said on the theater project, but I have had sufficient experience to know that there is a time when one should not speak.

I should like permission to insert in the RECORD the names of both individuals and organizations which have supported the amendment, and also a statement by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who, by the way, landed today in England in the *Yankee Clipper*. The Senator requested that there be printed in the RECORD the statement which he had prepared in support of the amendment in reference to the theater project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Senator CHAVEZ and the list presented by Senator WAGNER are as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ IN REFERENCE TO FEDERAL ARTS PROJECTS

Inasmuch as the House work-relief bill makes no provision for Federal-sponsored arts projects, I am leaving a live proxy with the Senate Appropriations Committee requesting that in the event that the subcommittee follows the House provisions in respect to this I have asked that my vote be recorded if an amendment is offered by the full committee in favor of Federal arts projects. I do this convinced that a careful and impartial study of what the Federal arts projects division of W. P. A. has done in the past will convince even the most biased of the tremendous cultural value of the accomplishment and further because of the need of the unfortunate persons who come under these types of projects which is equally as great as that of any other group in this Nation; and whose desire to live and work is quite as keen and should be just as respected as those of any other groups.

In New Mexico the work of the Federal arts projects has won the admiration and respect of all walks of life in every community. The artistic endeavors, I am told by authorities and persons competent to judge, rank with the very highest. Art which is termed "boondoggling" by prejudiced critics is welcomed and respected in New Mexico and I feel sure that the same condition exists all over this country. Theater projects in New Mexico have been enthusiastically supported by the communities. It is impossible to estimate the tremendous contribution which the writers project, for example, are making for the cultural advancement of the United States. I have in mind, for instance, a book which is now being prepared which has Nation-wide significance. The time when conflagration threatens in Europe and in the Orient and when the need of cementing closer relations with Latin America is so imperative anything which would benefit our relations with our neighbors to the south is not only helpful but an absolute necessity. The book which is being prepared by the Federal writers project is Study of Spanish Speaking People of the United States: 1540–1940. This book is the

epic of the oldest white inhabitants of our country, starting with the early Spanish settlements of the sixteenth century, and carrying the story down to the present time. The Spanish-speaking people are associated in the public mind with the Southwest. What is not so generally realized, and what is brought out clearly in this book, is that some of them migrated from the Mexican to the Canadian border and that they spread not only to the Pacific coast but as far east as New England and Florida.

The music, art, and historical records projects are cooperating with the writers project in the preparation of this study. It includes a detailed account of the Spanish-speaking people, and full treatment of their folklore, folk music, and folk art. With the exception of the Indians, the folk music of the Spanish-Americans of the Southwest has a longer history than that of any other racial group on our continent. Folk ways, folk songs, and folk games were brought in by the first hardy adventurers, and were handed down from generation to generation with comparatively little change.

All this material is being gathered together in the various State offices with the help of volunteer consultants from Spanish-speaking societies and from universities and colleges, and is being welded into a unified whole by the editors of the Washington staffs.

To my mind the success of pan-Americanism and of closer relations with Latin America is absolutely dependent upon an understanding by the citizens of the United States of Latin American philosophy and culture. We can find no better place to study this than in our own American Southwest, "The place where the Americas meet," to borrow a phrase coined by a very close friend and sponsor of pan-Americanism, Dr. F. M. Kercheville, of the University of New Mexico. This study which the Federal art project is in the process of making will develop information and material which will be helpful in promoting this understanding.

How then, can anyone call a study which is so necessary and so badly needed, "boondoggling" and "a waste of taxpayers' money"? The persons employed on such projects are needy and Congress has an equal responsibility to assist them as it has to other needy persons in the United States. This is only one of the many studies which the Federal arts project has under way.

I am leaving instructions that if there is a Senate vote on this that I be paired in favor of the amendment covering this point and I am asking that this statement be inserted in the RECORD.

EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT

Mr. WAGNER. The Federal art projects (Federal project No. 1) include the following five units: (1) the Federal music project, (2) the Federal writers project, (3) the Federal art project, (4) the Federal theater project, (5) the historical records survey.

Under the bill as now before the Senate, all of the music, theater, art, and writers projects, and the historical records survey, are required to obtain local sponsorship.

If the amendment is adopted, after October 31, 1939, not more than three-fourths of 1 percent of Federal relief funds appropriated in the bill will be available for projects sponsored solely by the W. P. A.

This means that over half of all these cultural projects will have to obtain local sponsorship by October 31. It also means that those phases of the music, theater, art, and writers projects which would be killed by the requirement of local sponsorship, can be continued under W. P. A. sponsorship. These include such important phases of the work as the music lessons for rural children, the traveling art shows, the traveling theater units, the books on regional subjects, such as the widely acclaimed Oregon Trail, Santa Fe Trail, guides to national parks, and many other regional projects.

Probably the most useful work done by the arts projects has been to bring music, painting, sculpture, drama, puppet shows, and literature to the remote rural areas of the country. People who would otherwise never see an oil painting or a wood cut, attend a musical concert or a legitimate-theater production have become acquainted with these arts for the first time through the W. P. A.

In short, the adoption of this amendment will enable those projects which obviously could not obtain local sponsorship to continue as W. P. A. Federal projects, while at the same time compelling all those which can operate under local sponsorship to be so transferred.

I want to emphasize that the attempt immediately to decentralize the arts projects cannot be justified on grounds of economy. The Federal Government contributes less in nonlabor costs to Federal project No. 1 than it does, for example, to the locally sponsored construction projects. The Federal contribution for nonlabor costs amounts to $4.85 a month per person for Federal project No. 1 as compared with $6 per person for all non-Federal projects.

It should also be noted that while the arts projects are now under technical Federal sponsorship, as a practical matter, through local participation in providing materials, space, services, admissions, and direct cash contributions, a high degree of local participation is obtained. Whereas local sponsors on all W. P. A. projects bear 53.8 percent of the nonlabor costs, in many units under Federal project No. 1, all the non-labor costs are locally borne, and more than 50 percent of them are locally borne in a majority of the units.

For example, the publication costs of all but two of the 300 volumes published by the writers project have been borne locally. In some localities, the music project is and has been under practical local sponsorship for a considerable period of time; in Massachusetts, it has operated for 2 years without a cent of nonlabor cost to the Federal Government. In addition, this project has taken in receipts amounting to $453,693, which, in addition to the sponsors' direct contributions, provides a high degree of local sponsorship.

The community art centers established by the art project are locally sponsored through the provision of space, light, heat, and other facilities. Of the 96,000 drawings, easel paintings, murals, and sculptured works produced by the project, a large number have been done for display in tax-supported buildings. The nonlabor costs of these works—principally the cost of materials—are borne by the city, county, or State requesting that they be done.

Finally, the theater project, like the music project, obtains substantial local sponsorship through admission charges. While more than 65 percent of its productions are free, admissions for the remainder have totaled $2,291,000. Since January 1939, admissions have amounted to 10 percent of the total cost of the project, or enough to cover all the nonlabor costs. In addition, the project has received a variety of local contributions in kind.

To illustrate the wide diversity of this local sponsorship so far as the theater project is concerned, I have inserted at the end of my remarks a list of over 300 clubs, universities, charities, and other civic and religious bodies which have actively sponsored the project through the purchase of large blocks of tickets or other financial contributions.

EMPLOYMENT AND EXPENDITURES ON FEDERAL ART PROJECTS

In weighing the merits of the proposed amendment, it will be helpful to summarize briefly the employment provided and sums expended in connection with the Federal art projects.

The five projects have employed an average of 40,000 people for the past 3½ years; 32,577 persons were on the rolls as of June 14, 1939.

Since their inception in 1935, the Federal Government has expended $136,053,221 on these projects, of which over 95 percent has been paid in wages. This sum has been distributed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Art | $18,493,968 |
| Music | 46,120,073 |
| Theater | 43,349,121 |
| Writers | 15,739,516 |
| Historical Records | 12,350,543 |

For the fiscal year 1939, expenditures on the arts projects have been distributed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Art | $5,532,095 |
| Music | 11,834,215 |
| Theater | 10,726,022 |
| Writers | 4,397,147 |
| Historical Records | 6,354,301 |
| Total | 38,843,780 |

As I have said, the average contribution by the Federal Government for nonlabor costs under Federal project No. 1 has been $4.85 per month per person, in comparison with approximately $6 per person under all other W. P. A. projects. In other words, these projects while under Federal sponsorship have cost the Government less in nonlabor costs than have the locally sponsored construction and other projects.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The accomplishments of Federal project No. 1 have been notable. In bare statistical terms alone its record is prodigious. As of June 30, 1938, it had produced the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Art:** | |
| Federal community art centers: | |
| Number established | 53 |
| Aggregate attendance | 4,000,000 |
| Drawings, easel paintings, murals, and sculptured works: Number | 96,602 |
| Etchings, lithographs, wood blocks, etc.: | |
| Number of originals | 15,756 |
| Number of prints | 76,000 |
| Arts and crafts: Number of objects made | 43,000 |
| Index of American design plates: Number of plates made | 7,940 |
| Stage sets, dioramas, and models for visual education: Number | 10,610 |
| **Music:** | |
| Music classes (January 1938 through June 1938): | |
| Average monthly attendance | 530,000 |
| Music performances (month of June 1938): | |
| Number | 4,355 |
| Aggregate audience | 3,030,000 |
| **Theater:** | |
| Theatrical productions: Number | 1,813 |
| Theatrical performances (January 1938 through June 1938): | |
| Average number per month | 1,077 |
| Average monthly attendance | 476,000 |
| **Writing:** | |
| Number of books and pamphlets published | 293 |
| Number of copies distributed | 3,550,000 |
| **Historical Records Survey:** | |
| Number of States whose records have been listed | 8 |
| Number of counties whose records have been listed | 2,051 |
| Number of county inventories published | 168 |
| Number of towns whose records have been listed | 1,559 |
| Number of town inventories published | 14 |
| Number of churches whose records have been listed | 50,355 |

That much of the work is of unusual quality is apparent from a glance at some of the honors conferred on project employees. For example, James Newell was awarded the Architect League's gold medal in 1938 for his mural at Evander Childs High School in New York City, entitled "The Evolution of Western Civilization." This medal had not been awarded for 5 years because no work worthy of its award had been found. Three W. P. A. project sculptors took the first three awards in the 1938 Metropolitan Life Insurance competition. Each year several of the woodcuts, etchings, and lithographs done by W. P. A. project artists, are chosen for inclusion in the volume Fine Prints of the Year. In 1936, Artist Harry Sternberg won a Guggenheim fellowship.

The theater project, too, has done distinguished work. Its staff has included such well-known figures in the theater as Orson Welles, Alfred Kreymborg, Virgil Geddes, John Houseman, and others. Orson Welles and the Mercury Theater, which he heads, owe their start and success to this project, as attested by Mr. Welles himself. More than 2,650 former employees of the theater project have returned to private theaters or the movies.

Of the 94 productions on Broadway during the current season, 88 employed one or more former Federal theater workers. Four of the seven playwrights winning Rockefeller scholarships this year were formerly connected with the theater project, while Arthur Arent, author of the highly successful W. P. A. production One Third of a Nation, received a Guggenheim fellowship. Ardis Gaines, known to moviegoers as Brenda Marshall, was recruited by Warner Bros. directly from the cast of a Federal theater play for the feminine lead in Career Man. The experience of Gloria Dickson was similar.

Practically every major Hollywood studio employs former theater-project employees. Howard Bay, who designed the sets for Tallulah Bankhead's production of the Little Foxes, had previously designed the set for the Federal theater's production of One Third of a Nation.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a list of all the W. P. A. theater productions by title, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The director of the theater project has a distinguished record of service to the American theater. As director of the experimental theater at Grinnell College, her alma mater, as assistant to George Pierce Baker in the famous "47 Workshop" at Harvard and as director of the experimental theater at Vassar, her work attracted wide attention which led to her being awarded the first Guggenheim Fellowship ever conferred on a woman. Of the report of her work under the fellowship, the New York Times has stated that it is "the most intelligible and best proportioned account of the contemporary European theater now available in English."

She returned to Vassar after her fellowship work, from where she was called to Washington to head the theater project. The tremendous success of this phase of her work is attested to by drama critics, playwrights, producers, actors, and actresses the country over.

A similarly high record of achievement has been made by the other cultural projects. Formerly employed on the writers project were such well-known literary figures as John Steinbeck, author of Of Mice and Men and Grapes of Wrath, Conrad Aiken, Richard Wright, Vincent McHugh, and John Cheever.

Practically every symphony orchestra in the country contains one or more former W. P. A. music-project employees. The Boston Symphony Orchestra, for example, has 11 former project members, the National Broadcasting Co. Orchestra has several, as have the Pittsburgh Symphony, the National Symphony, and others. In addition, former W. P. A. musicians are now conductors of the Houston and Louisville Symphonies.

While this list of individual accomplishments is impressive in itself, the worth of these projects as a whole is demonstrated by the unanimity with which they have been approved by critics, artists, actors, writers, producers, musicians, and others eminently qualified to judge. Only last week, 12 of the outstanding New York dramatic critics said:

> We declare that we have had many occasions to praise productions of the Federal theater in New York, many of which have been distinguished contributions to the art of the theater and others of which have been creditable in many respects.
>
> Brooks Atkinson, dramatic critic, New York Times; Burns Mantle, dramatic critic, New York Daily News; Sidney Whipple, dramatic critic, New York World-Telegram; Allene Talmey, dramatic critic, the Vogue; Wolcott Gibbs, dramatic critic, New Yorker magazine; Otis Ferguson, dramatic critic, New Republic; John Gassner, dramatic critic, Forum magazine; Paul Peters, Life magazine; Joseph Wood Krutch, the Nation magazine; Mrs. Eurphemia Van Rensselaer Wyatt, representative, the Catholic World; Kelcey Allen, Daily News Record and Women's Wear; Arthur Pollock, dramatic critic, Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

To the same effect was the following statement by 30 prominent actors, actresses, producers, and playwrights:

> Its productions have given entertainment and education to millions of Americans and brought economic relief and moral regeneration to thousands of theater workers who faced destitution.
>
> Helen Hayes, Eddie Cantor, Ben Bernie, George Abbott, Moss Hart, Lee Shubert, Arthur Schwartz, Burgess Meredith, Ethel Waters, Worthington Minor, Arthur Richman, Harold Clurman, Sam H. Harris, Clifford Odets, Richard Rogers, Laurence Langner, Philip Loeb, Katharine Cornell, Tallulah Bankhead, Katherine Hepburn, Blanche Yurka, Donald Ogden Stewart, Douglass Montgomery, Herman Shumlin, John Krimsky, Bela Blau, Laurette Taylor, Florence Reed, William Gaxton, and Victor Moore.

Brooks Atkinson, well-known theatrical critic, of the New York Times, wrote last month of the Federal theater project:

> Two million six hundred thousand people are employed on W. P. A. projects throughout the country. Only 8,040 of them are employed in the Federal theater—between one-third and one-fourth of 1 percent. Among the 2,600,000 it would be hard to find another group of 8,040 that has accomplished so much and given so rich a social return on the money. * * * It has been the best friend the theater as an institution has ever had in this country.

The art project, too, has been highly lauded. Ford Madox Ford, prominent English critic and author, said of this project:

> The level of the work is astonishingly high. Art in America is being given its chance and there has been nothing like it since before the Reformation.

The music project, too, has been highly praised. Erich Wolfgang Korngold, the Austrian conductor and composer, after hearing several W. P. A. music units, remarked:

Nowhere in Europe is there anything to compare with it. Of course, we have state-subsidized opera, but no country in Europe has anything to equal this.

Charles Wakefield Cadman, the celebrated American composer, has voiced his praise, as follows:

The Federal music project is the finest constructive force that has ever come into American musical life. * * * It is serving as a vital stimulating factor, not only in the immediate rehabilitation of musicians but in the perpetuation and furtherance of a high type of music which is so important to any nation's cultural and ethical progress. A vital musical evolution has taken place in every community it has reached.

The work of the writers project has been hailed by authors, editors, and publishers alike. On May 22, 1939, 44 publishers, including representatives of virtually all of the large publishing houses, such as Harcourt, Brace & Co., the Viking Press, Random House, Funk & Wagnells, Houghton Mifflin, Alfred A. Knopf, Bobbs-Merrill, and others, issued a statement praising the Federal writers project and urging that nothing be done to "hamper its program at this time."

On June 15, 50 authors, editors, and other literary figures, including Stephen Vincent Benet, Rockwell Kent, Burns Mantle, Louis Untermeyer, and Van Wyck Brooks, joined in a statement characterizing the work of the writers project as "one of the most significant literary records of the twentieth century."

Finally, Lewis Mumford, well-known literary critic, has said of the American guide series:

Of all the good uses of adversity, one of the best has been the inception and execution of a series of American guidebooks, the first attempt on a comprehensive scale to make the country itself worthily known to Americans. The best of the new guides that are so far available give one a great thrill of pride; pride of the country they describe and in the capacity and devotion and the fine anonymous collaboration which has gone into this work. These guidebooks are the finest contribution to American patriotism that has been made in our generation.

Mr. President, in the light of the distinguished record of the arts projects, their significant contribution to American culture, as well as their social and economic contribution to the unemployed artists, actors, writers, and musicians, I sincerely hope that the Senate will provide the comparatively insignificant sum authorized by this amendment for the Federal maintenance of those of the projects which cannot survive under a requirement of local sponsorship.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an eloquent and moving plea for the continuance of the Federal arts projects, delivered over the National Broadcasting System Monday evening by the distinguished actor, Mr. Lionel Barrymore:

RADIO ADDRESS BY LIONEL BARRYMORE

I have been in the theater a good many years. Acting is the only profession I know. I have been a pretty lucky actor, and don't think for a minute that an actor doesn't need plenty of luck. An actor is an odd sort of animal. If he's got any talent at all, he seems to feel that he ought to make his living by that talent. I am told that doctors and nurses and painters and sculptors all have kind of the same idea, because they like to make their living at what they are good at.

When this depression came along the theater was badly hit. That didn't stop the actors from wanting to keep on living, however. It didn't stop the stage hands and the electricians, and the ushers and the scrub women, from wanting to keep on living, too. Well, the Government recognized that fact. By golly, one day we found a special theater had been established, and those people went to working at it.

Now, the special theater was a little different from any we had ever seen. In the old trouping days our job used to be to get folks to the theater, and along came a modern, civilized idea: Let's take the theater to the people. So the Federal theater project was not limited to the big cities. The Government was saying, Why shouldn't the people that live in the little towns and villages, remote communities, that had never seen a play, have the advantage of getting acquainted with the great classics of poetry and drama? But what about the 26,000,000 people who have been benefited by seeing the Federal theater plays, and millions of others who have been finding education through its art projects? I think they would be kind of mad if they found they were going to go back to the humdrum world they had to live in before the Government came along to help them.

If I were a farmer, say, living down in the swamps of Florida, and my children had been taught to play the fiddle and paint a picture or sing a song, or watch theatrical productions, I don't know how I would answer them if they asked me why all these things were being taken away from them. Maybe I would want to ask my Congressman why this chance to improve themselves had been taken away from them, and he would have to have some pretty good answers if he wanted to satisfy me.

Yes, sir; as a farmer I think I would be pretty mad, and as an actor I know I would be as mad as I ever expect to be in my life if 8,000 men and women of my own kind, earning their living in a pretty tough world, were thrown out as though they weren't worth Congress' consideration.

Now, it is true, I am just an old actor talking, but I am also an old citizen of the United States and I bet you I could find a lot of people who feel just about the same way I do on this sort of thing. I think it is dangerous for a nation to start proving what a fine country it can be and then right in the middle of proving it let it slide back to the dark days of the depression. If I were a Congressman, I would try to remember that the American people never let anything be taken away from them permanently. Lately their own country has given them something else besides protective tariffs, good roads, good schools, and pellagra control. I hope Congress won't see fit to say, "Oh, all right; we will give them their old arts projects for a couple of months more." I hope they will realize that the help the Government has furnished in the last few years has become part of the daily life of the American people and part of their hope for the future, and taking it away would be almost like taking one of the stripes out of the American flag.

Now, you must not do that, and don't say, "Well, you can have it for a little while longer."

The Federal art projects are all part of America today and you ought not to fool with them at all.

PARTIAL LIST OF LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING FEDERAL THEATER PRODUCTIONS

Advertising Club of New York; Advertising Women of New York; Big Sisters Club; Business and Professional Women's Club; Business Men's League; Carroll Club; Drama League of America; Engineers' Women's Clubs; Flower Hospital Auxiliary; Friends of Music; Habima Guild; Junior League; Lawyers' Club; Leisure League of America; National Arts Club; Poetry Society of America; Professional Women's League; Smith College Club; The Town Hall Club; United Hospitals Camp Committee; Vassar Club; Women's International League; B'nai B'rith; Cathedral Community for Blind; Congregation Shaarezedek; Daughters of Zion; Hadassah; Jesuit Academy; LaSalle Academy; Manhattan College; Protestant Big Sisters' Council; Religious Drama Council of Greater New York; Riverside Church; Sacred Heart School; Temple Emanu-El; Zionist Organization of America; American Occupational Therapy Association; American Prison Association; American Psychiatric Association; American Red Cross; American Social Hygiene Association; Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor; Big Brother Movement; Boys Club of America; Catholic Charities; Children's Aid Society; Colony House; Crime Prevention Bureau; Five Points Mission; Flatbush Day Nursery; Grand Street Boys Association, Inc.; Grand Street Settlement; Greenwich House; Grosvenor Neighborhood House; Heckscher Foundation; Henry Street Settlement; Institute for Crippled and Disabled; Jacob Riis Settlement; Josiah Macy Junior Foundation; Juvenile Aid Bureau; Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association; Masters School Day Nursery; Milbank Memorial House; Mutual Aid Society; Neurological Institute of New York; New York Association for Blind; Russell Sage Foundation; Social Security Board; St. Thomas' Settlement House; Traveler's Aid Society; Trinity House; Young Men's Christian Association; Young Men's Hebrew Association; Young Women's Christian Association; Young Women's Hebrew Association; Adelphi College; Association of American Colleges; Barnard College; Brearly School; Carnegie Foundation; Chapin School; Child Study Association of America; City College of New York; Columbia University; Dalton School; Fordham University; Horace Mann School; Hunter College; International House; Long Island University; National League of Nursing Education; National Youth Administration; New School for Social Research; New York Board of Education; New York Public Library; Packer Collegiate Institute; Princeton University; Rutgers Alumni; St. John's University; Sarah Lawrence College; Teachers College; Todhunter School; Washington Irving High School; Consolidated Edison Co.; Gimbel Bros.; Macy & Co., R. H.; Paramount News; Sheffield Farms Co., Inc.; Wanamaker's, John; Western Union; Consumers Union; New York City Housing Authority; Tenants' Union; Women Shoppers League; Women Voters League; American Legion; Army and Navy clubs and organizations; Boy Scouts; Camp Fire Girls; Elks; Girl Scouts; Jewish War Veterans; Kiwanis; Knights of Columbus; Masons; Odd Fellows; Rotary; Shriners; Veterans of Foreign Wars; Architects League; Authors League; Book and Magazine Guild; Cartoonists Union; Civil Service Forum; Composers, Authors, and Publishers Society; Composers League; Dramatists Guild; Henry Street Visiting Nurses Association; League of American Writers; Musicians Union; National League of American Pen Women; Newspaper Women's Guild; Post Office Employees; Social Service Employees Union; Stage Hands Union; Women's Speakers Club of America; Alteration Workers Union, 177; Automobile Workers Union, No. 1; Bakery International Union, Barbers Union, No. 1; Biscuit

Worker's Union, No. 405; Bricklayers Union, No. 110; Clothing Cutters Union, No. 4; Domestic Workers Union, No. 149; Hotel and Restaurant Workers Union, No. 16; Housewreckers Union; Pressers Union; Rank and File Cutters Union; Seamen's Social Club; Suitcase and Bagmakers; United Textile Workers; Waiters Union; Window Trimmers Union; Abyssinian Young People; Aunt Dinah's Kitchen; Copper Colored Queens; Epworth League; Federated Youth Clubs; Friends of Harlem; Harlem Children's Center; Harlem District Charity Organization; Harlem Hospital Nurses; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Negro Actors Equity; Negro People's Art Committee; New York Colored Mission; Opportunity magazine; Shaw University Alumnae; Toussaint L'Ouverture Club; Urban League; Anti-Nazi League; Progressive Women's Council; Hillsborough Club, Pompano, Fla.; Holy Cross Church, Miami, Fla.; St. Paul's School, Jacksonville, Fla.; Orleans Neighborhood Center, New Orleans, La.; Maison Hospitaliers, New Orleans, La.; Protestant Home for the Aged, New Orleans, La.; United States Marine Hospital, New Orleans, La.; Old Soldiers' Home, New Orleans, La.; Milne Home for Girls, New Orleans, La.; Children's Bureau, S. P. C. C., New Orleans, La.; Waldo Burton Memorial Boys Home, New Orleans, La.; St. Margaret's Daughters, New Orleans, La.; Windsor Center, Greensboro, N. C.; Thalian Association, Wilmington, N. C.; Shaw University, Raleigh, N. C.; University Place Church, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Bryan School for Crippled Children, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Crippled Children's Hospital, Oklahoma City, Okla.; C. C. C. Camp, Purcell, Okla.; Bushnell Church, Detroit, Mich.; Knights of Columbus, Detroit, Mich.; Truth Lutheran Church, Detroit, Mich.; Redford Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.; Campbell M. E. Church, Detroit, Mich.; Y. W. C. A., Detroit, Mich.; Y. M. C. A., Detroit, Mich.; Petofi Club, Detroit, Mich.; Dodge Community Center, Detroit, Mich.; St. Joseph's Infants, Cincinnati, Ohio; Central Y. M. C. A., Cincinnati, Ohio; Christ Church, Cincinnati, Ohio; General Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio; Jewish Center, Cincinnati, Ohio; St. Leo's Church, Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland State Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio; Martini Evangelical Church; Wise Temple, Cincinnati, Ohio; Knights of Pythias, Cincinnati, Ohio; League of Hard of Hearing, Cincinnati, Ohio; Western Illinois Teachers College, Macomb, Ill.; Eastern Illinois Teachers College, Charleston, Ill.; Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb, Ill.; Masonic Temple, Seattle, Wash.; American Legion Post, Seattle, Wash.; Marine Hospital, Seattle, Wash.; Queen Anne Club, Seattle, Wash.; Phinney Ridge Community Club, Seattle, Wash.; Federal Marine Hospital, Seattle, Wash.; King County Home for the Aged, Seattle, Wash.; Veterans' Administration, West Los Angeles, Calif.; Los Angeles Sanitorium, Duarte, Calif.; Huntington Park Women's Club, Huntington Park, Calif.; American House, Los Angeles, Calif.; First M. E. Church, Los Angeles, Calif.; Orthopaedic Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.; Children's Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.; University M. E. Church, Los Angeles, Calif.; University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.; Motion Picture Guild, Los Angeles, Calif.; House of Neighborly Service, Los Angeles, Calif.; Kora Temple Shrine, Lewiston, Maine; Unity Lodge, I. O. O. F., Portland Maine; Pathfinder's Club, Deering High School, Portland, Maine; United States Veterans' Hospital, Togus, Maine; Y. W. C. A., Cambridge, Mass.; Masonic Temple, Worcester, Mass.; Seamen's Friend Society, Boston, Mass.; Jeffries Point Boys Club, East Boston, Mass.; Perkins Hospital, Boston, Mass.; Home for the Aged, Cambridge, Mass.; John J. O'Connell Post, American Legion, Dorchester, Mass.; Adult Recreation Center, Dorchester, Mass.; Fort Devens, Ayer, Mass.; C. C. C. camp, Warner, N. H.; Congregational Church, Candia, N. H.; Elks' Home, Nashua, N. H.; State Industrial School, Manchester, N. H.; Overbrook Hospital, Cedar Grove, N. J.; Robert Treat Boys Club, Newark, N. J.; Y. M. and Y. W. H. A., Paterson, N. J.; Dupont Women's Club, Arlington, N. J.; C. C. C. camp, Woodbine, N. J.; Newark University, Newark, N. J.; Optimist Club, Syracuse, N. Y.; Ursuline Academy, New Rochelle, N. Y.; Protestant Home, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rockland Street Hospital, Orangeburg, N. Y.; Presbyterian Church, Cuba, N. Y.; Children's Hospital, Buffalo, N. Y.; New York State Normal School, Plattsburg, N. Y.; Burke Foundation, White Plains, N. Y.; St. John's Church, Lattingtown, N. Y.; Adult Educational Center, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sons and Daughters of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Jewish Home for Children, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Women's Catholic Alliance, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sager Recreation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.; Women's Craft Center, Glenfield, Pa.; Sarah Street House, Pittsburgh, Pa.; East Side Hebrew Institute, New York City; Brashear Neighborhood House, New York City; Veterans Hospital, New York City; Odd Fellows, New York City; Hebrew Educational Society, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prescott Neighborhood House, New York City; Y. M. C. A., Brooklyn, N. Y.; St. Anthony's Church, New York City; Calvary Lutheran Church, New York City; Lexington School for the Deaf, New York City; Settlement House, Grand Street, New York City.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 21, to insert:

SEC. 38. Any Administrator or other officer named to have general supervision at the seat of government over the program and work contemplated under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and receiving a salary of $5,000 or more per annum from such appropriations, and any State or regional administrator receiving a salary of $5,000 or more per annum from such appropriations shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 1761 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any such appointee and the salary of any person so appointed shall not be increased for a period of 6 months after confirmation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the sections will be renumbered.

Without objection, those amendments which were passed over en bloc at the request of the Senator from Arizona and depending upon the action of the Senate with regard to the public-works amendment, will be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, at the end of line 23, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the words "on the basis of relative needs."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, because, although this is an important amendment, it is, indeed, a very simple one. I propose to add at the end of section 16 (a) the words "on the basis of relative needs." If the amendment should be adopted it would mean that all nonveterans would be given employment on the W. P. A., preference being given to those who have the greatest need. It would mean that when lay-offs take place on W. P. A. those with the greatest need would be laid off the last. My purpose in offering the amendment is twofold. In the first place, like every other Member of this body, I have received innumerable letters advising me that individuals who were in great need were not hired on W. P. A., whereas those with a lesser degree of need were hired. I have received complaint that when lay-offs were made those with comparatively slight degree of need were retained and persons with a large number of dependents were dismissed. It seems to me that it is clearly the purpose of the law to relieve the needy. If there is not sufficient money with which to relieve all the needy, then it seems to me that, insofar as nonveterans are concerned, we ought to give preference to the neediest people. The amendment does does not affect the veterans' preference section, and I believe if it were put in as a direction to the Administrator it would make crystal clear the intent of Congress.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this matter was presented to the committee by the Senator from Massachusetts. The committee, having entire sympathy with the purpose of the amendment, after careful consideration decided that it was administratively impossible that the people should be put on the rolls on the basis of relative need. The provision of the act is that people shall be employed and retained. If every day the rolls, with more than 2,000,000 persons, men and women, on them, had to be examined and reexamined when someone was taken off, because it became necessary to go into their case histories, into their family lives, into their income to find out who was in the greatest need, it would be utterly impossible as a practical matter to carry out this well-intentioned amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I make one further statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has already spoken once on his amendment. Does he wish to speak on the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I wish to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is on the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I know the Senate is impatient to act, and I shall take but 1 minute. The amendment, it is true, was defeated in the Committee on Appropriations by a vote of 10 to 9. I think the Senator from Colorado raises somewhat of an unnecessary objection to it. I do not think that the administrative difficulty would be so great as he says it would be. It would not be necessary to go over the list every day. I think it is important to establish a principle in the measure. The House inserted a formula for the allocation of funds. That was one attempt to establish a principle rather than to leave the whole thing to the personal decision of those who may administer the measure. I

do not say that those who will administer it and have in the past administered it are not splendid men. However, they are but human. They are merely men like you and me, Mr. President. It seems to me that we should establish this thing on the basis of principle, and if there is a better or a fairer or a more humane principle than to give preference to the neediest persons, then I do not know what that principle is.

Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, for a great number of years I have been a close follower of the distinguished and able senior Senator from the State of Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. Since January last I have been closely and intimately associated with him here in the Senate. I wish to say that I agree with what he stated in his address a few moments ago. Then I also wish to congratulate him because of his wit, his humor, his penetrating scholarship, and his profound knowledge upon legislative matters which he extols so frequently in this historic Hall.

Mr. President, this distinguished statesman a few moments ago discussed the question of communism and brought enlightenment to the Senate and the country upon that question. In view of what he said I cannot refrain from discussing the subject of communism or a certain phase of it as it relates to the subject matter before the Senate.

Mr. President, the Daily Record, of Chicago, Ill., is the recognized Communist newspaper for the Midwest section of this Nation. On June 20 last there appeared in that daily paper an advertisement entitled "Send This Wire Tonight!" For the benefit of the Senate and for the RECORD I shall read this wire, which is as follows:

Senator SCOTT LUCAS,
*Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*
Defeat of the Woodrum W. P. A. bill is vital for the future of America. We expect you, as our spokesman, to vote against the three-man W. P. A. board, P. W. A. earmarking, abolition of Federal Arts Projects, slashing of N. Y. A. funds, limitation of funds for individual projects, and elimination of prevailing wages.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois has received from his own State 613 telegrams, most of them coming from the city of Chicago, concerning the W. P. A. appropriation measure which the Senate is now discussing. I caused the personnel of my office to make a close comparison of each and every telegram received. Out of the 613 telegrams which came, either advocating the defeat of the measure or supporting the W. P. A. appropriation measure, I found 107 telegrams word for word just like the telegram which was printed in the Daily Worker, which is the chief communistic organ of the Central West. In addition to the 107 telegrams, 30 more used that telegram as a basis for conveying to me the same information which is found in the advertised telegram. In other words, out of the 613 telegrams, 22 percent came from those who are avowedly Communists, or at least who read the Daily Worker, and have leanings towards communism in this country.

Mr. President, I agree with the philosophy of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], in saying that no individual who advocates the destruction of the Bill of Rights, or advocates the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, is entitled to money from the Federal Treasury. And yet, notwithstanding their belief in and advocacy of such an un-American doctrine, they have the audacity and the temerity to send or cause to be sent to me 137 telegrams from my own State urging and insisting that I do certain things in connection with the W. P. A. program.

I have no way of knowing whether the 22 percent who sent me these telegrams are all Communists, but certainly they have been influenced by the advertisement to which I have referred, and could be convicted upon circumstantial evidence beyond any question of doubt of being either Communists or leaning toward the philosophy of communism. I give this information to the Senate merely to show how the Communists in the country are working day and night in connection with this particular program, which many of whom are apparently enjoying to the utmost, notwithstanding the fact that they believe in a different form of government than that under which they live.

In conclusion, let it be understood that I make no complaint against the thousands of true Americans who write or send me their views upon W. P. A. legislation. I welcome their honest advice and counsel upon all questions of government because these are trying times—there are times that test the mettle of men and women in all walks of life. I shall support the present legislation, but it should always be understood that the telegrams of the Communists had nothing to do with it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending, and the yeas and nays have been ordered thereon. The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is not in order.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understood we had completed the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have been completed, but an amendment has been offered by the Senator from Massachsetts [Mr. LODGE], and the yeas and nays have been ordered thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may the amendment again be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will again be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, at the end of line 23, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert the words "On the basis of relative needs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and vote "nay." I am advised that the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea." He is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], who, I am advised, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—33

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Austin | Gibson | Maloney | Townsend |
| Byrd | Gillette | Norris | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Idaho | Gurney | Nye | Van Nuys |
| Danaher | Hale | Reed | Walsh |
| Davis | Holman | Reynolds | White |
| Donahey | Holt | Russell | Wiley |
| Frazier | King | Slattery | |
| George | Lodge | Taft | |
| Gerry | McCarran | Tobey | |

NAYS—36

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Connally | Hughes | Murray |
| Andrews | Downey | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Bankhead | Ellender | La Follette | Pepper |
| Barkley | Green | Lee | Radcliffe |
| Bilbo | Guffey | Lucas | Schwellenbach |
| Bone | Harrison | McKellar | Smathers |
| Bulow | Hatch | Mead | Stewart |
| Burke | Hayden | Miller | Truman |
| Clark, Mo. | Hill | Minton | Wheeler |

NOT VOTING—27

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Capper | Lundeen | Shipstead |
| Bailey | Caraway | McNary | Smith |
| Barbour | Chavez | Neely | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | Glass | Overton | Thomas, Utah |
| Bridges | Herring | Pittman | Tydings |
| Brown | Johnson, Calif. | Schwartz | Wagner |
| Byrnes | Logan | Sheppard | |

So Mr. LODGE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 8, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 8, on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. (a) The Work Projects Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") in the Federal Works Agency is hereby continued as an agency of the Government for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section.

(b) Funds made available to the Administration for the purpose of enabling it to carry on the program of public works provided for by subsection (c) of this section may be expended for (1) the prosecution of projects approved for such Administration under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, the joint resolution of March 2, 1938, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938; and (2) the following types of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, subject to the approval of the President: (A) Highways, roads, and streets; (B) public buildings (including schools, hospitals, and public-housing projects), parks, and other recreational facilities (including buildings therein); (C) public utilities, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to serve persons in rural areas (including projects sponsored by and for the benefit of nonprofit and cooperative associations); (D) sewer systems and water supply and purification systems; (E) airports and other transportation facilities; (F) flood control, drainage, irrigation, and conservation; (G) eradication of insects pests; (H) miscellaneous construction projects; and (I) educational, professional, clerical, cultural, recreational, production, service (including training for domestic service), and miscellaneous nonconstruction projects.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Administration (1) to provide opportunities for the employment upon a program of public works of employable persons who are unable to find employment in private industry and who are eligible for employment under the provisions of this section, (2) to aid self-help and cooperative associations for the benefit of needy persons, and (3) to provide emergency direct relief for needy persons in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(d) The Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to make such upward revisions in the monthly wage rates payable to persons employed on the public-works program provided for by this section as may be necessary to enable such persons to maintain a standard of living compatible with decency and good health.

(e) The hourly rate of wages paid to persons employed upon projects under this section shall be not less than the greatest of the following—

(1) The prevailing hourly rate of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Commissioner of Work Projects.

(2) Thirty cents.

(3) In the case of employment in any occupation for which minimum rates of pay for persons employed by private employers are established under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, such minimum rates.

(f) The monthly rate of wages paid to persons employed upon projects under this section shall be not less than $36.

(g) Any person who is employable, who is unemployed, and who is unable to find suitable employment in private industry at wages not less than the prevailing rate of wages in his locality for work for which he is reasonably fitted by training and experience, shall be deemed to be eligible for employment on projects authorized by this section. The Commissioner is authorized to employ not less than 3,000,000 persons upon such projects as long as that number of persons are eligible for employment upon such projects.

(h) For the purposes of this section employment in any establishment at which there is a labor dispute shall not be deemed suitable employment.

(i) In the employment of persons upon such projects the Commissioner shall give preference to persons the income (other than public relief) of whose family units is less than the wages payable to such persons for employment upon such projects.

(j) All persons employed on projects established under the provisions of this section shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to deal collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in joint activities for the purpose of mutual aid and protection.

(k) No contract with respect to any such project, including the purchase of materials for such projects, shall be awarded to any person, firm, association, or corporation who, at the time of such award, is found to be interfering with, restraining, or coercing his employees in the exercise of their rights provided for in subsection (j). Any such contract shall contain a stipulation that in the performance of such contract the contractor will not interfere with, restrain, or coerce his employees in the exercise of such rights. Any violation of any such stipulation shall render the party responsible therefor liable to the United States for liquidated damages in the sum of $100 for each day during which any such violation shall have occurred.

(l) There shall be established within the Work Projects Administration a Bureau of Labor Relations which shall be responsible directly to the Commissioner of Work Projects. The Bureau of Labor Relations shall be responsible for the development of proper labor relations procedures and practices. It shall have power to hire investigators and maintain offices in local and State Work Projects Administration districts. It shall have power to make decisions on all matters affecting conduct of labor relations, subject to final decision by the Commissioner.

(m) Appointments under the provisions of this joint resolution to administrative and supervisory positions shall be made upon the basis of competitive tests of a character similar to civil-service tests.

(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the foregoing subsections of this section.

(o) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, there is hereby appropriated $2,250,000,000, together with all balances of appropriations under subsection (1) of section 1 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, as supplemented by Public Resolution No. 1 and Public Resolution No. 10 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which remain unobligated on June 30, 1939, including such unobligated balances of funds transferred to other agencies for nonconstruction projects under the provisions of section 3 of such act of 1938, as supplemented, or set aside for specific purposes in accordance with other law: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds heretofore irrevocably set aside for the completion of Federal construction projects under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938, as amended, shall remain available until June 30, 1940, for such completion, and any such funds which remain unobligated by reason of the completion or abandonment of any such Federal construction project shall be returned to this appropriation.

On page 19, beginning with line 11, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 12, on page 20.

On page 20, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "(a)."

On page 21, beginning with line 14, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 8, on page 23.

On page 29, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 23, both inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The queston is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has been generous enough to yield to me to present a very brief amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, my yielding in this instance does not result in my yielding the floor, does it?

Mr. BONE. I do not want to take the Senator off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Montana withdraws his amendment, he will have to take his chances of being recognized.

Mr. BONE. Then, Mr. President, in view of the fact that this amendment interests the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] very much, and has to do with municipal power, I am going to ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer the amendment now, and that the Senator from Montana may not lose the floor. This amendment will take only a very little time, I think. It seems to me that there is no reason why it should not be adopted.

The Senator in charge of the bill says he has no objection to the introduction of this matter into the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may present the amendment without the Senator from Montana losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is of the opinion that the Senate of the United States may do almost anything by unanimous consent; but he does not believe that one Senator may hold the floor, even by unanimous consent, while the Senate is passing upon an amendment. However, the Chair believes a unanimous-consent agreement could be entered into that the Senator from Montana should be recognized upon the disposition of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana be temporarily withdrawn and that the Senator from Washington be permitted to offer his amendment and that, at the conclusion of the consideration of that amendment, the Senator from Montana be recognized to reoffer his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Regular order!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was demanding the regular order as the Chair said there was no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I desire to have considered. I should like to have it considered.

Mr. BONE. I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Presiding Officer recognized the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The junior Senator from Montana did not yield the floor. Why should the junior Senator from Montana now be taken off the floor, when he has an amendment pending? The RECORD will show exactly what I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana did not lose any rights in the matter. The Senator's amendment will now be considered to be pending before the Senate. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this late hour I do not desire to enter into a lengthy discussion of the problem of unemployment; but it occurs to me, after having given most careful study to the situation, which confronts our country, that the program offered by the House joint resolution is utterly insufficient, and that a substantial increase should be made to carry the load of unemployment which is freely acknowledged to exist at this time.

Under the provisions of the House joint resolution it is proposed to reduce the relief rolls to a million and a half, while during the past year we have carried on the W. P. A. rolls an average of 3,000,000 workers. Anything less than an average of 3,000,000 would be utterly insufficient in view of the tremendous unemployment situation in the country.

It is not only inhuman but it is a great injustice also to the business interests of the country, because while this is a relief program it is also a program of recovery; for the money spent on W. P. A. is money that aids in the small business and professional circles of the country, and is absolutely necessary that that program be carried out if we are going to continue to advance in the efforts to bring recovery.

My amendment not only provides for an average of 3,000,000 on the relief rolls, but it also relates to the other various features of the House joint resolution which have been in controversy here during the day and are inadequately provided for. It seems to me that the amendment I have proposed is the absolute minimum necessary if we are going to continue to make a substantial fight against the desperate conditions which prevail everywhere in the country today.

As I say, I have no desire to make an extended speech at this late hour. I had hoped that a resolution would be adopted here which would make provision for carrying on the W. P. A. program after the 1st of July, so as to give the Senate an opportunity to make a careful study of the situation. As it is, we are rushing through with this program, attempting with great hurry to make provision for the relief program for the coming year, and we are bound to find that a great many mistakes have been made.

The desperate situation which we find in the country today is the result of a break-down of our industrial system. It is due to no fault of the unemployed in the country. They have made no contribution to the conditions which make it necessary to carry out a program of this kind. All prominent authorities on the problem of unemployment have now come to concede that it is no longer merely an emergency situation, but that it is a continuing problem, and that the Government must meet the situation until industry is again able to furnish employment to these workers. Therefore, in any intelligent consideration of the problem of work relief, it must be borne in mind that the problem to be adopted should be envisioned to extend over a considerable period of time. The reason for this is that our economic system is undergoing a serious process of readjustment, particularly in connection with the production and distribution of goods. This process of readjustment will take time.

Until our economic machine can be corrected and readjusted to meet the present-day conditions of the country, the problem of unemployment will continue to persist. Through the rapid development of machinery and technological advancement, America has become the leading country of the world in mass production of goods. American plants today are equipped to turn out goods far beyond the capacity of our purchasing power. In every line of endeavor, technological development has made it possible to throw on the streets by the hundreds, and sometimes by the thousands, workers who, under these existing conditions, have nowhere to turn for a livelihood.

The amendment which I propose, covers extensive changes in the joint resolution as it refers to the W. P. A. The first and most important change which the amendment would make would be an appropriation of $2,250,000,000 for the coming fiscal year in place of the $1,477,000,000 provided in the House joint resolution. This appropriation is devised to provide an average of 3,000,000 jobs for the coming fiscal year. This is slightly less than the appropriation which was made available to the W. P. A. in the past fiscal year.

In spite of some estimates which have been submitted to the Senate, it is my contention that such a sum is a bare minimum to carry through the W. P. A. for the coming year. I would challenge any economic or political forecaster to say at this time, in good faith and with conviction, that employment would increase within the next year sufficiently to absorb a cut of a million from W. P. A. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has indicated that it is the estimate of the committee that the sum provided under the committee joint resolution would cut the W. P. A. to

approximately 1,500,000 jobs by the end of the coming fiscal year.

It has been pointed out often that it requires the reemployment of four unemployed persons to take one person from the W. P. A. rolls into private employment. Therefore, it would be required, in order to meet the committee's estimate, to have a reemployment of 4,000,000 persons in private industry during the next year. Of course, no such thing will happen.

Our previous experience relating to deficiency appropriations during the past years has indicated that predictions of increase in private employment to absorb the cuts in W. P. A. have not materialized. The only result of cuts on W. P. A. has been to increase the misery of people who are unemployed, and to bring a faltering, a hesitation, and retardation in the recovery movement which was under way at the time this session of Congress convened.

Nonagricultural employment, as estimated by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, has declined from 33,620,000 in December 1938 to 32,804,000 in April of this year. In other words, instead of increased employment we have increased unemployment.

I wish further to call the attention of the Senate to the testimony of the representatives of the United States Conference of Mayors, the representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, including the United Automobile Workers of America, and the testimony of the American Federation of Labor unions which appeared before the committee. All of these powerful and influential organizations emphatically indicated, either directly or indirectly, that there was no prospect of increases in private employment sufficient to absorb the cuts in W. P. A. so far as they could predict.

It seems to be perfectly clear that a serious cut in W. P. A. funds at this time would be a direct threat to the continuation of recovery. A glaring example stands before us of what happened in 1937 to the economy of the country, when Federal expenditures which were made available to purchasing power were abruptly cut off.

From that experience we should take warning. There we had a condition in which business was constantly increasing, and we began to curtail the W. P. A. rolls; we cut down the P. W. A. program, and immediately we began to find in the country a situation in which men were being thrown out of employment in private industry because there was no purchasing power in the hands of the people of the country to continue the activity of industry and business.

It seems perfectly clear to me that this should be avoided now. Certainly anyone who advocates similar cuts in Federal investment and expenditure now, at a time when the economy is actually operating at a lower level than in 1937, takes upon himself a terrible responsibility. I, for one, do not wish to see this Congress repeat the mistakes of 1937, and I have therefore offered this amendment to provide for what I believe to be a minimum of necessary jobs.

Mr. President, the amendment which I propose has been carefully prepared after careful studies and conferences with the legislative experts of the Senate. It is designed to overcome any defects which may be charged against the administration of W. P. A. and thus place the national program of work relief on a sound, effective, and efficient basis.

Mr. President, unemployment is the most serious and threatening problem which has ever confronted this Nation. It cannot be disposed of by merely indicting the vast army of unemployed American citizens as a lazy and worthless army of leeches hanging on the Government and refusing to find employment in private industry. The plain fact confronting the Nation is that there is no present opportunity for the millions now employed on the W. P. A. rolls, and also nearly a million in addition thereto who are qualified for W. P. A. enrollment, to find employment in private industry.

This desperate situation has developed as a result of the break-down of our industrial system of private competitive enterprise. It is due to no fault or blame on the part of these millions of unemployed workers, but is due entirely to the failure of our economic system to afford them employment.

I feel very strongly, therefore, that this amendment offers to the unemployed, and to those who have a concern for the welfare of the working men and women of this country, the only practical opportunity to register their desire for an adequate provision for the unemployed.

Mr. President, I think it would be unfair for me to continue any argument on this subject at this time. It occurs to me that it should be plain to everyone that unless we continue this program of work relief on an adequate basis, unless we continue to spend money in this country to carry out a program of work for the unemployed and destitute people of the country, we are going to experience another recession such as that in which we found ourselves in 1938. I therefore submit that the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to comment for about 5 minutes in favor of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The chief appeal the amendment makes to me is that it tends to get away from the castigation of the people who work upon this program as "relief clients." I do not regard a person who has been displaced, for example, from the job he holds honorably because of technological improvements, as a person who is not deserving of confidence and respect in this country. I think that the first day we ever called this program a relief program, and tended to make everyone who was on the program almost to a degree ashamed of himself and ashamed of the fact that he was on it, we did a great injustice to a large number of honorable citizenry of this country.

I think I have mentioned heretofore an incident which came to my attention of a person who was working on W. P. A., who happened to be a young lady. While on a boat voyage on the Atlantic seaboard she met some other guests on the trip and got into close association with them. After the voyage had ended, and she had had a very pleasant association with these new-made friends, she wrote me and told me about it, and said, "I was ashamed to tell them that I was working on the W. P. A."

I do not think it is any less honorable to work on the W. P. A. than it is to work on the construction of a post office, which, too, is a Federal project; or to work on the construction of a highway which is contributed to by the Federal Government, or to be engaged in the construction of a ship, the development of which is subsidized by a Federal program. So that in the beginning of this endeavor to give jobs to people who did not have work in private industry we should never have castigated them as relief clients. They are merely American citizens who have a right to work, and to do any honorable work which may be provided for them.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to ask a question, because, perhaps, I am not familiar with the matter. How does the question arise as to whether or not it is an honorable job or something else?

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, a person has to be investigated by a social public welfare worker, and to be adjudicated by that person to be impoverished, and every means of subsistence so completely depleted that he is virtually on the verge of starvation before he is eligible to get the benefit of the work program. That is the application of a means test, which goes far beyond the natural right of an unemployed American citizen to do honorable labor, even if his National Government does make it possible for him to get the job.

What I was getting at, I will say to the able Senator from New Mexico, was that I am sorry that we ever applied a means test, that we ever so sharply limited the amount of the appropriation that there had to be a means test to restrict a place on the program to the relatively few who can pass it.

I think, if I may submit my individual opinion with humility, that this country is rich enough to give a job to

the people who are willing to work and who are able to work at the jobs they are fitted to fill.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to get the Senator's idea. Does he mean they should be employed regardless of the need?

Mr. PEPPER. Regardless of the need. I mean to say that a man who owns a little cottage, who has a wife and children, who, perhaps, is the absolute owner of the little cottage, may be working, for example, in some kind of a factory, whatever one may choose to take as an illustration, and that factory may put in new machinery which will do away with that man's opportunity to work in the factory.

Is that man, who cannot find a job in private industry, not to be permitted to work upon projects created by his National Government because he is the owner of a little cottage which he has been able to acquire through stinting in the years past? Why cannot his country provide for him an opportunity to work without him being so impoverished that he has to meet the ordinary means test that is applied to each person who now works upon the W. P. A.?

I believe that we would perhaps have saved the money in the long run if we had done away absolutely with the means test, if we had said, "We are giving jobs to American men and women who want to work and are willing to work a full day's work on a job they are fitted to do. If you cannot find a job by honest endeavor in private industry, we are not going to castigate you as a failure in life, we are not going to castigate you as one of the impoverished and one of the unworthy failures of your generation." Here is an alternative. Here is an implemented service that is made available by the activity of the National Government. I wish it were possible for that standard to prevail in the whole public-works program. It would cost but two or three or four million dollars, I believe, to carry out a program like that annually in this country, and I do not regard that as extravagant.

If we cannot build rural electrification lines and make those facilities available to the rural homes, if we cannot build homes for the people of this country who do not have decent habitations, if we cannot find enough highways, if we cannot find enough rehabilitation of eroded soil, and enough reforestation where the forests have been depleted in this country, in other words, if, with intelligent leadership, we cannot find enough projects to give employment to the honest men and women of this country who are able to work and willing to work, there is something wrong with the leadership of this Nation, and if we are unwilling to make available the funds to provide work of that character, there is something wrong either with the conscience or the sentiment, or, in any case, the judgment of this country.

I, therefore, commend the Senator from Montana. I think this is one of the best-drafted amendments I have seen in the Congress. It sets up a standard of employment which is related, in a degree, to the need of the applicant, but it does not apply the same sort of means test as is applied to the employee of the Works Progress Administration. It sets up about four or five possible wage standards, and provides that the highest one of those shall prevail, 30 cents an hour, or the prevailing wage in the community, or other wages which are specified in the amendment.

Mr. President, I think this administration should have the courage to say, "We are resolved that unemployment shall be abolished in this Nation; we are in competition with the dictatorships of the world, which are availing themselves of their resources of materials and men, every one of them to the last degree, and we cannot afford to let them get ahead of us by that kind of service to their people while we lag behind with the conscious, humiliating knowledge that ten or more million of the people of this country, however diligently they search in this rich Nation, are unable to find a chance to do an honest day's work without having people point them out as having so failed in life that they have to sink to the level of the means test of the W. P. A."

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

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

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Frazier | Lodge | Schwellenbach |
| Andrews | George | Logan | Shipstead |
| Ashurst | Gerry | Lucas | Slattery |
| Austin | Gibson | McCarran | Smathers |
| Bankhead | Gillette | McKellar | Stewart |
| Barkley | Green | Maloney | Taft |
| Bilbo | Guffey | Mead | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bone | Gurney | Miller | Tobey |
| Bridges | Hale | Minton | Townsend |
| Bulow | Harrison | Murray | Truman |
| Burke | Hatch | Neely | Tydings |
| Byrd | Hayden | Norris | Vandenberg |
| Capper | Herring | Nye | Van Nuys |
| Clark, Idaho | Hill | O'Mahoney | Wagner |
| Clark, Mo. | Holman | Overton | Walsh |
| Connally | Holt | Pepper | Wheeler |
| Danaher | Hughes | Pittman | White |
| Davis | Johnson, Colo. | Radcliffe | Wiley |
| Donahey | King | Reed | |
| Downey | La Follette | Reynolds | |
| Ellender | Lee | Russell | |

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time I can more readily call attention to the situation than by having the amendment I propose read at the desk. On page 32, in line 14, I offer an amendment which will transpose the words "in any election" to follow the word "candidate."

Mr. President, as a matter of legal draftsmanship the words "in any election" should follow the word "candidate." The amendment which I have offered would simply rectify that particular language. I have discussed the matter with the Senator from New Mexico. So far as I know, there is no objection. I ask that the question be put.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, line 14, it is proposed to transpose the words "in any election" to follow the word "candidate."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, last night, when we were examining the bill in connection with the explanation of the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], his attention was directed to page 22, line 11, and at that point the Senator from Colorado explained that the language came to us from the House in the form in which it there appeared. I have an amendment at the desk with reference to line 11, and I ask that the clerk state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 11, after the word "exists", it is proposed to strike out down to and including the period in line 13.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator would explain that amendment and advise us concerning what he has in mind.

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to do so, Mr. President. Let me point out that subsection (d), commencing in line 4, provides that "there shall be removed from employment on Works Progress Administration projects all relief workers whose needs for employment have not been certified by the formula which follows," first, that "a local public certifying agency" shall certify, or that the Work Projects Administration shall so certify where no local certifying agency exists. Then, in line 11, there is stated the alternative that

"where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept the certification by local public agencies." Obviously, this gives the Administration a veto power to nullify the certification by the local relief agency.

The alternative obviously goes right to the root of the very situation which led to the report by the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], which confronted us when we convened in January. Although the Senator from Colorado told us that there was no intention, certainly in the mind of the committee to make such a situation possible, yet the possibility of politics, and the application or misapplication of politics, which has led to the abuses in the W. P. A. in the past, is obvious. It is the type of language that ought not to be in the measure, and the amendment therefore is directed to cure the defect.

Does that answer the question of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; I understand. Mr. President, what the amendment does is to make final and conclusive the certification of the local board. The Federal Government has all the money, but under this provision it would be denied the right to exclude from employment anyone who was certified by the local board. There are six States in the Union where the Works Progress Administration has been compelled to set up its own certifying machinery because of the failure of the local boards or because of the lax and incompetent character of their work. It seems to me that that should be clearly understood. If Senators want the local board, the board of county commissioners or some other local board, absolutely to determine the amount of employment and to impose upon the Works Progress Administration any number of employees of their own choice, they should support the amendment.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, I should like to call the Senator's attention to the situation which existed during the winter of 1937 and 1938 at the time of the rapid increase of unemployment. There was a situation in many parts of the country against which complaint was made by Members of Congress of the failure of those who were entitled to Works Progress work because of the fact that they had not been certified by the local agencies. It was absolutely necessary and essential at that time in a number of instances throughout the country, in order to protect those who were unemployed, that the Works Progress Administration take action. First, they gave these local agencies a certain length of time in which to prepare their certified list. Then they found that that was not a successful method, and that they had to come in and do their own certifying. The amendment of the Senator which is now under consideration would take away from the Federal Government that power; it would take away that opportunity.

Of course, there are always those who see in everything some measure of politics. This is not a question of politics at all. It is merely a question of the Federal Government which supplies these funds seeing that they are properly used in instances where the local certifying agencies completely fall down on the job. There is no question of politics about it at all.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to say in corroboration of what the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington have said that, in my opinion, it would be one of the gravest mistakes that the Senate could make to agree to the amendment. It would make it impossible for the Federal Government to have anything to say about the certification of persons for relief. It would open the door wide for politics in its worst form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 8, after the word "months", it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert

*Provided further,* That the first such investigation be made forthwith.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, section (f), on page 23, provides that an investigation of the relief rolls shall be made at least each 6 months. Therefore, it is possible, in my opinion, that such an investigation may not be made until the last of 1939, or after 6 months have elapsed. During that time we are all desirous of seeing that as many of those on relief as possible get as much good out of this money as possible. Therefore, I think it is the desire of all of us to see that we start out with a clean slate. My amendment provides nothing more or less than that an investigation be had immediately on the passage of the measure.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "$123,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the numerals "$153,000,000."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. Last year it had $175,000,000, and used $50,000,000. I think it is generally agreed by those who are familiar with the situation that this is the cheapest form of relief under any of the relief programs we have under the Administration. The beneficiaries are paying the money back. Instead of giving them relief, loans are made to them, and 25 percent of the loans have already been paid back.

In the Appropriations Committee an amendment was offered to replace this $50,000,000. That was defeated by a narrow margin. I took it to the floor leader in charge of the bill, who is, of course, as we know, now coming to be known as "The Watchdog of the Treasury," and I have reduced the amendment from $50,000,000 to $30,000,000. I think the Senator in charge of the bill, as I have understood from his conversation with me, agrees to that amount. It will be a real saving ultimately, because, otherwise, a very large number of persons will be transferred to the relief rolls.

Mr. ADAMS. I told the Senator from Alabama that I had no control over the amount, but, so far as I was concerned, I was willing the matter should go to conference and there be further argued.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, having been one of those who suggested that this increase should be made in the committee, I am unwilling that it should be taken to conference with the sentence of death already pronounced upon it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I quite agree with the Senator. If that is the attitude of the Senator from Colorado, I want a straight vote, because I am not seeking any formal consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was quite apparent from what the Senator from Colorado said that the acquiescence was merely for the purpose of ending the debate and getting the pending matter out of the way.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot believe that the Senator from Colorado will take such a position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps that was an exaggerated statement, but I should like the Senator to explain just what he would do.

Mr. ADAMS. Exactly what I stated on the floor. I should be very glad to have the matter further discussed in the conference committee. I shall take it there.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot conceive it to be the attitude of the Senator from Colorado that he would take the amend-

ment to the conference committee merely for the purpose of letting it die there.

Mr. ADAMS. I am perfectly frank with the Senator. The Senator knows that in the committee a majority voted against the increase.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; a majority did not vote against this increase.

Mr. ADAMS. Well, against any increase.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; of $50,000,000. It has been now reduced to $30,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. I am quite in agreement with the Senator's view in connection with the major portions of the farm-security program as being very effective and very economical in its administration. I am not personally in a position to bind unappointed conferees. I will say that all I can do is to see that the matter receives consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not ask the Senator to bind anybody, but himself, but I know he is as firm in his convictions as any Member of the Senate and as determined in his attitude when he takes one. All I want to have the Senator do is to say that he will do his best to retain it in the measure in conference.

Mr. ADAMS. I will see that it receives fair consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I shall wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When this matter was discussed in the committee attention was called to the evidence which was presented by the representatives of the Farm Security Administration, that the repayment during the next fiscal year is estimated to be at least as much as $40,000,000. My own feeling is that this amendment should provide $40,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it should have provided $50,000,000. That was the amount they had last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct about that. Only $123,000,000 is appropriated in the joint resolution as it was reported by the committee. The evidence presented to the committee has established very clearly that more than $82,000,000 of some $340,000,000 has already been repaid.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Although these loans have been in force only 4 years, 87,000 families have not only been taken off relief but have been made self-sustaining by the operations of the Farm Security Administration. The testimony before the committee is that today there are at least 350,000 migratory farm families in the United States. The Farm Security Administration has succeeded in making more than 160,000 families completely self-sustaining. The evidence indicates that the net worth of families who have had the benefit of the farm-security loans has been increased in these 4 years by more than $67,000,000. I am frank to say that there is no agency in all the vast number of agencies which have been created under the relief work which to my mind has established as good a record as that established by the Farm Security Administration. I think it would be exceedingly desirable if the full amount of the appropriation of last year were now allowed, and I hope that the Senator from Alabama will alter his amendment to make it at least $40,000,000, and that we shall stand fast to secure that increased appropriation.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. Will the Senator from Wyoming state to the Senate what amount the President, after receiving reports from the Farm Security Administration, and being thoroughly acquainted with the facts, requested that Congress grant for this purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator wants to know what the Budget estimate was, I will say the Budget estimate was $123,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he has made any effort to increase the appropriation for the National Youth Movement to the amount recommended by the President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator addressing his inquiry to me?

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. In explanation of the question I asked, I think it is very important in considering this matter at this hour that we take into consideration the fact that the President, the Budget Bureau, and the Farm Security Administration, after thorough study of the matter, made a request for $123,000,000, and the House Appropriations Committee considered the whole matter carefully. The House considered it, and all agreed that $123,000,000 was adequate for this purpose. I think the picture is not complete without that statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, whatever may be the facts with respect to what the Senator has mentioned, they are to me irrelevant to this matter, because the judgment of the Budget Bureau, in my opinion, has failed to take into consideration the great success of the Farm Security Administration in establishing farm families upon land. That is the most essential thing that we can accomplish at this time. When we hear the stories which are being told and the evidence which is being presented of families wandering over the face of the earth, and when we know it is no longer possible for them to succeed as they have in the past, in establishing homesteads upon the public domain, this appropriation affords an opportunity for us to help establish firmly the theory of private property, which was so eloquently defended in the Senate this evening by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST]. I believe that our own judgment should outweigh the judgment of the Bureau of the Budget or any other official who may not know the facts with respect to this administration.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. BURKE addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope the Senator from Wyoming, before he takes his seat, will make it clear that, with the exception of $20,000,000 of this appropriation, it is all for loans, and that the repayments so far indicate that the Government will have a very small loss on these outlays. These people are paying for their own relief. They are in need, but they take these loans and pay for their own relief, and are rehabilitated as farm families on the land, rather than to flock into the cities, where they would undoubtedly wind up on the rolls of the Works Progress Administration, in which event the funds paid for their upkeep would be gone in perpetuity.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The record, in facts and figures as presented to the committee, is that a total of $320,000,000 plus have been loaned, and of that fund, although the loan period has not yet been reached, $82,939,000 have already been repaid.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me state to the Senator that the estimate of the Department is that 80 percent of the total amount appropriated by Congress has been repaid.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite correct.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to point out that 87,000 farm families have anticipated their farm loans and have paid off the loans in full before maturity.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That also is the evidence.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. I merely want to ask one further question. Of course, the Bureau of the Budget took its information for what was needed for the Farm Security Administration from the Farm Security Administration's own statement. I ask the Senator what facts he has to present to the Senate to indicate a change of condition since the Farm Security Administration made its request of the Budget Bureau for $123,000,000, which would now justify him in saying that the figure set by the Bureau of the Budget is irrelevant to this discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My answer to the Senator from Nebraska is that the Budget Bureau frequently acts without detailed facts, merely for the purpose of arriving at such a distribution of the funds as the Budget Bureau has determined in advance to reach. I do not believe that the reduction from $173,000,000 to $123,000,900 was based upon any facts that the Senator from Nebraska can produce.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that last year, with the larger appropriation, the Administration had applications for loans from 400,000 families in need, upon which they were unable to act. In the face of that statement, that testimony, and those applications on file with the Farm Security Administration, someone in the Bureau of the Budget brought about the reduction in the Budget estimate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no question that what the Senator says is true.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I want to add my voice to the voices of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. We are appropriating a large amount of money for use through various agencies. There is no agency connected with relief of any kind that has a record so successful as that of the Farm Security Administration. As Senators have already said, approximately 80 percent of the money used by the Farm Security Administration actually to locate people upon the land in homes of their own is being repaid.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only has the Administration made an effort but it has succeeded in the effort, which is the most important factor.

Mr. REED. We have been discussing appropriations for millions and scores of millions of dollars, which, when spent through other agencies, will never come back into the Treasury of the United States. Here is one undertaking on which we can more usefully employ the money, do more good with it, benefit more people, and salvage more of it and bring it back into the Treasury than in the case of any other agency provided for by the joint resolution.

When this amendment is voted upon I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote. I want the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to go into the conference with instructions from the Senate to maintain this increased sum.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me make clear that the Senator from Colorado has never gone into a conference but that he has maintained the position of the Senate; and the Senator from Colorado is never going into a conference unless he carries out the faith of those who send him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall take time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized on the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall yield in just a moment.

My remark at the outset may have provoked the statement which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has just made, to which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has made response. I wish to say that no member of the committee, and I am sure no Member of the Senate, fails to recognize the complete sincerity of the Senator from Colorado. In making my original remark, I was adopting, or attempting to adopt one of his own facetious methods of expression. I hope the Senator realizes that there was no intention on the part of anybody to cast any reflection whatsoever upon his loyalty to the instructions received from the Senate.

Mr. LEE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma has been endeavoring to obtain the floor for sometime. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wish to add my voice to the voices of those who have spoken favorably on the amendment. I cannot understand how we can give away millions of dollars, and then hesitate so long on a loan, most of which will be repaid. In the same measure we propose to vote about one and a half billion dollars for W. P. A. work. We can feed a man on W. P. A., and yet at the end of the year our money is gone and he is still hungry, and we have not put him a dollar nearer to self support. However, here is a program which is self-supporting, self-liquidating, self-starting, and self-operating, and we hesitate to make available sufficient credit to establish these people on the soil. Put people on the pavement and they starve to death. Put them on the soil and they live. We are bringing them nearer to self-support.

I rise simply to add my voice at this time, so that the Senator from Colorado will know at least some of the sentiment of the Senate on this question.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems the only point of difference in this matter is the extent to which the Senate will attempt to bind the Senator from Colorado as a conferee on the joint resolution.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Colorado agreed to accept this amendment. Of course, he cannot bind the conferees as to what will happen in conference; but it is my understanding that if this amendment is accepted and agreed to—and I will frankly say that I intend to support it, for I am in sympathy with it—the Senator from Colorado, without attempting to bind other conferees, says to the Senate and will say to the Senate that if he is a conferee, as no doubt he will be, he will use all reasonable and honorable means to see that the viewpoint of the Senate on this question is sustained.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. And it seems to me that is all we have a right to ask.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That question is out.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. REED. May I ask the Senator——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am letting all my time go to Senators who may speak in their own right. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it in order for me to move that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama shall be increased to $40,000,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I make the motion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as I am concerned, I accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has a right to modify his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, as modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. REED and other Senators addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to speak in my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this matter was presented to the Bureau of the Budget. It is just as easy to make any of these propositions look attractive as it is to make this proposition look attractive. I do not know anything about the question of the relative merits; but the Budget Bureau weighed those merits, and that was its duty.

So far as I am concerned, I do not think we ought to increase any appropriation that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended. In my opinion, the Budget Bureau has gone away beyond anything it is justified in doing under the law, which requires it to present a Budget. In my opinion, the President has gone away beyond anything he is justified in doing under legislation in presenting here a Budget three and a half billion dollars in excess of any possible revenues we can secure during the coming year. I say if, with all their disregard of proper financial management, the Bureau of the Budget still holds this appropriation down to $123,000,000, or holds any other appropriation down, I intend to support at least the figure that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended.

I think that argument should apply to this amendment. These projects come one at a time. Just as attractive an argument can be made for every single appropriation as the Senator from Wyoming has made for this particular one. It can be done; but we have the same responsibility that the Bureau of the Budget has. We have the same responsibility to say we are going to hold the total down to a certain figure.

The President has recommended a reduction in relief. As I understand, this reduction is approximately the same percentage that is occurring in the general relief appropriation. It seems to me that if we are going to maintain any kind of a fiscal policy whatever we ought to vote to support the position of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I merely wanted to say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] that if he received from anything I said any impression that there was any lack of confidence on my part in the senior Senator from Colorado, I desire to correct that impression. There is no man on this floor for whom I have higher respect, and I think no one respects him more than I do. I only suggested taking the yeas and nays so that we could emphatically go upon record upon this matter, and so that the senior Senator from Colorado would go into conference armed with a definite expression of the sentiment upon this question.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. AUSTIN addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. REED. To the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the hour and the exigencies, does not the Senator think the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator appointed a conferee would attempt to carry out the mandate of the Senate just as sincerely on a viva voce vote as he would on a roll-call vote, if this amendment is put in the joint resolution?

Mr. REED. If I were in the place of the Senator from Colorado I should prefer to have a roll-call vote back of me when I went into conference on this particular item.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to record myself in favor of this amendment. From personal observation, I am convinced that this is the finest type of relief in which the Federal Government is engaged; but I wish to say in passing that in my opinion there is a grave defect in the Bankhead-Jones Act, to which this section of the pending joint resolution refers.

The joint resolution provides that the funds provided in this section shall be available for farm-debt adjustment service, and making and servicing loans under this section and prior laws. That provision really refers to the Bankhead-Jones Act. The yardstick for allotment of these funds to the different States contains one element which is fallacious. It is an element which recognizes the conditions that exist in only certain States of the United States and disregards a different condition which obtains in a few other States. That is the yardstick consisting of farm tenancy.

Our system in certain of the States is entirely different from that in other States. We find farmers on farms who have an equity in the land; the title came to them, and they have the title; but they are in distress, in just as great distress as the farm tenant in the South is. The condition to which I refer exists in New Hampshire, in Vermont, in Wisconsin, in Minnesota; it is scattered over the northern part of the United States; and those States have been deprived of any substantial benefits under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act, because the allotment measured by the yardstick of farm tenancy is so small that they can participate only to a slight extent.

Mr. President, some time ago I introduced in the Senate a bill, known as Senate bill 2200, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] assured me of his sympatheic interest in that bill; but, somehow or other, the bill is still in the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Permit me to say to the Senator that there has been no opportunity, since we discussed the subject, for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to act on the bill. I had the bill, and intended to request the committee to make a favorable report on it; but we got tied up in a hearing, and adjourned today with only one member present. The others had to rush over here to answer to their names on a quorum call. I say that for the information of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama for that information, and I commend him to the other members of that great committee of the Senate. I take this occasion to ask the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to rectify this mistake promptly, so that there may be a fair and equitable allotment of these funds. I know the good that is done with them, and I want to see relief given to the States where there are good people on farms who cannot pay the high rate of interest charged under the old contract, and cannot meet the amortization or payments on the principal at the present time because of the depression, who need and who are entitled to the benefit of writing down the capital and of writing down and adjusting the interest rate which can be afforded only through this type of relief, which the Federal Government has given by means of the Farm Security Administration. They are entitled to it as much as are the people of the South; and I think the great Committee on Agriculture and Forestry ought to get together and afford that relief before the present session of Congress adjourns.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the hour is late——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has already spoken on the amendment.

Mr. REED. I was going to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I shall support the amendment offered to increase the funds to be available to the Farm Security Administration.

As a practical matter, we know that the Farm Security Administration, like other Government agencies and departments, could use more money; but, unlike certain other

agencies, it could use these funds to the very great advantage of the people and our whole economic and social order.

I know of no other agency created by the Congress to alleviate the suffering of needy persons that has done more than has the Farm Security Administration to relieve conditions wrought by depressed economic conditions, or that has done more to rehabilitate people. It has done fine work in Montana. I wish it were possible to broaden its powers in certain respects, and to increase its appropriation so that it might do more. I have in mind a stump-clearing project in northwestern Montana. If the Farm Security Administration had the funds, together with the proper authority—and I understand the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a bill on the Senate Calendar, Senate bill 1365, which would give the Farm Security Administration that authority—it would be possible to clear land in the great Flathead country in Montana, which would make self-sufficient many deserving families.

Before closing, I wish to pay tribute to those charged with the responsibility of administering the Farm Security Administration—Dr. Alexander, the Administrator; Mr. Baldwin, the Assistant Administrator; Mr. Wilson, regional director at Denver, and the many others with whom I have come in contact.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, a number of Senators have expressed their very great faith in the Farm Security Administration. I fully share that faith. I believe it is one of the finest of the governmental agencies dealing with this very difficult problem. The only place where I differ with these Senators is that after having expressed their great faith in the Farm Security Administration they promptly eat their words, and say that that agency did not know what it was doing when it gave its consent to a reduction to $123,000,000 of the appropriation for the work for the coming year. I go all the way with the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Nebraska is fair-minded.

Mr. BURKE. Is the Senator asking me to yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am.

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to say to the Senator that the Farm Security Administration necessarily acquiesced in the ruling of the Bureau of the Budget. It could not ask for any more than the Budget Bureau recommended.

Mr. BURKE. No statement has been made here, and, so far as I know, there is nothing in the record to indicate that the Farm Security Administration asked for more than $123,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They asked for it as strongly as they could, consistently with the regulations. They said they had 400,000 worthy, needy applicants that they could not accommodate under the amount appropriated. How much stronger could they make it?

Mr. BURKE. So far as I know from attendance at the committee hearings and from examination of the record, the Farm Security Administration and the President were entirely satisfied with the request for $123,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They were not.

Mr. BURKE. The only answer made here today is, "Why, last year we appropriated $50,000,000 more than that." Does that mean that because we appropriated——

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

Mr. BURKE. In a moment, when I finish the sentence. Does that mean that because 1 year, in the depths of distress, we appropriated a certain sum, we must keep on every year from now until the end of time appropriating the same sum? Are we never to come to the time when we can make any reductions in these matters?

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator began his sentence, in which I so rudely interrupted him, with the qualifying phrase, "So far as I know." How far does the Senator know? Is it not a fact that the Senator has not the faintest evidence as to what representations were made by the Farm Security Administration to the Bureau of the Budget, and not the faintest evidence of any reasons why the Bureau of the Budget reduced the appropriation?

Mr. BURKE. I know that the President of the United States submitted to Congress his request for $123,000,000 to carry on the work of the Farm Security Administration for the coming year; and I assume—and I think I am entitled to indulge in that assumption—that the President was acting after thorough consultation and advice with those who were carrying on this important work. If the President felt that under those circumstances $123,000,000 was adequate to carry on this work properly, that is all the information I need on this particular subject.

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

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator bases his argument entirely upon an assumption that the unknown evidence which was submitted by the Budget Bureau, if any, and the unknown evidence upon which the President acted, if he did act, would bear out what he has to say. Contrary to that assumption, I have presented to the Senator facts and figures which cannot be denied, and which, in my opinion, altogether overweigh the mere assumption of the genial and eloquent Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. If I may reverse the roles here and ask the Senator from Wyoming a question, what does he mean by saying that I assumed that "the President acted, if he did act"? What does he mean by "if he did act"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said he acted upon evidence that was presented by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BURKE. Surely the President did not act without any evidence at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, it may be that the Senator himself does not always sign his mail after reading all of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sure we all recognize this issue as too important to human interests to go off on a technical argument. The Senator from Nebraska is a fair-minded man. I recognize the splendid purity of his motives. He is inquiring whether there was any request for more money than the Bureau of the Budget or the President recommended.

Mr. BURKE. Any serious request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He now charges the Farm Security Administration with not asking for a larger amount. Let me read from the hearings. The Senator knows the limitations upon Federal departments about incurring deficiencies and asking for amounts in excess of those recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Let me read to the Senator what was said in the hearings, because I want to convince him. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was questioning Dr. Alexander, and asked this question:

> What do you think about the basis of need? Do you think that there will be as much need?

He was speaking about last year, when they had $135,000,000.

> Mr. ALEXANDER. Senator RUSSELL, there are these 400,000 families we have appealing to us now. Somebody has to take care of them wherever they are or they are going to go to the cities—

Take care of them where they are on the farms, or they will go to the cities—

> or they are going to go wandering around over the county.

Does not the Senator recognize that that was as far as Dr. Alexander could go in calling upon Congress to increase that amount, reminding us that 400,000 families are wandering, when we can keep them on the farms by loans?

Mr. MINTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MINTON. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. BURKE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana if he has a contribution to make to the debate.

Mr. MINTON. If the Senator will yield, does he not think we ought to enforce the rule we have of a limitation on time? Otherwise we will go on all night.

Mr. BURKE. I presume that the Presiding Officer will indicate when my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the time of the Senator from Nebraska on the amendment has expired he will be notified.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, all I desire to do at this time is to express my very great approval of the Farm Security Administration and to reiterate my feeling that, if Mr. Alexander and the others felt that there was going to be great hardship if this reduction from $175,000,000 to $123,000,000 were made, those very able men would have presented that matter to the President of the United States and to the Bureau of the Budget, and when the request was made of Congress it would have been for an amount adequate to take care of the needs. I am not willing by my voice or vote here to express a lack of confidence in the President or in the Bureau of the Budget or in the Farm Security Administration, and therefore I shall stand by their recommendation.

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

Mr. BURKE. If I still have time left, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. May I inquire whether those of us here may take new hope and new heart from the assertion by the Senator from Nebraska that he has confidence in the President of the United States that he is going to give full faith and credit to any recommendation the President may make?

Mr. BURKE. There are clouds which have silver linings, I will say to the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there has been some discussion as to the source of the figures given here. In the House hearings, when Mr. Wallace, the Secretary of Agriculture, appeared, with Mr. Baldwin, Assistant Administrator, it was definitely shown that there were unexpended balances as of June 30 of $15,457,000, which previously it had been expected would be used, which will be available. So if the amendment should not be agreed to, there would be a total of over $139,000,000 allocated in this instance. Mr. Baldwin also stated that the request before the committee at the time was from the President.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, I thought I understood the Senator from Kentucky a few moments ago to arrange for the amendment as originally submitted to be taken to conference in the general form in which any action of the Senate goes to conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this whole debate seems to have followed a colloquy nearly an hour ago with reference to the extent to which the Senator from Colorado considered himself bound by the adoption of the amendment, which he agreed to accept. I undertook to clarify the situation, and if I did not succeed, I should like to make a further effort.

I understood that the Senator from Colorado would consider himself, without attempting to bind other conferees, under the same obligation to use all reasonable and honorable means to see that the Senate viewpoint on this amendment was sustained as much as in the case of any other amendment the Senate puts in the joint resolution. It seemed to me that with that understanding——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas cannot take the Senator from New Mexico from the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas desires to raise a point of privilege, of course, I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I rise to a point of privilege with respect to the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky. I am heartily in favor of the amendment, but I do not think it is in order to put the Senator from Colorado on the hot skillet here, and make him promise in advance what he will individually do as a conferee. If we start that sort of practice on the floor of the Senate, it is in derogation of adjustments between the two Houses.

Every Senate conferee is in honor bound to go to a conference and represent the views of the Senate, but not to represent the views of the Senate merely on one point. There will be 50 points on which the Senator from Colorado will be supposed to represent the views of the Senate. If we single out one or two of them and say "Now, honor bright, you are going to stick to this one," an agreement would never be reached. So I think it is out of order for any such proposition to be put up to the Senator from Colorado. He is a Senator, he is an honorable Senator, and when he is appointed by the Chair as a conferee he is supposed to go to the conference to represent the views of the Senate in its entirety, not merely on some little, inconsequential amendment. I, therefore, think it is out of order to extort from the Senator from Colorado any promise regarding this amendment.

I am for the amendment; I believe it should be adopted. I think the Farm Security Administration is doing a great work, but I do not see anything that is so sacred about this particular amendment that we should go to the extent of demanding of the conferees in advance that "before you ever go to conference, you are told you can sacrifice anything else, but you cannot sacrifice this amendment."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would not agree to put the Senator from Colorado on the spot, so to speak.

Mr. CONNALLY. I referred to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not attempting to bind the Senator from Colorado. Nearly an hour ago the Senator from Colorado agreed to accept this amendment, and if his word had been accepted by the Senate, this matter would have been disposed of nearly an hour ago, but because the Senator from Colorado could not, and was unwilling, in all frankness, to bind the other conferees, to say that he would stand there indefinitely and would not yield on this amendment this debate has ensued.

It seemed to me, in all fairness to the Senator from Colorado and to the Senate, that his position ought to be made clear, that he does not take any different position on this amendment from that he takes on any other amendment put on the joint resolution by the Senate; that is, as a Senate conferee he would attempt to see that the Senate viewpoint was sustained so far as he could reasonably do so, but he could not guarantee that he could bring the joint resolution back to the Senate with the amendment agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely rose to state what the Senator from Texas has so well said, that this situation should never have arisen in the Senate as it has arisen. The Senator from Colorado did say everything a Senator could say under the circumstances; and although I am favorably inclined to the amendment, the way the matter has arisen I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word in reply to the Senator from New Mexico. What the Senator from Texas was objecting to was what he understood to be the suggestion by the Senator from Kentucky that we could adopt this amendment without a roll call provided the Senator from Colorado would make some sort of a declaration as to what he would do as a conferee.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator misunderstood me. My remarks were based on the unwillingness of the proponents of the amendment to accept the statement of the Senator from Colorado nearly an hour ago that he would see that this amendment was given every possible fair consideration in conference. That is all I think we ought to demand of the Senator from Colorado; and, based upon that, I thought we might save time, and we might have saved time by eliminating

all this debate, and even a roll call, but apparently that is impossible, so we will vote on it.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. I have not spoken on the pending joint resolution, and I have not disturbed the Senate in some time. [Laughter.] The Senator from Texas assumes that every Senator here is as good a gentleman as the Senator from Colorado is a conferee, and he accepts the Senator from Colorado as a 100-percent conferee. It seems to me that when a Senator is discussing the privilege of the Senate, Senators ought to listen. They would do well to listen.

The reason for raising this question is that I think it is a matter which goes to the fundamental privilege of the Senate, and I do not think we ought to violate or abuse our fundamental privileges. I beg the pardon of the Senator from Kentucky. I probably misunderstood him. What I am objecting to, however, is the demand that Senators make promises on the floor as to what they will do in conference about some particular amendment. When a Senator goes into a conference he is supposed to represent the views of the Senate on the entire bill. If he could get all the amendments agreed to, that would be well, and if he must sacrifice some of them, he must do the best he can.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know whom the Senator has in mind, but I want to state that I did not take any part in any effort to demand any promise of the Senator from Colorado. I would trust him as freely as I would trust myself.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure the Senator would.

Mr. BANKHEAD. However, in view of the way this whole matter developed, the way the Senator from Colorado expressed the idea that he would take the amendment to conference, I believe it would strengthen his hand in conference with the House if the Senate would now back up the amendment by a vote.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to delay the Senate longer. I merely wanted to make clear the reason why I interjected these remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I come from one of the drought-stricken States. We have had droughts in the western part of North Dakota for 10 years, and a dozen other States have had the worst droughts in the history of the Nation in recent years. The drought area extends from the Canadian border clear to the Mexican border. The farmers there have carried on, and held on to their lands as best they could year after year, hoping for better crops. They are entitled to have assistance, and they must have assistance if they are to stay on the land.

The reason why there is a little balance left in the farm-security fund, as there is at the present time, is because on the 1st of April they cut off the grants they had been paying in the drought areas. Farmer after farmer has made appeals for a little money to keep his family from starving to death. They did not have anything on which to live, in many cases no crops last year, and nothing to live on. Their allotments or benefit payments were cut off, and the grants were cut off on the 1st of April, and many of them had to be reinstated in order that they might be kept going. Many of them have been going hungry during the past month, not only in North Dakota, but in every one of the drought-stricken States.

In addition to that, last year there were low prices, and there was little or no money for the farmers, and they had to have relief. This year prices are still low. Wheat is selling in North Dakota for as low as 55 cents a bushel, corn is low, and as we know, cotton is low in the South, and the farmers in all the Nation will have to be helped again.

The only criticism I have of the amendment is that it does not provide sufficient to take care of the needs. It is not the fault of the Farm Security Administration that there is not a larger sum carried in the bill as it passed the House. It is because they have been told to keep down expenses, and must keep them down, and they did their part along with others. But if there is any department of the Government which needs assistance in the pending measure it is the Farm Security Administration, because they take care of the farmers who have been in hard circumstances, who have lost their crops through no fault of their own, and must have help until they can get a crop.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote on this amendment, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before with reference to my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], and withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I announce that my colleague [Mr. SCHWARTZ] is detained from the Senate by reason of illness. He has a special pair on this vote with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. If he were present and at liberty to vote my colleague would vote "yea," and I understand the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote "nay."

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the negative). I am advised that my general pair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] would vote as I have voted. I therefore let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—49

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Ellender | McCarran | Russell |
| Austin | Frazier | Maloney | Schwellenbach |
| Bankhead | Gibson | Mead | Slattery |
| Barkley | Gillette | Miller | Smathers |
| Bilbo | Guffey | Minton | Stewart |
| Bone | Hayden | Murray | Truman |
| Bulow | Herring | Neely | Van Nuys |
| Capper | Hill | Norris | Wagner |
| Clark, Idaho | Holman | Nye | Wheeler |
| Clark, Mo. | Holt | O'Mahoney | Wiley |
| Connally | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper | |
| Davis | La Follette | Reed | |
| Downey | Lee | Reynolds | |

NAYS—20

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Green | King | Taft |
| Burke | Gurney | Lodge | Tobey |
| Byrd | Hale | Lucas | Townsend |
| Danaher | Hatch | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Gerry | Hughes | Radcliffe | Walsh |

NOT VOTING—27

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Caraway | Logan | Shipstead |
| Bailey | Chavez | Lundeen | Smith |
| Barbour | Donahey | McNary | Thomas, Okla. |
| Borah | George | Overton | Thomas, Utah |
| Bridges | Glass | Pittman | Tydings |
| Brown | Harrison | Schwartz | White |
| Byrnes | Johnson, Calif. | Sheppard | |

So Mr. BANKHEAD's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, line 11, it is proposed to strike out all of section 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations made in this joint resolution shall not be less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Commissioner of Works Projects: *Provided*, That not less than the minimum rate of pay established by the Fair Labor Standards Act (Public Law No. 718, 75th Cong.) for private industry shall be paid to any person engaged upon projects under this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That in fixing the monthly earning schedule of persons employed upon work-projects projects, the Commissioner of Work Projects shall consider differentials in such earnings according to the various classes of work only and shall not give consideration to differentials between cities, counties, or other areas upon the basis of degree of urbanization, or any other factor that will tend to discriminate against the less urbanized areas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we commenced discussing this question in 1933. We have been carrying on the work ever since. It is proposed to maintain in America the wage standard for American living as established by American labor. If the Senate of the United States does not want those who are especially interested in wage standards to advise, then I would say that the Senate should disregard the views of the President of the United States, because following nearly 7 weeks of debate in 1933, at the conclusion of which we were defeated in the prevailing wage amendment, the President of the United States caused an investigation to be made out of which three great zones in America were established looking to the carrying out of the prevailing wage in each of those zones.

The amendment offered takes into consideration first of all the President's executive proclamations following the battle that he conducted in 1933 for the continuation of the prevailing wage.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is the second paragraph or section of the Senator's amendment, relating to the eliminating any differential, a new principle?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not a new principle, if the Senator has in mind a principle that has been worked out and is now in the law.

Mr. WALSH. I understand clearly what the Senator said in reference to the first paragraph and the application of the prevailing rate of wage during the years that have passed; but I have wondered whether the second paragraph was likewise in the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. The second paragraph or the second proviso?

Mr. WALSH. The latter is a better expression.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not in the law, but is in the Executive order.

Mr. WALSH. So that the Senator contends that both the first proviso and the second proviso are now, by reason of the Executive order, the law and the manner in which the wages are adjusted and determined under W. P. A. appropriations.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is entirely correct. In the President's Executive order is involved the security wage. So the security wage has been established, after a study resulting in an Executive order by the President. And then involved in this matter is something more, namely, the wage and hour provision. In other words, we established a floor below which wages could not go, namely, 25 cents per hour.

Mr. WALSH. Does that floor increase with the years, as the wage-and-hour law provides?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not increase.

Mr. WALSH. It remains for the present year at the minimum wage fixed in the wage and hour law, namely, 25 cents?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. But may I bring to the mind of the Senator the three zones established by the Executive order in which the particular minimum-wage scales prevail? There are four wage scales.

Mr. WALSH. Is the minimum wage the same in all those regions?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are not the same. They cannot be the same, because the wage and hour measure does not contemplate that they would be the same.

Mr. WALSH. The wage and hour measure makes the minimum wage uniform throughout the whole country?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, sir; uniform over the entire country. That is true. But remember that the Executive order provided for three zones, and those zones with their particular classification of hours and the particular classification as to monthly earnings, must be contemplated.

I may say, Mr. President, that while we started the battle for this amendment in 1933 with the idea of establishing a wage in conformity with what the labor class of the country had evolved by experience, we have now worked into the amendment not only that experience but also the law as it has been evolved by the Congress.

I submit it to the Senate with the hope that it may be adopted as a substitute in place of the present section 15.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. As the Senator knows, I am strongly in favor of the prevailing-wage principle. I should like to ask the Senator whether the words in the amendment "or other areas" mean that there shall be no difference in pay or in rates of pay between the various sections of the country?

Mr. McCARRAN. In that regard, if the Senator will bear in mind in connection with my answer the three zones, each of which carries its particular rate of pay——

Mr. LODGE. That is what the W. P. A. calls a wage region.

Mr. McCARRAN. A wage region. With that in mind, if I catch the Senator's question, I think my answer is that within the zone there is no differential.

Mr. LODGE. This would not act as a prohibition to a differential between different zones, would it? There would be a differential between the different zones, but there would not be a differential within the zones; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. There would be no differential within the zone.

Mr. LODGE. But there would be one between the zones.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. In other words, let us assume we are in the first zone, and let us assume, if I may go home, that the principal city in my State, with a population of 30,000, has established a wage scale which is recognized by the various methods by which recognition is accomplished. Now, let us assume that a project is outside that particular city. Then the wage scale of that city shall prevail in that project which is outside. But let us assume that over in Idaho, an adjoining State in the same zone, a different wage scale is attempted to be established. Then the amendment carries the idea that the same wage scale shall prevail within the zone in the same district.

Mr. LODGE. But it does not require that the same wage shall be paid in Nevada as is paid in Massachsetts, let us say?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not certain whether or not Massachusetts is in the same zone.

Mr. LODGE. Assume that they are in different zones.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am assuming that. I would say no. I rather think, if I hold in my mind the zones as they have been portrayed, that New England is in the same zone as Nevada.

Mr. LODGE. Then that is a poor illustration. The point I am trying to get at is that there is no attempt in this amendment to iron out all the rates on a uniform basis.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct in that regard.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment and ask for a record vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the first prevailing wage scale was approved by the President of the United States on March 3, 1931. During the years I have been in the Senate I have consistently upheld the principle of the prevailing wage. In 1931 I was actively identified with the movement which finally resulted in the enactment of the Davis-Bacon bill. I have followed this principle through in its application to industrial firms doing business with the Government under the terms of the Walsh-Healey Act. I favored and voted for the essential principles of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The American Federation of Labor over a long period of time has held a consistent position in these matters.

Mr. President, I ask that a copy of the Davis-Bacon Act, approved March 3, 1931, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The act is as follows:

[Public—No. 798—71st Congress]
[S. 5904]

An act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That every contract in excess of $5,000 in amount, to which the United States or the District of Columbia is a party, which requires or involves the employment of laborers or mechanics in the construction, alteration, and/or repair of any public buildings of the United States or the District of Columbia within the geographical limits of the States of the Union or the District of Columbia, shall contain a provision to the effect that the rate of wage for all laborers and mechanics employed by the contractor or any subcontractor on the public buildings covered by the contract shall be not less than the prevailing rate of wages for work of a similar nature in the city, town, village, or other civil division of the State in which the public buildings are located, or in the District of Columbia if the public buildings are located there, and a further provision that in case any dispute arises as to what are the prevailing rates of wages for work of a similar nature applicable to the contract which cannot be adjusted by the contracting officer, the matter shall be referred to the Secretary of Labor for determination and his decision thereon shall be conclusive on all parties to the contract: *Provided*, That in case of national emergency the President is authorized to suspend the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 30 days after its passage but shall not affect any contract then existing or any contract that may thereafter be entered into pursuant to invitations for bids that are outstanding at the time of the passage of this act.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am for the pending amendment and hope it will be enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order to perfect the amendment and to make clear the point which was raised by the question of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I move that the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "city" the word "or" and by striking out after the word "county" the words "or other areas." That modification makes clear the interpretation which the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Massachusetts have agreed upon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator so modifies his amendment.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, may we have the amendment as now modified reported?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], as modified, will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment, as modified, proposes to strike out, on page 19, line 11, all of section 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations made in this joint resolution shall not be less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Commissioner of Work Projects: *Provided*, That not less than the minimum rate of pay established by the Fair Labor Standards Act (Public Law No. 718, 75th Cong.) for private industry shall be paid to any person engaged upon projects under this joint resolution: *Provided further*, That in fixing the monthly earning schedule of persons employed upon work-projects projects the Commissioner of Work Projects shall consider differentials in such earnings according to the various classes of work only and shall not give consideration to differentials between cities or counties upon the basis of degree of urbanization or any other factor that will tend to discriminate against the less urbanized areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as modified. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

On a division the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 16, line 13, I move to strike out the figures "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000." That is to restore the Budget estimate, so that the Commissioner would be authorized to allocate not to exceed $75,000,000 to other Federal agencies for Federal projects.

The change in the language is a mere limitation. The amount of money appropriated in the bill is in no manner affected. Senators who do not understand this proposal think that if money is transferred or allocated over to a Federal department, in some way or other we lose money by the operation. What it means is this: We appropriate $1,477,000,000 to hire to perform work people who are on relief. We are going to pay them by the year. They are going to be on relief, and the question is, For whom shall they work?

If they are on a project sponsored by a municipality, a county, or a State, the Federal Government pays them to work for the county, the State, or the municipality; but if it is on Federal property, we have a limit to the effect that only $50,000,000 may be expended. It is as though I hired a man by the year to work on my farm. I contract with him. I know I have to pay him by the year. However, when it comes time for him to do some work, I say to him that he may not work on my farm. My neighbor may need some work done, and he may go over and work for him, and I will pay him, but he cannot work for me.

The testimony before the committee is that the entire $50,000,000 allowed by the House for this purpose could be expended by the War Department alone. I shall not take the time to read from the hearings, but in the hearings will be found the statement that last year the War Department had $26,000,000 of this kind of labor furnished to it for work upon airports and upon Army posts all over the United States. The War Department could use $50,000,000. The representative of the Navy Department testified that the Navy Department could use $12,000,000. The Department of Agriculture could use $40,000,000 or $50,000,000, if it could obtain the money. In my judgment, the appropriation should be $100,000,000. The Budget estimate is $75,000,000. I ask that the Budget estimate be restored.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this matter has been before the Senate on other relief bills. The question is, What is the appropriate amount? In the bill of a year ago the amount fixed was $60,000,000 on an appropriation relatively the same. It seems to me the Senator from Arizona is being unduly liberal with Federal projects. I move to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona so as to make the amount $60,000,000 instead of $75,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest to the Senator that a good place to make that reduction is in conference. The House

has allowed $50,000,000. The Budget estimate is $75,000,000. If we set the figure at $75,000,000 we shall probably receive $60,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. This is a good place to make the reduction.

Mr. HAYDEN. I hope the Senator's amendment to my amendment will be defeated, and that we will be allowed to take the Budget estimate to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on page 18, line 6, I move to strike out the figures "$40,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], as well as other Senators, the amount on this page was not changed by the Senate committee. The limitation of $50,000 is put upon Federal buildings. I presume that means post offices. So far as Federal post offices are concerned, I think it may be advisable to limit the amount expended on any one building to $50,000, so that any general post office building program can be carried in a bill for that purpose.

A limit of $40,000 of Federal contribution toward any sort of building would very seriously disrupt the building program of the W. P. A. in all the States and make it almost impossible for any building such as a high school to be constructed in a large city. A Federal contribution of $40,000 may be enough for the small towns; but in the larger cities, and even in the larger towns, on the question of building high schools and other public buildings of a permanent and valuable nature, the $40,000 limitation seems to me to be entirely too small. For that reason I have offered the amendment to increase the amount to $100,000. I hope the committee may accept the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. ADAMS addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to say only a word to supplement my personal knowledge of the statement just made by the Senator from Kentucky. At every one of the State institutions in my State we have tried to erect some permanent buildings in cooperation with the W. P. A., the State putting up half the money. As a result, we have some permanent structures that are of permanent value and a real credit to the W. P. A. program.

Great criticism has been directed at the W. P. A. because we started it off as a leaf-raking enterprise, and we have never yet lived it down. So, the more durable and permanent we make W. P. A. projects, I think the more respect and confidence they will have in the public mind.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the figure in the joint resolution, which is the House figure, is entirely too small. I really think it is ridiculously small. Probably it ought to be above the $100,000 which I have fixed in the amendment; but, in view of the situation, I do not feel justified in offering an amendment to go beyond $100,000. I do think, however, it ought to be at least that amount.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, several of the mayors of the larger cities, including the mayor of New York, came before the committee urging an increase in this amount, taking the position that with this limit they could not proceed with the character of construction that is required in a thickly populated, high-priced part of the country. On the other hand, we were presented by the artisans and the workmen with objections even to the $40,000 limit, upon the ground that it was too much. They claimed that we should not undertake large construction with W. P. A. labor; that that construction should be left to the artisans and to the workmen. There was no change in that figure by the committee as a result of a choice between the two arguments.

I am simply presenting the matter so that the Senate may have the problem as it was before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes appear to have it.

Mr. PEPPER. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which is on the clerk's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "$100,000,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "$123,000,000."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this amendment comes up at a fortunate time. I had become a little impatient, fearing that I should never have an opportunity of offering the amendment; but while I listened to the arguments why the appropriation of $123,000,000 on the opposite page, page 91, for farm loans, should or should not be made, I felt like moving that that sum be transferred to page 8, where $100,000,000 is appropriated for the N. Y. A. I was particularly impressed by the argument, both on this side of the Chamber and on the other side of the Chamber, that the recommendations of the President and the Budget Director should be followed. It happens that the same sum of $123,000,000 was the sum in question; and I trust that the arguments of Senators on the other side of the Chamber and on this side that the recommendation of the President should be followed, and $123,000,000 should be appropriated, will cause them to vote in favor of this amendment.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did not the Senator understand me to state that I thought the Budget itself was grossly excessive, and therefore, while I thought nothing should be done over the Budget, I thought reductions should be made wherever they could be made?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I certainly understood that statement; but it seems to me the argument which the Senator from Ohio made at that time is applicable at this time, because this is a project which calls for an increase even more than the other one did; for in the other case the loans are made once for all, while in this case the appropriations for the youth have to be made each year.

The President requested $123,000,000 to help young people between 16 and 24 years of age, some of them to get their education either in school or in college; some of them to be sent to work, and incidentally to learn how to work. It is conservatively estimated that there are about 2,000,000 young people who want the type of work which the N. Y. A. provides in addition to those who want to be aided in their education.

With an appropriation of $123,000,000, the N. Y. A. can somewhere near adequately meet that demand, although it will not meet it completely. This will provide the benefits of education and the benefits of work, too.

I have heard in talking with Senators only one objection to this movement, and that is that the students should not have their education paid for by the Government; that they themselves should pay for it. For that reason I want to read just a few figures showing what the Government actually does pay for the students in helping them to get an education.

I will take the figures from my own State, Rhode Island, because that is the one with which I am familiar.

In Rhode Island, about one-half of the youth who are helped by this appropriation are helped in educational ways by having their tuition in school or college partly paid for, and just about one-half receive the other sort of aid, in work. The amounts that they are paid are as follows:

In the school-aid program in secondary schools they are receiving only $5.63 a month.

In the colleges and universities the college-aid students are earning an average monthly wage of $11.92.

The graduate students in the colleges, who are receiving the highest amount, receive $21.13 a month.

Those on the work program receive an average monthly wage of $19.74 a month.

No one can claim that those students are being pauperized by this amount of Government aid; but it is a fact that those students would not be able to receive the education they are now receiving if they did not receive that additional help from the Federal Government.

Therefore I trust this amount may be increased from the $100,000,000 recommended in the committee report to the $123,000,000 recommended by the President and the Budget Director.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the report made by the unemployment census headed by Mr. Biggers some 2 years ago showed that one-third of the unemployed in the country were between the ages eligible for this program?

Mr. GREEN. That is true.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Under the joint resolution as it comes from the House, the amount allocated for this program is a little less than one one-hundred-and-seventeenth of the total amount allocated for the whole program; so that even with an increase of $23,000,000 it still is not more than one one-hundred-and-fifteenth of the total amount of the program, while one-third of the eligibles for unemployment relief are within the class between the ages of 18 and 24.

Mr. GREEN. That is very true; and to some of us, among whom I include myself, the appeal of youth is the most stirring appeal of all those who need our help, because the future of the country depends on these young men and young women being developed into good citizens. The chance of their being good or bad depends a great deal on the start they get; and, in my opinion, the Government should exert itself to give them a good and a fair start.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LEE. I understand that this amendment is to increase the amount for the N. Y. A. from the figure of $100,000,000 now provided in the joint resolution to $123,000,000, the amount recommended by the President. Is that correct?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. LEE. I am for it.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I had intended to ask for the floor in my own right, but the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH] has pointed out that one-third of the unemployed are between the ages of 16 and 25. I had the figures and wanted to discuss them; but in view of the fact that the point has been made, I desire to associate myself with the opinion expressed by the Senator from Rhode Island, and add to it, if I may, that the numbers in this particular group not only represent one-third of the unemployed at this time, but, due to the fact that so many young men and young women with no opportunity for employment are leaving the high schools and colleges every day, that number is bound proportionately to increase, in my opinion, rather than decrease.

I am very hopeful the Senate will accept this amendment.

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

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Like the Senator from Connecticut, I wanted to take the floor in my own right to discuss the National Youth Administration, particularly as to its work in my own State. There are several matters I wanted to discuss, because they have done a most worth-while job in New Mexico; but if the Senator does not object, I should like to present the figures I have here relating to the work in New Mexico. I shall not take the time now to read them, but I ask permission to insert these figures in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION—FACTS ON THE N. Y. A. PROGRAM IN NEW MEXICO

The fund allotment for the present fiscal year to the State of New Mexico was $580,188. Currently a total of 3,271 persons are employed on the works program and the student-aid program, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Total employment | 3,271 |
| Works program | 2,067 |
| All student-aid programs | 1,204 |
| School aid | 862 |
| College and graduate aid | 342 |
| Total number of participating institutions | 148 |
| Schools | 141 |
| Colleges and universities | 7 |

In New Mexico the earnings of the students receiving N. Y. A. assistance are sufficient to represent the difference between their remaining in school or leaving school because of lack of funds. The students participating in the school-aid program in the secondary schools are receiving an average of $4.89 a month; in the colleges and universities the college-aid students are earning an average monthly wage of $10.93; and the graduate-aid students are averaging $15.71 a month.

On the works program N. Y. A. project workers are receiving an average monthly wage of $17.24 for 47.5 hours of work per month.

The youth on the N. Y. A. projects are learning to do a great many types of work and are becoming familiarized with working conditions in potential fields of private employment. There is an effort made to relate this work experience to training along the lines of the youth's interests and aptitudes.

In New Mexico N. Y. A. project youth are working in the following major work classifications:

| | *Number of persons employed* |
|---|---|
| Highways, roads, and streets | 50 |
| Construction of new buildings | 126 |
| Remodeling and repairing of public buildings | 34 |
| Improvement of grounds | 116 |
| Recreational equipment and facilities (excluding buildings) | 107 |
| Conservation | 8 |
| Sewing | 88 |
| Workshops | 528 |
| Nursery schools | 37 |
| Resident-training projects | 247 |
| Recreational-assistance projects | 214 |
| Clerical projects | 341 |
| Library service and book repair | 88 |
| Museum work | 13 |
| School-lunch projects | 19 |
| Youth-center activities | 28 |
| Miscellaneous projects | 23 |
| Grand total | 2,067 |

In New Mexico, there are 1,131 needy, out-of-school, unemployed youth who are certified by the local welfare agency as eligible for N. Y. A. projects and who are awaiting assignment to project work. It is estimated that there are 9,600 young people between the ages of 18 and 24 who are out of school and unemployed needing and wanting the work experience and training provided by the National Youth Administration.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I think every member of the committee agrees that the work which has been done by the National Youth Administration has been an excellent work. That work has been done with an appropriation of $75,000,000. I gather that the Budget estimate has proved of significance at one time and not at another. Some of the Senators are willing to go above the Budget estimate, but not below it.

What the House did—and the House action was folllowed by the Senate committee—was to divide the difference between the appropriation for last year of $75,000,000 and the Budget estimate for this year of $125,000,000. It seemed to the committee that an increase of $25,000,000 from an appropriation of $75,000,000 was a liberal and entirely adequate one. In addition to that we have reappropriated the unexpended balances, amounting to some $2,000,000 more; so

there is practically an increase of $27,000,000 over the former appropriation of $75,000,000.

That, in substance, is the attitude of the committee.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to call the attention of the Senator to a report which I have here from the N. Y. A., that in Florida there are 5,446 needy, out of school, unemployed youths who have been certified by the local welfare agency as eligible for N. Y. A. projects, and who are awaiting assignment to project work, which is dependent upon there being additional funds available.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, one thing I think perhaps ought to be added. Of the $75,000,000 expended in the past year, there was expended for school help $22,000,000. That is the amount and the proportion that was expended for aiding young men in school. Fifty-three million dollars, or the balance, was expended for projects. We asked the type of projects, and they were all types of projects—ditch digging and every other type. The work is similar to that of the W. P. A. in its character, except with the age limits running from 18 to 25.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not true that involved in the percentage which the Senator has just mentioned were those who were engaged in vocational training?

Mr. ADAMS. I think not. I think that was all included in the educational part. I am making no complaint; I am merely stating to the Senate the facts presented to the committee.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I can give the Senator the figures. When the appropriation of $123,000,000——

Mr. ADAMS. I am interested only in the figures as to what the administration spent out of the $75,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. The proportion is almost the same.

Mr. ADAMS. They testified before the House committee that if they got $123,000,000 they would add $5,000,000 to the amount for education. When they came before us, they said that in view of the fact that some of the House Members were a little dissatisfied with that they proposed that they would take more of it for education.

Mr. GREEN. They provide part-time employment and educational opportunities for the 460,000 needy young people to enable them to continue in schools and colleges and universities, and adequate work experience and training on public projects for 350,000 young people who are out of school and unemployed. That is the relative proportion, 460,000 in the field of education, and 350,000 engaged in what is called out-of-school work.

Mr. ADAMS. Those out of school and at work receive more per month than those in school.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. But the actual proportion in dollars was $22,000,000 for education and $53,000,000 for out-of-school work.

Mr. GREEN. My figures show the number of those helped.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. There is no question about that feature. The only question is whether or not Congress wishes to draw any line as to expenses. If we should go to the point of saying that just because a certain work is desirable we ought to go the limit, and merely say to the Department "What do you want?" the money of this Government would not last 3 years.

Mr. GREEN. It is not what the Department wants, it is what the youth of this country want. Even the amount proposed will not take care of those already certified. It provides for perhaps 200,000 during the present year getting jobs, but the number who need the help are far greater than the number who will get the jobs. The number will increase year by year unless the trend changes, and we will have to appropriate more year by year if we are to look after these young people. It does the same sort of work the C. C. C. does in a different way. It prevents the young men going to the bad on the streets. The C. C. C. has captured the public imagination. I believe the N. Y. A. does equally good work, but it has not yet captured the public imagination; so we hesitate about giving them the increase they need.

Mr. ADAMS. So far as we know, there has been no question as to the desirability of the work. Those in touch with it have been enthused by it. There is merely the one question, as to how much the Government this year should appropriate for that work, how large an increase there should be. Last year the President recommended $75,000,000, and that was appropriated. This year the recommendation went to $123,000,000, and the House of Representatives felt that $100,000,000 would represent a fair increase.

I am not speaking in opposition, other than to say that the Committee on Appropriations felt that the compromise reached by the House was a fair, a reasonable, and an adequate appropriation under existing conditions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question about the difference in the appropriation.

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Can the Senator inform me as to whether the separation of the departments resulted in the National Youth Administration losing funds which it formerly received from the Works Progress Administration?

Mr. ADAMS. I think perhaps they are losing, not funds but perhaps some assistance; that is, formerly the Youth Administration was a part of the W. P. A., and to a certain extent they receive perhaps the benefit of the statistical services and other services of the W. P. A., but there is no loss in the funds. There may have been a countervailing service rendered to the W. P. A. by the Youth Administration.

Mr. HATCH. Somehow I had the impression that the separation would cause additional outlay by the Youth Administration which was not occasioned before because the money was provided by the W. P. A. appropriation.

Mr. ADAMS. There are two things. One is in reference to what the Senator from Rhode Island says. I am still one of those who have hope that conditions are going to be better and that there is going to be less need rather than more need. I have always had faith that the reorganization plan was going to be effective, and that when we changed the departments it would be in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the figures show that there are in the country about 2,000,000 young men and young women, boys and girls, who are eligible for National Youth Administration training, but who cannot get the training because there have not been sufficient funds to give them the training. I desire to emphasize that this whole program of the National Youth Administration is an educational program. It is divided into two divisions, as we know. One is what is called the student aid division, and that is where the National Youth Administration provides money for boys and girls going to high schools, colleges, and universities. The National Youth Administration requires these boys and girls to do a certain amount of work and then pays them the money to enable them to go to the schools and the colleges.

The record shows that these boys and girls who are being helped by the National Youth Administration have made far above the average in their grades in their scholastic standings at the schools and colleges.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wonder if the attention of the Senator has been called to the fact that Mr. Aubrey Williams testified that there are now 997 field positions, but for the 1940 program he contemplates an increase of 1,378 field positions, making a total hereafter of 2,375.

Mr. HILL. For this program to be carried out properly and to be effective requires a great deal of supervision and leadership on the part of the program providing work, under which young men are working on all kinds of different

projects, such as learning machine-shop work, metalwork, foundry work, typewriting and stenography, accounting, bookkeeping, filing, construction work, mechanics, nursery technique, engineering, chemistry, home economics. The boys and girls on these different projects not only have the practical work on the project but they are gathered together, so to speak, in classes and given the theoretical side as well as the practical side. It requires a great deal of leadership and supervision to carry out this program.

Mr. DANAHER. To the extent of an increase of 150 percent, obviously. I ask the Senator if he realizes that Mr. Williams also testified, as bearing on the Senator's reference to the youth in the colleges, and the like, that the increase in the cheapest part of the program for such assistance is only $5,000,000. It was so testified. Does the Senator realize that?

Mr. HILL. The cheapest part, of course, is the chief part. We know some of these boys and girls in colleges and high schools are receiving only five, six, seven, or eight dollars a month. That is a very cheap part of the program, but it is a great educational program, and it is now taking fine, splendid young boys and girls out of idleness and giving them an opportunity not only to work, but to go to school and train and prepare themselves for their life's work. The figures show that the turn-over in this work program is over 10 percent a month, over a hundred percent a year.

We know that the average boy and girl who comes to one of our offices and asks for a position does not know anything about the work, has no particular training, is not qualified for any particular kind of employment. This sort of program, whether it is teaching the boy chemistry, or to be an automobile mechanic, prepares the boy for his life work, it trains him so that he may go out and get a job in private employment. The figures show that is just exactly what is happening. There is a large turn-over, of more than 10 percent a month, of these boys being trained by the Government, preparing themselves so that they may carry on and thereby go out and get employment.

Mr. President, it is the cheapest form of help or assistance the Government is engaged in furnishing today. It costs just one-tenth of what the C. C. C. work costs. We all know how fine the C. C. C. work is, but this work is also fine, and costs just exactly 10 percent of what the C. C. C. work costs. There are some 2,000,000 fine, splendid boys and girls in the United States today who are idle, who are seeking something to do. They are the seed corn of this Nation. We should not permit them to rot; we should give them this opportunity to prepare themselves for work, to prepare themselves to carry on their part in this Nation.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, when the honorable and able committee which is responsible for a $23,000,000 deficiency in the item now before the Senate acted in this matter, it was manifestly under the influence of the philosophy of the elderly woman who decided that she would for the first time in her life ride on a train. She went to the station and said to the agent, "I want a ticket to Springfield." The agent responded: "There are several Springfields—one in Ohio, one in Illinois, and one in Massachusetts. To which Springfield do you want to go?" She retorted: "To whichever one is the cheapest." [Laughter.]

In her opinion the cost of transportation was more important than destination. In the matter of opening the doors of opportunity to the young people of the United States, destination is more vital than cost. There are now 2,000,000 young men and women in this country who are eligible for enrollment by the N. Y. A., but no accommodations are available to them. Three hundred thousand of these have been certified for enrollment. They are imploring the Government to extend them a helping hand. To their supplication deafened ears must not be turned. If there should be a war, the boys who are among these eligibles would, if necessary, be conscripted and sent into the trenches to fight and perhaps to die for their native land. And the girls among the eligibles for enrollment by the National Youth Administration would be required to work in factories and fields as substitutes for the boys who had gone to war.

We should expect all of them to be loyal to our flag and the glorious institutions for which it stands.

In return for the loyalty we require of them, we should make it possible for them to obtain employment or acquire an education. The most important asset of this Nation is not the silver that is stored at West Point. It is not the money in the Treasury. It is not the hoarded gold in Kentucky. Our boys and girls are more valuable than all of these combined. Because—

Not gold but only men
  Can make a people great and strong;
Men who for truth and honor's sake,
  Stand fast and suffer long;
Brave men, who work while others sleep,
  Who fight while others fly;
They plant a nation's pillars deep
  And raise its banners to the sky.

Let us not shut the door of opportunity in the faces of these young men and women. Let us rescue them from the possibility of becoming failures on earth, or the necessity of begging their bread from door to door. By adopting the pending amendment to provide them an additional sum of $23,000,000 we shall so demonstrate our determination to be just to them in their necessity that they will patriotically and sincerely proclaim:

My country 'tis of thee
Sweet land of liberty
  Of thee I sing.

They will wholeheartedly help to plant this Nation's pillars deep and raise its banners to the sky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. NEELY. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "who are in need" and to insert the words "who have been certified as in need of employment and who are qualified and available therefor."

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make effective the provision for veterans' preference. As it is now, the language is "who are in need," and as that has been interpreted it works a disadvantage to the disabled veteran who draws a small income. For instance, the Administration has held that a veteran with a pension of $15 or $20 a month is not in need. The amendment changes the provision so as to read "who have been certified as in need of employment" and makes effective the veterans' preference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I tender an amendment which is now on the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, line 3, it is proposed to insert the following sentence: "This section shall not apply to municipal electric plants."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, it clearly appears in the language of section 34 that an effort has been made to prevent any part of W. P. A. funds being used in manufacturing plants which might compete with private industrial operations, but the language is obscure and ambiguous, and I take it that there has been no studied effort on the part of the Senate committee at least to make it impossible to use W. P. A. work in connection with the expansion of electric-light enterprises carried on by a municipal body.

In the Northwest particularly a great many municipal operations are being carried on, which are now in existence,

and it is vitally important that there be nothing in the measure which might be construed as a prohibition against the use of W. P. A. funds in projects associated with that sort of an expansion. It may be that other sections of the country do not care to do this, but in my section of the country, where we have Bonneville and Grand Coulee, this becomes a matter of very vital importance.

I talked to the Senator from Colorado, and he assured me that there was no desire on the part of the Senate committee in charge of the joint resolution to make it possible, by construction of the language, to forbid the use of W. P. A. labor in connection with the expansion of these little plants. They are very small affairs in the West. So I have suggested this language in order to get rid of any ambiguity, and to remove any question which might arise out of an attempt to interpret the act. That is my sole and only purpose in offering the amendment.

I discussed it with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who, I am at liberty to say, authorized me to say he is in favor of it. I believe the amendment, which is proposed merely in the interest of clarification and the removal of any question, should be adopted. It does not expand the bill or add anything to it. It simply allows the little plants in my section, of which there are large numbers, to avail themselves of the opportunity to employ W. P. A. workers on projects embraced in the expansion and operation of small plants.

I urge my brethren of the Senate to adopt the amendment. There is nothing in the amendment which adds anything to the cost. It is a decent, purposeful, worth-while thing. If it be said that the language does not forbid the use of W. P. A. labor on those projects, then, Mr. President, there could be no objection to the amendment, because it merely makes impossible an interpretation of the language to the injury of those little plants of which there are a large number in the Northwest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 7, after the comma, following the word "Service", it is proposed to strike out "$300,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$600,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was about to make an explanation, Mr. President. I am glad that the temper of the Senate is such that Senators are willing to listen for one moment to what I regard to be one of the most important provisions in connection with this measure. The purpose of the amendment is to appropriate to the Public Health Service the sum of $600,000 for the supervisory work which that Department of Government does in connection with public-health projects within the several States.

At the present time in 29 States cooperative community sanitation programs are being carried on by the State public health departments in conjunction with the Federal health service operating Works Progress projects. In 17 States there are malaria-control projects, and they are of vital importance to the health of the people of those States.

In the fiscal year 1937 and in 1938 $1,300,000 was made available for this purpose to the Public Health Service, to give technical advice and engineering service to carry on these worth-while health programs. In this measure only $300,000 is allowed.

I submit that any such drastic reduction as that is wholly unjustified, and that its effect will be to dry up and starve every public health project in the United States.

I am merely asking for $600,000, as compared to an appropriation of $1,300,000 made for the same purpose in 1937 and 1938. I have here and could give a great many statistics to the Senate showing the vital importance of these public-health projects. Certainly, the labor that we find on the rolls of the Work Projects Administration, the unskilled labor, can be utilized to better advantage in drainage and public-health projects than in almost any other kind of project. It would be nothing short of criminal now to cut them all off and stifle them by this drastic reduction in the appropriation to the Public Health Service of the United States for the supervisory and technical work.

I beg of the Members of the Senate to consider the importance of this small amount of money proposed to be added to the sum we are appropriating to preserve public-health projects in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the benefit of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

"The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting at the end of section 3 a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(e) Loans may also be made under this title to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm personally occupied and operated by him and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon, in cases where the Secretary determines that such refinancing is necessary and will enable the borrower successfully to operate the farm, and that the borrower cannot obtain credit for such refinancing from any other Federal agency or federally incorporated lending institution. Such loans shall comply with all the provisions of this title: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title, but shall not use for such purpose in excess of 10 percent of the funds made available during any fiscal year for the making of loans under this title.'"

Mr. AUSTIN. A very brief explanation of the amendment seems to be in order. It is germane to that part of the pending joint resolution which is entitled "Department of Agriculture," and which starts out with the words:

In order to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and relief to needy farmers—

And so forth. And then, on page 10, it specifically provides that the funds may be used for "farm-debt adjustment service and making and servicing of loans under this section and prior law."

One of those prior laws is the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and the section which I propose to amend is section 3, which provides:

Loans made under this title shall be in such amount (not in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire—

Notice that word—

to acquire the farm and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon.

And so forth. The point is right on that word "acquire." My amendment provides that "Loans may also be made under this title to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm."

Under this Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act, as drafted, we have section 4 reading as follows:

In making loans under this title, the amount which is devoted to such purpose during any fiscal year shall be distributed equitably among the several States and Territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy, as determined by the Secretary.

That is the point—"prevalence of tenancy."

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, does the Senator's amendment change that point; and if so, how?

Mr. AUSTIN. It does, in this way:

*Provided, however,* That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title—

That is what I have just read—

but shall not use for such purpose in excess of 10 percent of the funds made available during any fiscal year for the making of loans under this title.

In other words, this is a very simple arrangement which undertakes to make it possible for the Farm Security Administration to go into those States where they are now unable to allocate funds because of the small amount of farm tenancy. This proposal was recommended by the Farm Security Administration. It was drawn by the Farm Security Administration. It is supported by the Farm Security Administration and by the Farm Bureau Federation. It is fair. It adds no burden onto the country, but it enables the Government to aid to rehabilitate the farmers who have titles which they are going to lose because they must meet the heavy interest demand, and because they are unable to meet it on the due date of these obligations.

It is suggested to me that they are land poor. That is one way of saying the same thing I am saying. They are industrious, they are thrifty, they are honest, they pay as they can, but, as Senators all know, their circumstances have been such that they were obliged to default interest and principal on their farm mortgages.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska, who has been seeking recognition.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I think this is a very commendable amendment. However, on page 2, line 1, the language seems to make it necessary for the borrower, before he can avail himself of the benefits of the provision, to prove that he cannot obtain credit from any other Federal agency. Why is it necessary to include that provision?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I understand that that is the policy of the Farm Security Administration, and that it is also the policy under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act. In order that the RECORD may show what that policy is, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD all of section 3 of that act, to which this language refers.

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

SEC. 3. (a) Loans made under this title shall be in such amount (not in excess of the amount certified by the county committee to be the value of the farm) as may be necessary to enable the borrower to acquire the farm and for necessary repairs and improvements thereon, and shall be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust on the farm.

(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and security given therefor shall—

(1) Provide for the repayment of the loan within an agreed period of not more than 40 years from the making of the loan.

(2) Provide for the payment of interest on the unpaid balance of the loan at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

(3) Provide for the repayment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon, in installments in accordance with amortization schedules prescribed by the Secretary.

(4) Be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the unpaid balance of the loan, together with interest thereon, to protect the security, and to assure that the farm will be maintained in repair, and waste and exhaustion of the farm prevented, and that such proper farming practices as the Secretary shall prescribe will be carried out.

(5) Provide that the borrower shall pay taxes and assessments on the farm to the proper taxing authorities, and insure and pay for insurance on farm buildings.

(6) Provide that upon the borrower's assigning, selling, or otherwise transferring the farm, or any interest therein, without the consent of the Secretary, or upon default in the performance of, or upon any failure to comply with, any covenant or condition contained in such instruments, or upon involuntary transfer or sale, the Secretary may declare the amount unpaid immediately due and payable, and that, without the consent of the Secretary, no final payment shall be accepted, or release of the Secretary's interest be made, less than 5 years after the making of the loan.

(c) Except as provided in paragraph (6) of subsection (b), no instrument provided for in this section shall prohibit the prepayment of any sum due under it.

(d) No provision of section 75, as amended, of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 11, sec. 203; Supp. II, title 11, sec. 203), otherwise applicable in respect of any indebtedness incurred under this title by any beneficiary thereof, shall be applicable in respect of such indebtedness until such beneficiary has repaid at least 15 percent thereof.

Mr. NORRIS. I think what the Senator says is probably true; but it has occurred to me that before a farmer can avail himself of this provision he must make some negative proof.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. He has to go to the trouble, time, and expense of proving that he has tried this agency, that agency, and the other agency, and that they all turned him down.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; that is true.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not like that part of it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Neither do I.

Mr. NORRIS. I would suggest to the Senator that he leave out that part of the language.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am afraid that would run counter to the policy of the Farm Security Administration. When I talked the matter over with representatives of the Farm Security Administration it was claimed that the Administration did not want to become the reservoir of mortgages now held by the Farm Credit Administration or some other of the lending agencies of the Government and have the whole business dumped onto it.

Mr. NORRIS. Before a farmer can obtain any relief under this provision he must almost prove that he is a pauper and that he cannot obtain relief anywhere else. It seems to me the proof he has to offer has a tendency to show that he is a poor risk.

Mr. AUSTIN. Indeed, this kind of relief is to prevent his becoming a pauper, because he is in great danger of that right now. Many of these defaulted mortgages on farms are under foreclosure at the present time, and this type of relief ought to be granted, but it cannot be. The Farm Security Administration comes in with a very beneficial service. There is a humane side to this question, besides the money side. I refer to the side of the farmer.

Of course, it is also an advantage to a creditor in one respect to go to the debtor and negotiate with him upon a settlement which reduces the debt, reduces the interest, and extends the period of payment for a longer period of time, making it possible for the farmer, who thus far has been unable to make his payments, to do so in the future. So there is a saving to these thrifty people who are merely victims of the bad times through which we have been passing.

Mr. LEE and Mr. MILLER addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LEE. A portion of the Senator's amendment disturbs me somewhat. I do not know whether it applies to the purchase of farms for farm tenants, or only to refinancing. I am very much in sympathy with the Senator's amendment to make provision for refinancing farm loans which are in distress, because it is just as much of an advantage to save a farmer from becoming a farm tenant as it is to rehabilitate one who is already a tenant.

What disturbs me is that, as I understand, a provision of the Senator's amendment would strike down the only yardstick or criterion by which these loans are to be made in the different States and different sections. The present Bankhead-Jones law provides that these loans shall be made according to the ratio of farm tenancy to farm population, which provides some guide for making the loans. Part of the Senator's amendment, I think, strikes down the theory of the Bankhead-Jones act. If it applied only to refinancing, I would not see any objection to it. However, if it applies to the sale of farms as well as to refinancing, it seems that we ought not to agree to it, unless the Senator has some other provision which will give us a guide for making these loans.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, in answer to the learned Senator I assure him that he has misunderstood the amendment. The amendment does not strike down the theory of the Bankhead-Jones Act at all. It leaves section 3 as it was with respect to acquisition. That is dependent upon

the tenancy feature, just as the Senator from Oklahoma wants it to be. That is left undisturbed. The amendment relates solely to adding to section 3 this language:

Loans may also be made under this title to enable the borrower to refinance an existing mortgage or mortgages on a farm personally occupied and operated by him.

That is all. It adds that aid, and it is limited in amount. The amount of money which may be allocated to a State where this condition exists is limited by the proviso:

*Provided, however,* That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title—

Mr. LEE. Is not section 4 the one which gives the Department the guide, which is the ratio of farm tenancy to farm population?

Mr. AUSTIN. That relates only to allocation to the State. Let me read it:

SEC. 4. In making loans under this title the amount which is devoted to such purpose during any fiscal year shall be distributed equitably among the several States and Territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy as determined by the Secretary.

Mr. LEE. Is that language left in?

Mr. AUSTIN. That language is left in, exactly as it is. It is not changed at all. In those States where that yardstick bars the allocation to them of their equitable ratio of the amount of this appropriation, the proviso comes in to a limited degree, namely, 10 percent:

*Provided, however,* That the Secretary may make such loans without regard to the provisions of section 4 of this title, but it shall not use for such purposes in excess of 10 percent of the funds made available during any fiscal year for the making of loans under this title.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield further.

Mr. LEE. I am very much in sympathy with the Senator's amendment; and I should like to say that the farm-tenancy bill, which is now on the calendar, has a provision in it for the refinancing of farm mortgages which are in distress.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know about that bill. However, it does not service the social purpose covered by the Farm Security Administration. We want to rehabilitate these families. That can be done by giving attention to them directly, going to the family and discovering what will aid the family to produce a better income with which to retire the debt. That is one aspect of this service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall take time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized on the bill.

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

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

Mr. MILLER. I wish to refer to the proviso in the amendment, making a limitation of 10 percent of the funds made available in one fiscal year. Personally I think the Senator is to be congratulated upon the amendment. I think it will serve a very useful purpose in every State in the Union. It will reach a class of people who cannot be reached in any other way of which I know. Neither the Federal land bank nor any other agency is reaching them. I refer to a class of people who are going on relief daily and constantly. Unless relief is granted, I do not know what is going to become of them. I wonder why the Senator limited the amount of loans to 10 percent of the appropriation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall be quite frank about that. It was believed that those States which now enjoy a a larger allocation by virtue of the limitation with respect to prevalence of farm tenancy might object if more than 10 percent were diverted to other States in trying to allocate an equitable amount. However, since the appropriation has been increased tonight, I feel certain that that objection cannot possibly be made on any rational basis.

Mr. MILLER. I think it would be a short-sighted policy for any State to object, because the thing which is creating farm tenancy in this country is the inability of the small landowner to obtain a loan.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont made reference to the fact that the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration had been increased tonight. I voted for that increase. I think it was deserved. However, not one dollar of that money can be used for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. The appropriation for the purpose of enabling tenant farmers to purchase farms, and which would be available for the purposes of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont in the event that amendment is adopted, was carried in the agricultural appropriation bill. Senators will recall that the Senate amended that bill to appropriate the full amount of the authorization of $50,000,000 for that purpose for the coming fiscal year. The conferees on the part of the Senate supported the Senate position as valiantly as they knew how. We insisted that the House conferees take that amendment back for a separate vote in the House. The House voted it down by a substantial vote. When the action of the House was reported to the Senate, the Senate again insisted on its amendment and threw the matter into conference once more.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know whether or not I surrendered the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator did; and the Chair recognized the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator in my time.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask the Senator how he interprets the language on page 10 of the pending measure:

The sums provided in this section shall be available—

Now, come down to line 7:

for farm-debt adjustment service and making and servicing of loans under this section and prior law.

As a lawyer I cannot see why that does not refer directly to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act as prior law. Throughout the provision entitled "Department of Agriculture", we find direct references to it, particularly on page 11, where it is provided that:

The Farm Security Administration within the Department of Agriculture is hereby extended until June 30, 1940,

Why?

to carry out the purposes of this section.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the very reason why I do not think the funds voted here tonight are available for the purpose of making loans on land. True it is that they are available for the purpose of making loans, and that is the chief function of the Farm Security Administration, but the loans referred to in section (b) are loans which are made to farmers to enable them to make crops, and to purchase livestock and farming implements and things of that nature, and personal property, and do not pertain to the real-estate loans which are provided for in title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

By some strange construction or perhaps by some logical construction of the language pointed out by the Senator from Vermont, loans might be made on land; but undoubtedly the references here are to the loans which are made on personal property, and which are made to farmers to enable them to subsist and live during the period in which they are making crops and do not apply to the farm-tenant loans.

I have no quarrel with the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. It will doubtless serve a useful purpose. I do think the sum of $40,000,000, which has just been agreed to in the agricultural appropriation bill, is woefully inadequate for the purpose of dealing with the farm-tenancy program or with the problem of refinancing loans of the type the Senator from Vermont has described. I put the House conferees on notice that if it was possible to do so in any deficiency bill I intended to offer again an amendment

appropriating the $10,000,000 that the Senate heretofore has voted, to bring this appropriation up to the full amount of the authorization of $50,000,000; and I therefore offer an amendment to the Senator's amendment, appropriating the $10,000,000 authorized by law for the purpose of making these loans to tenant farmers to enable them to purchase farms. These funds will also be available for the purpose sought by the Senator from Vermont in his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont the following:

There is hereby appropriated the sum of $10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of said Bankhead-Jones Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing ing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the relief joint resolution been laid aside and the Bankhead-Jones bill been taken up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, we seem to have before us an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act and then another amendment appropriating money to carry out the Bankhead-Jones Act. I do not know anything about the merits of the thing. It seems to me, however, that the relief joint resolution ought in some way to be confined to provisions bearing upon relief.

This amendment starts out:

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting at the end of section 3 a new subsection, reading as follows—

Then I gather that my fellow member of the Appropriations Committee has a provision adding $10,000,000 for the operation of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am merely restoring the $10,000,000 which was twice voted in the Senate, but which we have never been able to get the House to agree to.

Mr. ADAMS. In the Bankhead-Jones Act, or in the relief joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am offering it as an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. ADAMS. Which is an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is. It is in order, however.

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, it is in order in a purely parliamentary sense.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. LEE. If we are able to take a farm family off W. P. A. and put them on a farm that they have a chance to buy, and make the farm purchase itself, that is relief; and if we are able to keep a farm family from losing their farm and going on W. P. A., is not that relief?

Mr. ADAMS. Does the Senator from Oklahoma seriously contend that in the passage of a great relief measure we ought to go back into some other farm bill which is pending before the Agricultural Committee, and has not been reported out from that committee, just because it is a good bill?

I think the Senate ought to exercise a little discretion in handling this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], as amended. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" appear to have it.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Frazier | Lee | Reed |
| Austin | Gerry | Lodge | Reynolds |
| Bankhead | Green | Lucas | Russell |
| Barkley | Guffey | McCarran | Schwellenbach |
| Bilbo | Gurney | McKellar | Slattery |
| Bone | Hale | Maloney | Smathers |
| Bridges | Harrison | Mead | Stewart |
| Bulow | Hatch | Miller | Taft |
| Burke | Hayden | Minton | Tobey |
| Byrd | Herring | Murray | Townsend |
| Capper | Hill | Neely | Truman |
| Clark, Mo. | Holman | Norris | Vandenberg |
| Connally | Holt | Nye | Walsh |
| Danaher | Hughes | O'Mahoney | Wheeler |
| Davis | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper | Wiley |
| Ellender | La Follette | Radcliffe | |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The yeas and nays have been requested by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] on his amended amendment. Is the request seconded?

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

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before concerning my pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is paired on this question with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. If present, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

Mr. HALE (after having voted in the negative). My general pair, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], would vote as I have voted; so I will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—43

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Austin | Bone | Connally | Frazier |
| Bankhead | Bridges | Danaher | Guffey |
| Barkley | Bulow | Davis | Gurney |
| Bilbo | Capper | Ellender | Hayden |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hill | Mead | O'Mahoney | Smathers |
| Holman | Miller | Pepper | Stewart |
| Holt | Minton | Reed | Tobey |
| La Follette | Murray | Reynolds | Truman |
| Lee | Neely | Russell | Wheeler |
| McCarran | Norris | Schwellenbach | Wiley |
| Maloney | Nye | Slattery | |

NAYS—19

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Green | Johnson, Colo. | Taft |
| Burke | Hale | Lodge | Townsend |
| Byrd | Hatch | Lucas | Vandenberg |
| Clark, Mo. | Herring | McKellar | Walsh |
| Gerry | Hughes | Radcliffe | |

NOT VOTING—34

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Andrews | Clark, Idaho | King | Smith |
| Ashurst | Donahey | Logan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bailey | Downey | Lundeen | Thomas, Utah |
| Barbour | George | McNary | Tydings |
| Borah | Gibson | Overton | Van Nuys |
| Brown | Gillette | Pittman | Wagner |
| Byrnes | Glass | Schwartz | White |
| Caraway | Harrison | Sheppard | |
| Chavez | Johnson, Calif. | Shipstead | |

So Mr. AUSTIN'S amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 18, line 6, to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$75,000." In the amount of money appropriated, the amendment is the same as the one I offered awhile ago which was defeated by a tie vote on a division, except that the amount was $100,000 then instead of $75,000. This does not change the amount appropriated in the joint resolution at all.

I have talked with Colonel Harrington about the effect of this $40,000 limitation, and he says it will disrupt the building program of the W. P. A. in every State of the Union. I know it will in my State, and I am sure it will in all the States. I think the Senate feels that $40,000 is too little as a limitation, because even with the State or the locality putting up 25 percent of the total cost, it means that the outside limitation on the construction of any commodious high-school building in any community of any size would be limited to about $50,000 or $52,000. It is not enough. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 2, after the period it is proposed to insert the following:

> If the person filing such affidavit was not born in the United States, the affidavit shall contain a statement as to the time, place, and manner of his entry into the United States and the time and place of his acquisition of said citizenship by naturalization.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on page 22, beginning in line 20, we find the following language:

> (e) No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship.

The amendment would merely be a further assurance on the part of the Government that only duly qualified American citizens should be provided with work under the terms of the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, line 18, before the period, it is proposed to insert "or to any person who participates in any activity the subject matter of which relates to the overthrow of such Government through force or violence."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this is in reference to the matter we had under discussion this afternoon in regard to communistic activities in the W. P. A. In other words, anyone who participates in activities of the sort mentioned in the amendment would not be entitled to employment under W. P. A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 24, to strike out the word "and" and to insert a comma after the word "recreational", and to strike out the word "work" and the semicolon following the said word "work"; in line 25, to insert a comma after that part of the word "production" which appears in line 25; to strike out the words "of goods for distribution to the needy" and the semicolon following the word "needy" and to insert a comma after the word "service" appearing in line 25, to strike out the words "to the"; and on page 4, line 1, to strike out the word "needy" and the comma following that word.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in explanation of the amendment, I will merely say that striking out the words and making the corrections I have suggested in the amendment restores the language of existing law. In the bill as prepared by the House, I think, striving to strike at the theater project and the art project, a change was made in the language which does and will interfere with work rather than the projects which were sought to be affected. The amendment which I offer merely restores the language of the existing law.

I conferred with the Senator from Colorado earlier in the day, and at that time he agreed as I understood to take the amendment to conference. I am perfectly willing to rely upon the Senator from Colorado.

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

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was interested in offering an amendment, and I am anxious to know whether it is not covered perhaps by what the Senator has offered. I propose at the bottom of page 3, after the word "needy," to offer an amendment providing "including men, women, or children receiving treatment or maintenance from charity or from any charitable institution."

Mr. HATCH. One of the purposes of the amendment is to cover cases of that kind.

Mr. PEPPER. They will be covered, and goods from the W. P. A. can be distributed under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few minutes on the joint resolution itself. I intend to vote for it, but I do not like to vote for it without explaining that I do not approve of the principle of the measure—that I think relief ought to be returned to the States. I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a bill presenting a system which I believe should be adopted, and have it printed as a part of my remarks, it being the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and myself, presenting substantially the plan which was presented as an amendment to the Byrnes bill earlier in the session.

I do not like to vote against the pending measure because we have a serious relief problem.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did I understand the Senator to say that he is against the joint resolution in principle?

Mr. TAFT. I say I am against the principle of the administration of work relief by the Federal Government; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then why is the Senator going to vote for the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Because we face a situation in which a very large number of men—2,000,000 men—will be thrown out of work on the 1st of July unless we take this action now, because it is impossible to change the system except after a very considerable time. The bill which I present proposes that the system be changed on the 1st of July 1940, because it requires the States to adopt a plan of relief which must be approved by the Federal Government, and under which the Federal Government will extend aid to the States to the extent of 66⅔ percent of the total cost of work relief and direct relief, just as it extends aid for old-age pensions and other uses under the Social Security Act.

In the meantime, until that system can be adopted, I see no alternative except to proceed with the present system.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator has such a fine plan all worked out, why did he not introduce it some months ago, when there would have been some hope of getting it adopted?

Mr. TAFT. Substantially this bill was introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] almost the very first day of the session. The committee has not seen fit to give consideration to any such change in plan. We think we have somewhat perfected the bill. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and myself have joined in presenting at the present time a bill which I hope will be considered at this session, because, as I have said, it will take nearly a year to get the necessary State legislation and the necessary plans if we are to have administration by the States.

Mr. HATCH. Did I understand the Senator to say that he proposes that the Federal Government shall contribute toward the payment of direct relief in the States?

Mr. TAFT. I propose that the work relief and direct relief be one plan, and that the Federal Government contribute approximately 66⅔ percent of the total cost of work relief and direct relief to the States; yes.

Mr. HATCH. Then the Senator proposes to destroy the principle we have now established, that the Federal Government shall contribute only toward the employment of persons who can work?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I propose to destroy that distinction. It is a distinction which never should have been made. There is no real distinction between employables and unemployables; and the Federal Government has never carried out the principle laid down originally, that it would employ all employables. There is no distinction. The two ought to be administered together. They should work together, and they should also work together with the unemployment-insurance divisions which are operated by the States. There should be one single administration if we are to have effective relief, and, in my opinion, the Federal Government, if it is to carry out such a system, must contribute the money.

I think relief is a local problem, but I recognize the fact that the localities and the States have no means of taxation sufficient to provide adequate funds. So we must assist them, as we must assist them in the case of old-age pensions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the cost of direct relief in the United States is about equal to the cost of work relief.

Mr. TAFT. No; I think the cost of work relief is very high. The cost of direct relief is less than 50 percent of the cost of work relief today. I do not know whether if work relief were properly administered, it would not be almost as much, but my impression is that today it is less than 50 percent of the cost of direct relief. The result is that what we are doing today is to make the States contribute 25 percent for the cost of work relief and the whole cost of direct relief, so that today the localities, under the present system, are forced to pay nearly half of the total cost of all relief.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then the Senator's plan proposes to transfer what is now a local burden to the Federal Government. How would he save any money?

Mr. TAFT. I think the administration of relief by localities will be infinitely more economical. There is no city council in this country, there is no State legislature in this country, with the utter lack of financial responsibility demonstrated by this body tonight. There is not another body in this country that I know of which will vote millions and millions of money when they do not know where the money is coming from, when they cannot think of a system of taxation which will provide the money they are spending. If the administration of relief is so changed that the localities will have the responsibility for administering the relief, and providing a percentage of the funds, it will be an infinitely more economical administration. There will be less money spent by the Federal Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator spoke of the bill in substance having been prepared very early in the session—I believe in January—and introduced. Has there been the slightest effort upon the part of anyone to bring it out of the Committee on Appropriations, so far as the Senator knows?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is a matter for the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] also introduced a similar bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did it go to our committee?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know to which committee it was referred. The President himself has reiterated that he is entirely opposed to the principle, and apparently so long as the present administration is in power the possibility of adopting this system is not worth the effort, practically, of insisting upon the adoption of the plan by a committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wanted to let that be understood.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand the Byrnes committee has also considered the problem. It has not met their approval, and they have refused to go ahead with any serious consideration of such plans.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to ask one other question. The Senator from Ohio, I understand, says he does not know to what committee this matter was referred. Is that correct? He does not know before what committee it has been pending during all the present session?

Mr. TAFT. I understand the Byrnes Committee on Unemployment Relief has been considering it, but has not given it serious consideration.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] himself is opposed to this system, and wrongfully, I think. I think he confuses public works with relief. I do not think they ought to be confused. I think relief is one thing and public works another.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suppose the Senator has asked for a hearing before the Byrd committee?

Mr. TAFT. No; I have no bill pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then to what bill is the Senator referring?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] offered a bill as an amendment, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] also offered a bill. All three of us joined in offering amendments to the Byrnes bill when it was before the Senate, which we would have pressed had the Byrnes bill not been laid aside at that time because of the reorganization. I have now proposed a bill which was offered as an amendment to the Byrnes bill at that time. The bill is a combination of two previous bills and one or two additional ideas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Ohio is against the Federal Government administering direct work or work relief as a Federal proposal entirely?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. But he is in favor of a bill which would make the States do it, and require the approval of the Fed-

eral Government, and also make the Federal Government pay two-thirds of the cost?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Two-thirds for the present. I should hope that as the problem grew less the amount might be lowered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator said awhile ago that direct relief, which is now borne by the localities, is as large as the Works Progress Administration. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. No; I said I thought it was less than 50 percent. In my own locality, with which I am familiar, it is only 25 or 30 percent of the cost of W. P. A.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that be true, the Federal Government would be paying about as much under the new plan as it pays now.

Mr. TAFT. If relief and work relief are coordinated under one local administration which is determined to carry out the language in an economical way to suit the will of the people of their own district, instead of suiting the will of some national body and a lot of pressure groups, I say that then the total cost would be much less, and that I would hope that the Federal Government contribution might be less.

Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senator would neither save money nor save Federal participation. About all he would save would be to get his name on the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I would make a fundamental change in the whole matter of relief. I hope it would be infinitely more satisfactory.

Mr. President, I will say that if the Senator thinks the Federal Government is going to continue the administration of direct relief for many years to come he is very much mistaken. I do not think the people approve of it. I do not think it is a proper method of administering relief.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Did I understand the Senator from Ohio to say that he did not favor Federal administration of relief?

Mr. TAFT. That is what I said.

Mr. PEPPER. And then did I understand the Senator to say that the purpose of the relief plan which he introduced contemplated the Federal Government contributing 66⅔ percent of the cost of the projects and the local community one-third? Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. In dealing with projects, the Federal Government would contribute two-thirds of the total cost of relief and work relief, leaving to the local locality the direct relief they might have. I may say that the apportionment plan between the States, which is somewhat similar to the apportionment plan that was in the bill before it was taken out by the Senate committee, is to make sure that no State will get an excessive percentage.

I may say that the plan provides further that the administration in each State must be under civil-service rules, and that it must conform to certain minimum standards.

Mr. PEPPER. Would the Federal Government have any supervision over the construction program in the several States?

Mr. TAFT. None whatever, except that it must conform, as I said, to some fixed qualifications which the State plan must have. This in effect is similar to the unemployment-insurance plan. The State must adopt a plan and must conform to that plan. If it departs from that plan, the Federal Government may withhold the payment of money just as they may in the case of unemployment insurance.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. At the present time Cook County is paying for direct relief at the rate of $4,000,000 per month. Under the Senator's plan would the Federal Government take care of two-thirds of that $4,000,000 by transferring the proper sum to the State authorities and then having them pay it to the municipalities?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. They would add to that the total sum of work relief, which, I suppose, in Chicago may run to seven or eight million dollars a month. I should think it would be about $8,000,000 a month, which would make $12,000,000 a month, which would make the total cost of relief in Chicago nearly $150,000,000 a year.

I should say that if the city of Chicago were willing to put up $40,000,000 the Federal Government would put up $80,000,000, to enable the city to carry out its complete relief plan, providing it did not exceed the total allocation of the State of Illinois, which is provided by the Federal appropriation, and which, of course, may be changed from year to year.

Mr. LUCAS. That is hardly the question. What I was trying to ascertain was whether or not the Senator's plan would cost the Federal Government more, providing it had to put up two-thirds of $4,000,000 that is now being contributed by the taxpayers direct per month for direct relief.

Mr. TAFT. I would say that in the city of Cleveland, which I know more about, the Federal Government last year was spending in the neighborhood of about $50,000,000 for W. P. A. The city of Cleveland was spending about $12,000,000 more, or a total of $62,000,000. The best authorities in social work that I could find in the city of Cleveland felt that if they had a single administration of relief in Cleveland they could do the whole job for $40,000,000, in which case the Federal contribution would have been two-thirds, or about $26,000,000, instead of approximately twice that sum. I say the present method of administering, according to any social worker one may talk to, is the most expensive method of administering relief that we have had in the United States, and we have had some six different methods since the depression of 1929 began.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I am looking to 1940. I do not think the Senator ought to monopolize this bill all to himself, or along with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I wonder if he would not take in my friend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]?

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to do so.

The bill introduced by Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. TAFT (S. 2721) to amend the Social Security Act to provide for grants to States for direct relief and work relief was read twice by its title, referred to the Special Committee on Unemployment and Relief, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XII—GRANTS TO STATES FOR DIRECT RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States Government to discontinue on July 1, 1940, the administration of direct relief and work relief (which shall not be construed to include the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps) and to assist thereafter only in financing the administration of such relief by the States and the local subdivisions thereof. The Administrator shall cooperate with the States and local subdivisions and assist them to set up the necessary records, personnel, and organization to handle work relief, and on July 1, 1940, he shall discontinue the direct administration of relief.

"(a) The term "needy individual" means any person who lacks self-support and who lacks resources from which may be derived support adequate to provide a reasonable standard of subsistence compatible with decency and health for such individual and for persons legally dependent upon such individual living in the same household, and includes such persons legally dependent upon such individual living in the same household.

"(b) The term "States" shall include the District of Columbia and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 1202. For the purpose of enabling each State to extend and improve, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, plans for providing financial assistance, including both direct relief and work relief, to needy individuals not otherwise receiving assistance or benefits as referred to in titles I, II, III, IV, and X of this act, or for whom the assistance or benefits received as referred to in such titles is inadequate to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the sum of $1,250,000,000, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year thereafter a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States

which have submitted, and had approved by the Board, State plans for such services.

"SEC. 1203. A State plan for direct relief and work relief within the meaning of this act must—

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;

"(2) provide for financial participation by the State, or by political subdivisions thereof, or by both, in the cost of such relief;

"(3) either provide for the administration of the plan by a single permanent State agency or provide for the administration of the plan by agencies of political subdivisions within the State, supervised by such single permanent State agency; and shall provide that such State agency be directed and controlled by a relief board of not less than five persons, no more than a bare majority of whom shall be members of any one political party;

"(4) provide that all officials (except board members) and employees of such State agency, and of all agencies of political subdivisions administering the plan, shall be selected and protected in their tenure of office by civil-service laws of the States;

"(5) provide that the State agency and the agencies of political subdivisions within the State will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the board may from time to time require;

"(6) Provide that there shall be no unreasonable discrimination between needy individuals within the jurisdiction of the State, and particularly no discrimination on account of race or color;

"(7) Provide for the periodic reexamination and reconsideration of all individuals receiving direct relief or work relief under the plan;

"(8) Provide that the State agency may enter into reciprocal agreements with the appropriate agencies in other States for the care, treatment, and redomiciling of transient needy individuals; and

"(9) Provide the exact manner in which the share of the State or the subdivisions, or both, shall be paid into the relief fund.

"(b) The Board shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that it shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for work relief under the plan—

"(1) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for 1 year immediately preceding the application; or

"(2) Any citizenship requirement which excludes any citizen of the United States.

"SEC. 1204. (A) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan under this title for each quarter beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1940, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as financial assistance, equal to two-thirds of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as financial assistance by the State and the political subdivisions therein under the State plan, in which expenditures shall be counted—

"(1) payments of direct relief, both in cash and in kind, with respect to needy individuals who at the time such payments were made were not inmates of any public institution; and

"(2) the ascertained cost of all work-relief projects on which only needy individuals (other than supervisors) are employed, and 80 percent of all expenditures are direct payments to such needy individuals: *Provided, however,* That the total amount paid to any State for any quarter shall not exceed such State's quota as calculated under paragraph (B) (1) of this section.

"(B) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) The Board shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, fix the total amount which it will distribute during such quarter to all the States out of the amount or amounts appropriated by Congress for the entire fiscal year; it shall then calculate the quota of each State for such quarter by apportioning 90 percent or more of the amount it has fixed for all the States, among the several States in the following manner:

"(a) One-third in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census;

"(b) One-third in the ratio which the number of unemployed individuals in each State bears to the total number of such individuals in all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census of unemployment, including the unemployment census of 1937, or by the latest available statistics with respect to unemployment supplied by Federal or State agencies.

"(c) One-third in the ratio which the prevailing average of wage rates as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor in each State bears to the prevailing average of wage rates for all of the States as similarly determined.

"(2) A sum not to exceed 10 percent of the amount or amounts appropriated by Congress for the entire fiscal year may be apportioned among the States or local subdivisions thereof by the Board without regard to any limitations as to amount or percentage prescribed by this title: *Provided,* That such apportionment shall be made only among such States or local subdivisions which have made written application therefor, and only when the Board, after a complete hearing, finds that by reason of disaster, or extraordinary conditions of unemployment, or extraordinary conditions of inability to finance relief, such States or local subdivisions are unable to provide adequate relief within their boundaries, and the President approves such findings.

"(3) The Board shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, estimate the amount to be paid to the State for such quarter under subsection (A) of this section, but not exceeding the quota fixed under paragraph (B) (1) of this section, plus such sum as may be apportioned under paragraph (B) (2), such estimate to be based on (a) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter; and if such amount is less than one-third of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived; (b) records showing the number of needy individuals in the State; and (c) such other investigation as the Administrator may find necessary.

"(4) The Board shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by it, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under this act for such quarter, except to the extent that such sum has been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the Board for such prior quarter.

"(5) The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Board, the amount so certified.

"SEC. 1205. In the case of any State plan for financial assistance under this title which has been approved by the Board, if the Board, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds:

"(1) That the plan has been so changed as to impose any residence, citizenship, or other requirement for relief prohibited by section 3 of this title, or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1203 of this title to be included in the plan;

the Board shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until the Board is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer so imposed, and that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until it is so satisfied it shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, is the presentation of an amendment in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. BONE. I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 20, after the word "insect" it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "plant and fungus."

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, throughout the forests of the West, and I suspect through most of the timbered sections of the United States, the W. P. A. has carried on certain operations dealing with what is commonly known as blister rust. It has been a recognized activity of W. P. A., and that is particularly true in California, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana.

The purpose of inserting this language is merely to make sure that the handling of blister rust in the forests of the West, especially in the national forests, will not be interfered with, and that it may be continued under W. P. A. operations as a recognized project.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will again be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 20, after the word "insect" it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "plant and fungus."

Mr. BONE. I may say that the language of the measure permits the fighting of insect pests, but the fungus that attacks the trees out there, which is known as blister rust, is not an insect pest.

Mr. McCARRAN. May I ask the Senator from Washington whether or not embraced within the term "fungus" there is contemplated the fungus that attacks other plants aside from the trees in the Northwest?

Mr. BONE. I think the term "fungus" is broad enough to include the entire category of fungi. I would assume that to

be true. I think it is broad enough as it would be interpreted to include any legitimate handling of that sort of pests. I do not doubt that it will. I think the language I employ there is sufficiently broad to cover it.

Mr. McCARRAN. What I have in mind, I will say for the purpose of the RECORD, is that we are throughout the West now contending with a pest known as the alfalfa fungi, and I wondered if the Senator had that in mind when he offered the amendment, or whether he considered that the amendment embraced it.

Mr. BONE. I assume that this work will be done on public lands, and I am not certain whether or not the Senator from Nevada had in mind doing that class of work on private lands. I have in mind the great public forests in the West in which these operations are now being carried on very extensively.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have in mind, I will say to the Senator from Washington, the semi-public land embraced within public or Federal reclamation projects.

Mr. BONE. If it is any form of fungus, I think the language is broad enough to cover it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$7,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment for the reason that it is in conformity with the request of the Bureau of the Budget, and I recognize the fact that many Senators in the course of the evening's debate have left with us the thought that we ought to be guided to a very great extent by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Has the Senator from New York followed that program himself?

Mr. MEAD. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that at the time the Senator was making his strong and forceful argument I was in his corner.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered increases from $7,000,000 to $10,000,000 the amount of the appropriation for the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration. This amount was recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. I read from page 155 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations the following statement:

> Now, I would like to say just a word in regard to Puerto Rico. The economic situation has become progressively worse in Puerto Rico. The sugar quota has hit Puerto Rico very hard. The trade agreements have hit Puerto Rico very hard, and that leaves a situation for which the Federal Government is responsible.

Secretary Ickes recommends that with the following language:

> There is one item I should like to call particular attention to. The Bureau of the Budget set up $10,000,000 for Puerto Rico, for the Puerto Rican Reconstruction Administration. Puerto Rico must depend upon this appropriation not only for its agricultural relief, but for its urban relief as well.

On page 248 of the hearings there is a statement which goes on to relate the experiences of the island in its attempt to obtain works-progress projects.

The following statement was made by one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee:

> We have found it impossible to get the W. P. A. to come down into Puerto Rico to set up W. P. A. projects. Governor Winship time and time again asked the W. P. A. to set up projects, and the Administration felt that it could not do so.

Mr. President, this appropriation, recommended as it was by the Secretary of the Interior, recommended as it has been by the Bureau of the Budget, is essential because of depressed economic conditions today in Puerto Rico. This organization is now employing about 35,000 people. The appropriations contained in the joint resolution will effect a reduction of that number to 15,000. Last year this agency had $13,500,000. That sum was made up of the appropriation contained in the legislation, plus the unexpended balance and plus the balance which remained in a revolving fund. Today there is only $150,000 in the unexpended balance, and we are providing only $7,000,000, a reduction of $3,000,000 from the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and from the suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary of the Interior attempted to impress the committee with the desperate plight of the island. He pointed out that he was extremely concerned, and wanted the full appropriation, and yet the committee evidently did nothing about it.

So, Mr. President, I offer the amendment; and I trust it will meet with the approval of the Senate.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations heard the testimony of the Secretary. We had the same testimony at a previous hearing. The House committee heard the testimony not only of the Secretary but of the representative of the island, and the appropriation included in the joint resolution was in an amount which the committees of both Houses felt to be adequate.

I think one item in the statement of the Secretary ought to be noted. I think perhaps the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is better equipped to answer the question than I. I refer to the statement that Puerto Rico is suffering by reason of the Sugar Act. As a matter of fact, Puerto Rico is receiving about $10,000,000 a year in benefit payments by reason of the Sugar Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on page 39, under section 34, an amendment was offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] which reads as follows:

> This section shall not apply to municipal electrical plants.

That particular paragraph in this measure was put forward by the Appropriations Committee so that no funds should be used in a plant, factory, or mill which might come into competition with private business. I think the amendment was put through in pretty rapid fashion, without due explanation. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. NORRIS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] offered this amendment he said there was doubt that it would prevent the building of a municipal electric-lighting plant if a municipality wanted to build such a plant with assistance from any Federal agency. The fact that the Senator from New Hampshire moves to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is a demonstration that the doubt was well-founded.

Mr. President, if the Senate wants to put in a prohibition preventing the use of any instrumentality under this joint resolution, such as the labor which will be employed, in the construction of a municipal lighting plant, municipal water plant, or a municipal sewage-disposal plant, the Senate ought to support the Senator's motion to reconsider.

It is safe to say that the only thing he has in mind is to take the amendment out so that it will be impossible, if his

view of the law is correct, to build a municipal lighting plant. What is the difference between a municipality which votes to take advantage of any provision of the law in building a municipal lighting plant and any other agency which seeks to take advantage of the law?

I had intended to offer a similar amendment until I talked with the Senator from Washington, and it was agreed that he should offer it. I talked with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] about it, and he said he would not object to the amendment. It was agreeable to him because the real intent of the language in this section was that it should not apply to a municipal lighting plant. I have entire sympathy with that intention.

The amendment reads:

No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the State or local government agency from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories—

That far, as I see it, there could be no objection to the prohibition. That far, it would perform a useful service. However, the following words are added:

or plants which would manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products other than those derived from the first processing of agricultural products, in competition with existing industries.

Some testimony was offered by several representatives of the Government on the question whether or not that language would prohibit building a municipal electric-light plant; or, if a municipality had a privately owned water plant that was supplying water, whether or not the municipality could build a municipally owned plant under this section. The testimony of Mr. Fortas explains it. He says:

Section 301—

That is section 34, the one to which this amendment applies—

which is on page 33 of the committee print—

That was a different print from the one we have—

and page 35 of the bill as passed by the House, provides that no funds appropriated in this joint resolution shall be used to purchase, establish, or expand mills or factories or plants which will manufacture or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products in competition with existing industries.

Now, it is my understanding that the origin of this provision is in the first deficiency bill passed this year, and that the provision is in a narrower form and that it was made applicable to the W. P. A. to meet a specific situation where the W. P. A. funds were being used to build competing mills and factories, and the Congress desired to stop that.

This language originated in the first deficiency bill of this year. We did not want that situation to continue. We did not want to get into competition with mills and factories privately owned. We did not want this money to be used to go into that kind of business. In the joint resolution the words "or plants" were added. Those words do not add anything. They are unnecessary. The whole idea is expressed without them.

Mr. Fortas continues:

The provision as presently drafted is applicable to P. W. A. and W. P. A.; we could not do any work on any plant that appears in section 301 or in that whole provision.

He goes on to enumerate various things, such as a sewer system, a water system, or a plant which possibly might compete with an existing industry.

For example, if you had a city which had a private water system that was obsolete and the charges were excessively high and they wanted to put in a modern water system, we might not be able to do work under this provision.

And the same is true of public power development.

That is the secret of it. Nobody objects to the rest of it. The words "or plants" would not be in the joint resolution and they would not be defended by the Senator from New Hampshire if there were any necessity for them, or if the language applied to anything else.

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

Mr. NORRIS. In just a moment. I wish to finish this reading.

Mr. Fortas continues:

And the same is true of public power developments. It is impossible to tell just exactly what this provision means with the words "or plants" and "or produced." But I think it is clear that it will mean litigation and indirectly increased expenses where funds are appropriated under this bill where a municipality wants to build a water system or wants to improve its water system or build a power plant or improve its power plant.

I concede that it probably never will occur under this joint resolution that that provision will interfere with a water system, because there will not be any built in competition with a privately owned water system; but it will occur all over the United States if the municipalities are to put in publicly owned municipal power plants. If they want to do so, and vote for it, I do not see any reason why Congress should stand in their way.

Farther on in the same testimony, speaking of litigation, somebody asked Secretary Ickes whether or not he would have any objection if they did have litigation. Secretary Ickes said:

We have spent a lot of time in court since 1933——

When they first started out; and I want to tell you that the time spent in court, without any exception, has been when they wanted to build a municipal power plant.

Mr. HOLMAN. How did the words "or plants" get in there?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know. They cannot do any good. They said, in effect, "If you had good lawyers, it would not make any difference if you did have lawsuits." Secretary Ickes said:

But we have spent a lot of time in court since 1933.

He might have added:

We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal and court fees, even though we won the suits in the end.

Mr. President, that being true, since it is a matter only of delay—it is a matter taken up here at 1 o'clock in the morning, when we have once had a vote on it, and adopted this amendment—I move to lay the motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the Chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to lay on the table the motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I want to have it clearly understood what the issue here is. Apparently, the United States Senate tonight wants to go on record as favoring taking relief funds from the poor people of the country to use in building and expanding municipal plants in competition with private industry.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, they will do a great deal of good for the poor people if they do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend while the Chair makes an announcement? There is no question pending before the Senate at this time.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I thought there was a joint resolution pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have the floor, and there is a joint resolution pending, and I have a right to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to speak on the joint resolution. The Chair meant to say that there was no amendment pending.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I did not intend to prolong this discussion; but since an effort has been made to shut me off, I may take my 15 minutes now. We have stayed here for some time, and we can stay for a while longer.

This issue is pretty clear. I want to point out what the United States Senate is doing tonight. The Members of this body whose hearts bleed for the poor people of the country are tonight voting to use relief money to build municipal power plants and expand municipal power plants, rather

than letting the relief money go to the poor people of the Nation. That is what it amounts to.

I realize that there are different philosophies in this country. The Senator from Nebraska is entitled to his opinion and his philosophy on the expansion of public power plants; but this is a question of the use of relief funds. I am very glad to see the issue made so clear; but I want to go on record as one Member of the United States Senate who is not in favor of using relief funds to build power plants in this country. I want to go on record further as being one Member of the United States Senate who is not in favor of building with public funds any type of plants, mills, or factories to compete with private industry.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator has not only gone on record as one Member of the Senate who is trying to save the Nation, but he has gone on record as the one Member outstanding in the Senate of the United States who does just exactly what the Power Trust of America wants done.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to be recognized. I simply want to make the point of order that the Senator from New Hampshire has exhausted his time on the joint resolution and on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending, and the Senator from New Hampshire has spoken on the joint resolution. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY. I call for the yeas and nays on the passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HARRISON. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and withhold my vote.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. My colleague the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is unavoidably detained on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MEAD. My colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. My colleague [Mr. LOGAN] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily detained. I am advised that all of these Senators I have named, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to make some announcements for Senators who are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If present, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea." I am not advised how the Senator from Virginia would vote.

I announce a pair between the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I am not advised how those Senators would vote if present.

I announce that my colleague [Mr. GIBSON] would vote "yea" if present.

I announce a general pair between the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I am not advised how those Senators would vote if present.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—55

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | Frazier | Lee | Radcliffe |
| Andrews | Gerry | Lodge | Reed |
| Austin | Green | Lucas | Reynolds |
| Bankhead | Guffey | McCarran | Russell |
| Barkley | Gurney | McKellar | Schwellenbach |
| Bilbo | Harrison | Maloney | Slattery |
| Bone | Hatch | Mead | Smathers |
| Bulow | Hayden | Miller | Stewart |
| Burke | Herring | Minton | Tobey |
| Capper | Hill | Murray | Truman |
| Clark, Mo. | Holman | Neely | Walsh |
| Connally | Hughes | Norris | Wheeler |
| Davis | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney | Wiley |
| Ellender | La Follette | Pepper | |

NOT VOTING—41

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ashurst | Danaher | Logan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bailey | Donahey | Lundeen | Thomas, Utah |
| Barbour | Downey | McNary | Townsend |
| Borah | George | Nye | Tydings |
| Bridges | Gibson | Overton | Vandenberg |
| Brown | Gillette | Pittman | Van Nuys |
| Byrd | Glass | Schwartz | Wagner |
| Byrnes | Hale | Sheppard | White |
| Caraway | Holt | Shipstead | |
| Chavez | Johnson, Calif. | Smith | |
| Clark, Idaho | King | Taft | |

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 326) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940."

Mr. HOLT subsequently said on Thursday morning, June 29, 1939,

Mr. President, I desire the RECORD to show that last night I was advised that there would be no yea-and-nay vote on the relief joint resolution. I left the floor, and before I could return the vote had been taken. Had I been present, I should have voted for the relief joint resolution.

If there is no objection, I desire to have this statement inserted in the permanent RECORD at a point following the roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be authorized to correct the totals in the joint resolution in accordance with the text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ADAMS, Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN,

Mr. BYRNES, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TOWNSEND conferees on the part of the Senate.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

I understood, as I listened to the last remark of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], that he impunged the motives of the Senator from New Hampshire. As I understand, that is against the rules of the United States Senate. A man as old in the service of the Senate as is the Senator from Nebraska should know better than to make such a remark.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, what remark? I did not hear all that the Senator said. What remark does he refer to?

Mr. BRIDGES. I refer to the last remark the Senator made about the Power Trust.

Mr. NORRIS. All right; let the RECORD show what I said. I shall be glad to stand by it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Senator from Nebraska will appear in the RECORD, and the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire will also appear in the RECORD.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6977) to extend the time within which annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States may be commenced, for the year commencing at 12 o'clock m., July 1, 1938, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 698) thereon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported favorably the nomination of John M. Carmody, of New York, to be Federal Works Administrator, to be effective July 1, 1939.

He also, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. PITTMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably the following nominations:

Paul H. Alling, of Connecticut, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service; and

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a counselor of Embassy at Lima, Peru, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iran.

Mr. PITTMAN also, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported without reservation Executive N, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom for the exchange of certain stocks of cotton and rubber, signed at London on June 23, 1939, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 9) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reports will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. REYNOLDS (for Mr. LUNDEEN) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with the provisions of rule 40 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing of my intention hereafter to move to suspend paragraphs 1 and 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of proposing, for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN], to the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz: At the end of the bill to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. —. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the boards of county commissioners of the counties of Hennepin and Anoka in the State of Minnesota, in such proportions as the Secretary may deem appropriate, the sum of $100,000, to be used for the relief of the victims of the tornado which occurred in such counties on June 18, 1939.

"SEC. —. Any sum paid to a board of county commissioners under the provisions of the first section of this act shall be apportioned by such board, in such proportions as it deems appropriate, to the villages and cities within such county which were affected by such tornado. Any sum so apportioned to a village or city shall be expended, under the joint direction of such board and of the municipal government of the village or city to which apportioned, for the relief of the victims of such tornado residing within, or in the neighborhood of, such village or city."

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with the provisions of rule 40 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing of my intention hereafter to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6970) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, to provide appropriations required immediately for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, the following amendment, viz: At the proper place in the bill to insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. That section 6 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1940 (Public, No. 65, 76th Cong.), approved May 6, 1939, is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 6. On and after July 1, 1939, no executive department or independent establishment of the Government shall transmit through the mail, free of postage, any book, report, periodical, bulletin, pamphlet, list, or other article or document (except official letter correspondence, including such enclosures as are reasonably related to the subject matter of the correspondence; informational releases in connection with the decennial census of the United States, mail concerning the sale of Government securities, and all forms and blanks and copies of statutes, rules, regulations, and instructions and administrative orders and interpretations necessary in the administration of such departments and establishments), unless a request therefor has been previously received by such department or independent establishment; or such transmission is required by law; or such document is transmitted to inform the recipient thereof of the adoption, amendment, or interpretation of a statute, rule, regulation, or order to which he is subject. For each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1939, the head of each independent establishment and executive department (other than the Post Office Department) shall submit to the Postmaster General, within 30 days after the close of the quarter, a statement of the weight of the mail matter by classes of mail that the independent establishment or department has transmitted free of postage during such quarter, and he shall also certify to the Postmaster General at the end of each such quarter that nothing was transmitted through the mail free of postage by the independent establishment or department in violation of the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the mailing free of postage of lists of agricultural bulletins, lists of public documents which are offered for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, or of announcements of publications of maps, atlases, statistical, and other reports offered for sale by the Federal Power Commission as authorized by section 312 of the Federal Power Act: *Provided further*, That this prohibition shall not apply to the transmission of such books, reports, periodicals, bulletins, pamphlets, lists, articles, or documents to educational institutions or public libraries, or to Federal, State, or other public authorities.' "

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6970, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to see the foregoing notice.)

THE MEANING OF CIVIL LIBERTY—ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL MURPHY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered on June 21, 1939, by Hon. Frank Murphy, Attorney General of the United States, at the commencement exercises of John Marshall College, Jersey City, N. J., on the subject The Meaning of Civil Liberty, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes a. m., Thursday, June 29), the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 1939

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

O Thou who maketh the clouds Thy chariot, who walketh on the wings of the wind and maketh Thy ministers a flaming fire, deepen in our hearts the acceptance of the simple words, "Our Father who art in heaven." We pray Thee, in the name of Him who bore the burden and endured the cross, do Thou inspire our lives with the significance of Thy life and the reality of Thy being. Thou who upholdest the world, uphold Thou us; Thou who art the light of the sun, grant us sight of Thy sight; walk with us and replenish our altar fires from above. Call us to that large manhood that includes conscience, honor, sympathy, and aspiration; sanctify in us these instruments of power, and may we ever disown the things that minister to malice and evil. In the holy name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5427) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Labor Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes," and agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6577. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. KING, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1302. An act to make permanently effective the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935, as amended, and for other purposes.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask recognition to call up House Resolution 233.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beam | Chapman | Ellis | Kelly |
| Boehne | Connery | Engel | Keogh |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Cooley | Evans | Kerr |
| Byron | Culkin | Fitzpatrick | Lesinski |
| Cannon, Fla. | Curley | Grant, Ala. | Luce |
| Cannon, Mo. | Darden | Harrington | McGranery |
| Cartwright | Dies | Hartley | McLeod |
| Case, S. Dak. | Drewry | Hennings | McReynolds |
| Casey, Mass. | Eaton, Calif. | Hook | Magnuson |
| Mapes | Satterfield | Smith, Ill. | Taber |
| Marshall | Scrugham | Smith, Maine | Vinson, Ga. |
| O'Toole | Seger | Smith, W. Va. | Whelchel |
| Peterson, Ga. | Shannon | Sumners, Tex. | Wood |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Enquirer on the subject of war debts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial under date of June 23 appearing in the San Carlos Bulletin.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

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

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman on what subject he is going to extend his remarks?

Mr. THORKELSON. Why does the gentleman want to know that? These are my remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I have a right to ask on what subject the gentleman is going to extend his remarks.

Mr. THORKELSON. I do not believe so. I represent the State of Montana and I have the same rights as this gentleman here.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address recently delivered by Elliott Roosevelt over the radio.

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

There was no objection.

### WOOL PRODUCTS LABELING BILL

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill H. R. 944, known as the wool-products labeling bill.

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

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Livingston Enterprise on neutrality legislation.

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

There was no objection.

### STABILIZATION FUND AND ALTERATION OF THE WEIGHT OF THE DOLLAR

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 233.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 233

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H. R. 3325 with Senate amendments thereto be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to by the

House; that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said bill be, and hereby is, agreed to by the House; and that the Speaker shall immediately appoint conferees without intervening motion.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman from New York desire any time on the resolution?

Mr. FISH. I would like half the time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will yield later 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that objection has been raised on the part of some Member to granting unanimous consent to taking the bill H. R. 3325 from the Speaker's desk and sending it to conference, it has become necessary to bring in a special rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For the sake of accuracy, as far as the record is concerned, will the gentleman tell us who did object to granting such consent?

Mr. SABATH. I really do not know.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As a matter of information, if the gentleman will yield, because I know he wants to be set right on the subject, I may say that no one objected.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. I was informed that there would be objection, so the request was not made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is a different matter. The gentleman anticipated that there might be objection.

Mr. SABATH. It has been rumored and promised that some gentlemen would object; therefore, it became necessary for the Rules Committee to meet and bring in this rule. The rule will not deprive any Member of any rights. It authorizes the Speaker, as I have stated, to name conferees, as requested by the Senate. As the House has gone on record by a very substantial majority for its bill, the House cannot agree to the Senate amendments. Consequently, the conferees will have to come back to the House for instructions, and, upon so doing, any Member will have the right to offer a preferential motion to agree to any of the Senate amendments. If such a motion is made, I hope it will not be agreed to, because the House bill is a real, constructive measure.

Personally, I cannot quite understand why there should be any objection to the bill being sent to conference, and I do not know of any reason why the House conferees should not be able to convince the other conferees that the House bill, as passed here by a substantial majority, should be made the law of the land.

Personally, I have the highest admiration for some of the gentlemen from the silver States, and I congratulate them, and especially the Democrats, because at all times they are doing everything they can for their people and their section of the country, but, unfortunately, this bill, as it has been emasculated over in the other body, is a bill that I cannot see how they themselves could support or vote for. Therefore, I hope that the rule will be agreed to and the bill will be sent to conference so that early action can be had by the Congress.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he knows whether or not this bill, if it goes to conference, will involve in the conference the question of a tax on bullion silver.

Mr. SABATH. As I recall, there was nothing of that sort in the House bill and I do not think there is anything along that line in the emasculated Senate bill. In view of that fact, the conferees would have no jurisdiction to take up any such matter unless it was in the House bill or in the Senate bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. The subject of taxation is brought into the Senate bill and, therefore, would not that particular matter naturally be brought up in conference? Is it not a parliamentary question that the conferees will have to decide?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, it is; but I doubt very much whether that question could be taken up by the conferees. The conferees cannot go any further than the action of the House or the Senate.

Mr. TREADWAY. I realize that fact, but as long as the question of taxation comes into the picture, it seems to me, perhaps, it is a fair parliamentary question to be decided by the conferees.

Mr. SABATH. To be candid, I have not studied the Senate amendment because I did not feel it deserved very much study. I feel that the Senate amendments are unfair, and therefore the bill should go to conference, and the Senate amendment should be eliminated so that final action on the legislation can be had.

Mr. TREADWAY. I hope that question can be brought up in the conference within the limits of what appears in the Senate bill.

Mr. SABATH. I do not think the conferees will have such jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there are a large number of Members who desire time to speak in favor of the adoption of this rule, I will content myself with what President Roosevelt has to say with respect to the Senate action on this legislation, which appeared in this morning's papers, believing that he has been correctly quoted:

> The Senate action would, in effect, be an open invitation to international foreign-exchange speculators to manipulate the dollar with resultant injury to United States foreign trade. The national defense is weakened, he observed, if the national economy is weakened.

Mr. Speaker, whether we are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, or what not, we must concede, if we are honest, that the President has acted prudently and wisely in devaluing the dollar as he has. To take away from him that power, as is contemplated, would be injurious to America, would be injurious to our trade, and injurious to the best interests of our Nation.

It must be conceded, and it is conceded by even the arch enemies of the President, that today the American dollar commands a premium throughout the world. We know that the policy of President Roosevelt, under the act of Congress, has reestablished and increased our export business and at the same time has brought about a credit never before had by our country, a credit whereby under present conditions we can frequently obtain money at one-twentieth of 1 percent. I dispute the charge that the bill will give greater power to the President. It will not give him any greater power than that he has enjoyed since the enactment of the original act in 1934, and which power he has exercised intelligently and effectively to the best interests of our country. I am convinced that this bill which proposes to extend the life of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 is absolutely needed in order to hold the international bankers and money speculators in check. What has been accomplished by this administration should not be destroyed and the President's position should not be weakened. I think the act, as it has been passed here—and I may say many of you Republican gentlemen voted for it—should be extended. Therefore I hope the resolution will be adopted by a unanimous vote of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure, brought up under a rule with only 1 hour of debate. The Members of the House will have the opportunity, if they so desire, to restore the control and regulation of the value of money to the Congress by voting down the previous question.

For the first time in over 150 years Congress surrendered this far-reaching and important power to the President of the United States. We now have an opportunity, by voting down the previous question, to get a direct vote on whether we want to take back this power by instructing our conferees to agree with the action of the Senate.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

That is the constitutional prerogative of the Congress. We have yielded the power of the Congress to the President to devalue the dollar in an emergency. The Senate, in its wisdom, has taken back that power. It will give us an opportunity to express our sentiments if we vote down the previous question.

Furthermore, if we vote down the previous question, we will get an opportunity to agree with the action of the Senate which prohibits from now on the buying of silver from foreign nations. In all sincerity, I do not believe there is a single Member of Congress who wants to continue this fallacy. It is the most absurd of all the wand-waving, crystal-gazing ideas of the New Deal. I do not believe a single Member of Congress will defend it today. We have been buying this silver by the hundreds of millions of dollars from foreign countries at twice the cost of production, and then burying it again in the ground in our own country, where it serves no useful purpose. We might just as well buy seaweed or ocean salt water as to buy silver from foreign lands. Yet we were told at the time that such a silver-purchasing program was the road to recovery and the employment of labor and would increase the price of agricultural products. It is the most gigantic failure of the New Deal, and there is not a single new dealer that I know of who will even defend it today and ask that we continue this policy of throwing American dollars into the sewer to buy silver from foreign lands.

By voting down the previous question we could then get a vote on that. Then comes the other question of whether we want to vote to increase the price of silver in our own country some 10 cents. I do not mind giving a subsidy to our own silver producers so that they can produce more silver in our own country. I am not opposed to that if it gives them protection, and it will only cost some $7,000,000 if the Senate proposal is adopted.

As far as I know, there is no coalition between the Republicans in the House who want to take back from the President the power to regulate the value of money, and those Members from the silver States who want an increase in the price of domestic silver. No one has approached me, but I do know that practically every Republican Member of Congress wants to take back from the President this power, and restore representative government in the United States of America. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is just as important now as it was when this bill was before us. At the time this bill was before us for consideration, the committee to study the extraordinary powers of the President made certain recommendations. Those recommendations have largely been written into the Senate amendments, with the exception of the fact that the Senate raised the price which the Treasury would pay for domestic silver from 64.64 to 77.5 cents per ounce.

I want to comment briefly, and I hope without too much partisan rancor, on the statement made by the President yesterday, that the adoption of the Senate amendment would virtually turn the country over to Wall Street. I do not think the President gave very serious consideration to his words when he made that statement.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has said, ours is the duty to coin and regulate the value of money.

For a great many years there have been straw men in America, as there have been straw men in Soviet Russia, in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. In Soviet Russia the straw men to be destroyed, to perpetuate dictatorships, are the capitalistic nations. In Fascist Italy, the straw men are the democracies of the world to be destroyed, that dictatorships may be perpetuated. In Nazi Germany the Jews and, in many instances, the Catholics are the straw men, built up to be destroyed in order that dictatorships may be perpetuated. In this country the straw men to be destroyed to perpetuate power are not capitalistic nations, they are not the democracies of the world, and thank heaven they are not the Jews and Catholics, but here the Wall Street bankers, the international bankers, successful businessmen, and farmers who are the straw men to be destroyed in order that power might be perpetuated. That is the reason, I presume, for the statement made yesterday that because certain of the powers which had been delegated to the President were about to be taken away that the country was to be turned over to the Wall Street bankers.

We should not continue to devalue gold, because every economist in the United States worthy of the name has repudiated the theory that the dollar price of commodities follows the dollar price of gold. Professor Warren and Professor Pearson advocated that. Professor Warren has now gone to the Great Beyond, and Professor Pearson I am given to understand is weakening in the light of experience, but if he still clings to the idea that the dollar price of commodities follows the dollar price of gold he stands alone among the economists of the United States in the advocacy of that theory. So we should take the initiative to establish the price of gold, to stabilize somewhere; and the adoption of the Senate amendment stabilizes the price of gold at $35 an ounce. The nations of Europe, Asia, and of the world at large can tie to the American dollar, with the price of gold stabilized; and instead of destroying our trade there will be an incentive toward an increase in trade because of that.

What about silver, what about the purchase of foreign silver? Rene Leon, a great silver expert, appeared before our committee and testified that this would aid our trade with China, that it would give them a purchasing power through which they might buy American goods. What happened? We forced China off the silver standard, we forced her to tie to the British pound sterling; and we should bear in mind the fact that if the United States participates in a war in Asia it will be an economic war to protect the commerce of Great Britain with China. Every purchase which China makes from the United States because of our fallacious silver policy must now be done through the back door of London, England. I was told that by no less an authority than a gentleman connected with the Chinese Treasury Department, who corresponds to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All of our trade with China must be through the back door of London, England, because of this fallacious silver policy. We should not deplete the monetary stocks of foreign countries by purchasing foreign silver. One of the greatest economists, Dr. Sprague, who was formerly an adviser to the Bank of England, before we entered upon this policy, had advised the Government of Great Britain and the Bank of England that there was too much monetary silver in India, it was wholly out of proportion to the monetary use to which it should be put. The net result of our fallacious silver policy was to bail out Great Britain by purchasing the surplus silver stock of India and thereby helping to stabilize the British pound sterling to the prejudice of the American dollar. In order to continue this policy we must continue to assume that the purchase of silver and the devaluation of gold is necessary to help our foreign trade. It is not. Every economist in the United States worthy of the name has repudiated that theory and is on record as having repudiated it. What we need in foreign exchange today is not a war among the nations to see which one can cheapen its money the most, but it is stability, it is stability in international exchange. [Applause.] I have advocated the freezing of the value of gold at $35 an ounce, as we do in this bill; and I have advocated the discontinuance of the buying of foreign silver, believing very firmly that by doing so we would have stabilized to that extent and that by our example the other nations of the world would stabilize and

improve not only our foreign trade but the trade of all the nations of the world. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] compare Wall Street to a straw man, as if we were attacking Wall Street as a straw man when we are trying to keep them from turning the fiscal affairs of this Government over to Wall Street again as they did in 1920 and probably throw this country into another panic with the same results.

He says that Congress should do this, regulating the value of money and not leave it to the President. I am sorry to admit that I have come to the conclusion that Congress either does not have the courage or else does not have the ability to go ahead and regulate the value of our money as the Constitution provides. Some of you sat here in 1929 and saw the country go to the dogs, and never attempted to solve this problem. Was Wall Street a straw man then?

I advocated turning this power over to the President in 1933 because Congress would not exercise it. Something had to be done, and Congress had refused to act.

What is the trouble? We are in a money panic, and have been since 1927. We are gradually nosing out, but if you take this power away from the President and turn it back to Wall Street, to the money changers who now have control of the Federal Reserve System, I shudder to think what will happen to the agricultural people of this country within the next 12 months. Look what happened to them in 1920 and in 1932.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] asked about increasing the price of domestic silver. He surely is not going to touch that, because it was passed in the Senate by Republican votes; surely he will not touch that ark of the covenant. But he opposes continuing the President's power to devalue the gold dollar. Every country under the shining sun that amounts to anything has long since devalued its gold currency, reduced the amount of gold in its currency more than we have devalued the United States dollar. If you take this power away from the President and deny him the power to issue currency against the gold we have, you are likely to throw this country into a panic in 1940 the like of which has never been seen; and the farmers of this Nation, the producers of this Nation, the toiling masses, and the small-business men will pay the price.

I know it is stated that we bury this gold in the ground.

Mr. KNUTSON rose.

Mr. RANKIN. I trust the gentleman from Minnesota will not interrupt me. He was here in 1929 and never opened his mouth when Wall Street was financing the jamboree on the stock market and the farmers of this country were going bankrupt.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I cannot yield.

Mr. Speaker, they say the President has not exercised this power to issue currency against our gold reserve. I am sorry he has not. I wish he had issued $3,000,000,000 in gold certificates or United States notes and put them in circulation in 1933. If he had done that, in my opinion it would have ended the depression. We would have got out of it long ago; and if he will do that now, it will still do more to restore prosperity than all the legislation we are now passing. If you take this power from him, if you take away from him this power, you turn it over to the international bankers, to Wall Street, the same crowd that brought on the panic in 1920 and in 1929–32.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the previous question will not be voted down, but that this rule will be passed and the bill sent to conference. I hope this power will be retained in the hands of the President to protect us against such calamity as we have experienced in former years. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago when this legislation was up in the House of Representatives for consideration, one of the ablest and most respected Members of this body stated that it was and would be the most important legislation to be considered by this body during the present session of the Congress.

When the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures had this measure under consideration it held hearings which lasted for several weeks. The bill was brought upon the floor of the House and 7 hours of debate were devoted to a discussion of its merits and demerits. The bill as it finally passed the House consisted practically of two propositions. One section of the bill continued in force the existence of the stabilization fund. The other prolonged the power in the President to devalue the dollar. Those were practically the only sections of the bill. They were almost identical with the provisions of the bill that had been enacted 2 years previously and similar to one enacted in 1934.

When the bill under discussion reached the Senate, extensive hearings were held by the Committee on Banking and Currency, which hearings consumed several weeks. Debate on the floor of the Senate occupied several days. The action which the Senate took last Monday leaves one section of the bill practically intact, to wit, the provision continuing for 2 years the existence and operation of the stabilization fund; however, the Senate eliminated that portion of the House bill which gave to the President the power to devalue the dollar and added an amendment providing that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase domestic newly mined silver for 77 cents per ounce. A further amendment terminates the authority to purchase foreign silver.

It is now up to the House of Representatives to determine whether it will accept the amendments of the Senate or, practically speaking, allow the whole legislation to die a natural death. It will die by operation of law if some action is not taken before Friday night because the existing statutes creating the stabilization fund and the power to devalue contain in themselves a provision that the power and authority therein granted will expire on the 30th day of June this year. I have believed in the existence of this stabilization fund. I believe it should be continued in force. I have my doubts as to the rest of the bill. But I believe the Congress, and this House of Representatives in particular, should stand upon its own feet today and this House should take the opportunity afforded it to instruct its conferees as to its wishes. I am not afraid of the bugaboo that we have heard for so many years that Wall Street is running the United States Government. I have faith in the ability, the intelligence, and the integrity of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives. I believe there is not a man here who is a tool of Wall Street. We are capable of legislating wisely, freely, and constitutionally.

The judgment of 435 Representatives of the people must be sound. The conference committee should have the benefit of that judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote down the previous question. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when anybody tries to make people believe that depriving the President of his power to devalue the gold dollar is "restoring" any power whatsoever to the Congress, he is committing a pure act of deception. It does no such thing. Anybody who sincerely wanted to advocate the exercise of monetary powers by the Congress would make such criticism as he made on the ground that we have not utilized as a base for credit or money the metal that has been purchased. He cannot make an argument against the purchase of that metal or against the power of the President to devalue the dollar. Nobody from an agricultural community in this House can possibly afford to have this power shorn from the President. Rather, for the sake of agriculture we might require the President would use his power. The gentleman from Michigan nor anybody else

can give us the slightest assurance that any other nation in the world will desist from taking advantage of the action of the United States in freezing the gold content of the dollar to debase their currency and deprive us of such trade as we have left. [Applause.]

Such action on the part of other nations will, in effect, mean that our farmers will be paying the costs of their production with more valuable dollars, in terms of other currencies, than was the case before.

It is, in my opinion, of basic importance that we face this issue exactly as it really is. I think my views on this monetary question are very well known. I firmly believe that we should now, at the very least, make constructive use of such free gold and silver as our Treasury possesses of such metal, with no obligations whatsoever against it. We have over $3,000,000,000 worth. Certainly it could be employed in the retirement of a portion of the public debt, or we could use it as a credit base for the making of the loans provided in the President's proposed lending program. But this has nothing whatsoever to do with the question at issue here today. I cannot see how gentlemen can believe that the right avenue to take is to deprive a governmental official like the President of the United States of the only protection we have under present circumstances against monetary action by foreign nations, and above all things we should not deprive him of his power to further devalue the dollar. When gentlemen talk about stabilizing the currencies of the world by having the United States tie its own hands, they are talking about something that is absolutely beyond the realm of possibility, because that is the very thing that will prevent stabilization of the currencies of the world by making it the evident interest of other nations to devalue further than they have yet done.

Let us face one problem at a time. Let us not get all balled up with a lot of things that have nothing to do with the question at issue. Personally, I should like to see the Congress set up a monetary authority under congressional mandate to be the sole agency in the Nation bringing money into circulation and regulating its value. To such an agency I should like to see all these powers transferred. But pending that time I prefer to have the power in the hands of a Government official such as the President, rather than in the hands of private speculators and international bankers, and I am as convinced as I can be that that is exactly where it would go. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. The suggestion has been made here that domestic silver and foreign silver are at cross purposes in this issue. Does not the gentleman believe that we might properly continue the purchase of domestic silver and give up the purchase of foreign silver? I am willing to reduce or stop our purchase of foreign silver, but I insist on the continuing purchase of domestic silver at a higher price.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I think we certainly can buy domestic silver without obligating ourselves to take all foreign offerings, if we want to do that. I would say, however, once again that the more important thing is to make constructive monetary use of the foreign silver after we have purchased it. And I want to say this one further thing. It has been brought out in this House before that if you want to have foreign commerce you must find some way to get American exchange into the hands of foreign buyers. There are only three ways to do it that I know of. One of them is to pay them for services, another is to import from them, and another is to purchase these metals. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, let none of us on this side of the aisle—Democratic—deceive ourselves. This is a direct attack politically on the President of the United States. When the original bill was passed in 1934 the roll-call vote by which the bill was passed was 360 to 40. Today the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]—and, by the way, he voted against it on that occasion, although the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] voted for it today—the gentleman from New York said—and, of course, I do not believe any Member accepted his statement on its face value—that there was no coalition between the Republicans and certain other Members of the Senate that put through the amendment in relation to the devaluation of the gold content of the dollar. Everybody knows what happened in the Senate. It is chronicled in the newspapers. Why, it is already being chronicled as one of the most outstanding—I will say it mildly—of coalitions, and I quote the newspapers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is talking about the august body on the other side of the Capitol, which is contrary to the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will proceed in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Quoting what I have read in the newspapers as written by various columnists, why, even Republican Senators—and I quote them from the newspapers, not what they said in the Senate, and if I understand the rules correctly I have a perfect right to quote them when they talk in the press—Senator VANDENBERG admitted that he and two other Republican Senators——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Admitted in the newspapers, in a statement outside of a speech made in the Senate——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I believe my distinguished and good friend from Massachusetts is in error in his deduction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the gentleman is talking about Members of the Senate and the Senate itself, and the actions of the Senate, and he cannot do that in the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, certainly no one would contend that a Member of the House cannot refer to a statement or a speech made by a Senator outside the United States Senate, and that is what the gentleman from Massachusetts is now doing.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The rules of the House prevent him from criticizing a Member of another body.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is not criticizing the Senator, he is criticizing what he said.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule:

> It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House.

The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. In order to satisfy the disturbed feelings of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, whom I admire, and whom I am glad to see is the minority leader, and who would make a good candidate of the Republican Party for President [applause]—and I mean it.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman vote for him?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not the question. The Republican Party cannot do any better than to put the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] on its national ticket. [Applause.] Do not blame me, Joe, if I have started a Presidential campaign for you.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am afraid the gentleman has now disarmed me completely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Quoting the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], he said there was no coalition. I contend there was a coalition, and the coalition is for the political purpose of discrediting the President of the United States in the eyes of the American public. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-quarter of a minute.

Mr. Speaker, just for the sake of accuracy in the RECORD, I made no reference whatever to a coalition in the Senate. I know nothing about that august body. I merely said there was no coalition in the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat disturbed at the attitude of my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and what he had to say in regard to the possibilities should this legislation be repealed. He probably does not remember that in 1934, the first year of the New Deal's monetary policy, the cotton farmers of this country shipped out more than 8,000,000 bales of cotton. During the 4 years when this policy has been in effect the cotton exports have decreased from around 8,000,000 bales to a little over 3,000,000 bales this year, and then the gentleman talks about this legislation helping the farmers of the United States or helping the cotton farmers in his area. Does he recall that the prices on cotton have fallen from over 12 cents a pound in 1934 down to under 9 cents a pound? Does he recall that under this New Deal monetary policy the prices of wheat have fallen from $1.40 a bushel down to 65 cents a bushel in my home State? Does he recall the falling of agricultural prices that have taken place under this New Deal monetary policy?

So, apparently, this policy has not helped American agriculture, but, on the contrary, it has helped the foreign producers and aided them in selling their products in our American market to the detriment of our farmers.

I always want to help the American people. I am not interested in continuing a policy of government that has for its primary purpose the aiding of foreign individuals, and that is all this monetary policy does—to give aid, bounty, and gifts to foreign speculators.

Under this policy and monetary program the United States Treasury has purchased nearly 2,000,000,000 ounces of foreign silver at a cost of around $1,000,000,000. Do you know that under this policy since January 1, 1934, this country of ours has purchased more than $9,000,000,000 of gold, foreign gold, and has paid a premium of nearly $3,600,000,000 on it, an outright gift of nearly $5,000,000,000 from the American people to the people in the foreign countries of the world, mostly foreign gold and silver speculators who are getting the advantage of a good-neighbor policy established by the New Deal administration?

I am for helping American citizens, American workmen, and American farmers, and when I see that a policy is wrong we should be big enough to repeal or change it, and get back to sanity and reason for the benefit of our own American workers and people.

President Roosevelt said yesterday in criticizing the Senate vote on the stabilization and devaluation bill, that its action restored control over money to Wall Street speculators and international bankers.

If the return to Congress of its constitutional right to fix and regulate the value of money means Wall Street control of money, as stated by the President, then the people had better abolish Congress and representative government.

What a sad commentary on the part of the Chief Executive as to the integrity of Congress. His attitude toward the membership of Congress can be briefly stated. When Congress "rubber stamps" his edicts, then it functions properly, but when Congress attempts to exercise its constitutional prerogatives, the President calls it a tool of Wall Street or begins a far-reaching purge.

The right to fix and regulate the value of money, under the Constitution, belongs solely to Congress. Today, we have the opportunity of recapturing that power by voting down the "previous question" on the rule, and concurring in the Senate amendments to the bill before us. The people of the country demand this action today in behalf of constitutional and representative government.

What is the effect of the action taken by the Senate on the stabilization bill as passed by the House in April of this year?

First. Senate action provides for the continuation of stabilization fund as approved by the House.

Second. Senate action takes away from the President, and restores to Congress, the constitutional power to regulate and fix the value of money (gold). Senate vote—ayes 47, noes 31.

Third. Senate action discontinues the purchase of foreign silver by the United States Treasury. No record vote taken in Senate. Vote overwhelming in favor of discontinuance.

Fourth. Senate action provides for the purchase of domestically mined silver at 77.57 cents per ounce. Senate vote—ayes 48, noes 30. The price of 77.57 was paid by the Treasury for domestic silver for several years prior to the present price of 64.64 cents per ounce, which closed many mines in this country and threw thousands of miners out of work.

The concurrence of the House in the Senate amendments will be one step toward the restoration of business confidence and a return of faith of our people in representative government.

It is about time that the American people stop playing Santa Claus to the rest of the world.

Foreign governments owe us more than $12,000,000,000 from the days of the World War. This staggering sum will never be paid and the New Deal administration has made no attempt to collect any of it. The little country of Finland has paid voluntarily, but other foreign governments have declined to meet their obligations.

Despite this enormous obligation, the New Deal has gone out of its way in giving away our domestic markets to cheap foreign production, and in making gifts of goods and money to foreign speculators and producers during the past 6½ years.

Since January 1, 1934, under President Roosevelt's "good neighbor" policy, the Treasury has purchased more than $9,000,000,000 in foreign gold. America's gift to foreign gold miners and speculators on these purchases amounts to more than $3,600,000,000.

Instead of spending this gift for our farm and manufactured products, foreign recipients of New Deal bounty, have piled up more than $7,000,000,000 in bank deposits and security investments in this country. They can break our market or cause a complete collapse any day by making heavy withdrawals of their funds, which are now temporarily in American institutions. In other words, foreign speculators and international bankers now have the American people by the neck.

FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC SILVER

Under existing law the President can pay up to $1.29 per ounce for domestic silver. The Treasury has paid as high as 77.57 cents for silver. The Senate amendment requiring the purchase of domestic silver at 77.57 cents per ounce is a small price to pay to domestic producers and workers in order to get rid of the purchase of foreign silver. Domestic production of silver for 1938 approximated 58,000,000 ounces. Maximum production in any year under the New Deal totaled 71,000,000 ounces.

Under the New Deal silver-purchase program the Treasury has purchased nearly 2,000,000,000 ounces of foreign silver at a cost to the American people of approximately $1,000,000,000. This silver is not used for monetary purposes and now lies buried in the ground at West Point. Our King Midas gold hoard of $16,000,000,000 is buried in the hills of Kentucky. In reality, we have made an outright gift to foreign silver speculators of more than $1,000,000,000, as this silver has not been used for monetary or any other purpose and is being piled up to build another mountain of silver. It is no good to us. We cannot sell it or use it.

President Roosevelt has fixed and maintained the price of gold and silver for the entire world, yet he is against fixing and maintaining prices on agricultural commodities produced by American farmers. There would be more sense in maintaining prices on food products.

Power of the President to devalue and purchase foreign silver has nothing to do with the so-called tripartite agreement. This agreement with Great Britain and France, according to Mr. Morgenthau, deals exclusively with the stabilization fund, which is continued in the bill.

The authority of the President under existing law expires at midnight on June 30. The overwhelming vote cast in the Senate for the amendments before us plainly shows that there will be no compromise.

The House should now concur in the Senate amendments to H. R. 3325 and restore to itself its constitutional right to fix and regulate the value of money and to discontinue the pernicious role of playing Santa Claus for foreign speculators and international bankers at the expense of the American people.

I urge you to vote down the previous question so that the House may concur in the Senate amendments now before us. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 164, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—216

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Duncan | Kennedy, Md. | Randolph |
| Allen, Pa. | Dunn | Kennedy, Michael | Rankin |
| Anderson, Mo. | Durham | Kirwan | Rayburn |
| Arnold | Eberharter | Kitchens | Richards |
| Barden | Elliott | Kocialkowski | Robertson |
| Barnes | Ellis | Kramer | Robinson, Utah |
| Barry | Faddis | Larrabee | Rogers, Okla. |
| Bates, Ky. | Fay | Lea | Romjue |
| Beckworth | Ferguson | Leavy | Ryan |
| Bell | Fernandez | Lewis, Colo. | Sabath |
| Bloom | Flaherty | Ludlow | Sacks |
| Boland | Flannagan | McAndrews | Sasscer |
| Boren | Flannery | McCormack | Satterfield |
| Boykin | Folger | McGehee | Schaefer, Ill. |
| Bradley, Pa. | Ford, Miss. | McKeough | Schuetz |
| Brooks | Ford, Thomas F. | McLaughlin | Schulte |
| Brown, Ga. | Fries | McMillan, John L. | Schwert |
| Bryson | Fulmer | McMillan, Thos. S. | Scrugham |
| Buck | Garrett | Maciejewski | Shanley |
| Buckler, Minn. | Gathings | Mahon | Sheppard |
| Burch | Gavagan | Maloney | Sirovich |
| Burdick | Gehrmann | Mansfield | Smith, Conn. |
| Burgin | Geyer, Calif. | Marcantonio | Smith, Va. |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Gibbs | Martin, Colo. | Smith, Wash. |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Gore | Martin, Ill. | Snyder |
| Caldwell | Gossett | Massingale | Somers, N. Y. |
| Celler | Grant, Ala. | May | South |
| Chandler | Green | Merritt | Sparkman |
| Clark | Gregory | Mills, Ark. | Spence |
| Claypool | Griffith | Mills, La. | Starnes, Ala. |
| Cochran | Hare | Mitchell | Steagall |
| Coffee, Wash. | Harrington | Monroney | Sullivan |
| Cole, Md. | Hart | Moser | Sutphin |
| Collins | Harter, Ohio | Mouton | Sweeney |
| Colmer | Havenner | Murdock, Ariz. | Tarver |
| Cooley | Healey | Murdock, Utah | Taylor, Colo. |
| Cooper | Hendricks | Nelson | Tenerowicz |
| Courtney | Hill | Nichols | Terry |
| Cox | Hobbs | Norrell | Thomas, Tex. |
| Creal | Hook | O'Connor | Thomason |
| Crosser | Houston | O'Day | Tolan |
| Crowe | Hull | O'Neal | Vincent, Ky. |
| Cullen | Hunter | Pace | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Cummings | Izac | Parsons | Wallgren |
| D'Alesandro | Jacobsen | Patman | Walter |
| Delaney | Jarman | Patrick | Ward |
| Dempsey | Johnson, Luther A. | Patton | Warren |
| DeRouen | Johnson, Lyndon | Pearson | Weaver |
| Dickstein | Johnson, Okla. | Peterson, Fla. | Whelchel |
| Dingell | Johnson, W. Va. | Peterson, Ga. | White, Idaho |
| Disney | Jones, Tex. | Pierce, Oreg. | Whittington |
| Doughton | Kee | Polk | Williams, Mo. |
| Doxey | Keller | Rabaut | Woodrum, Va. |
| Drewry | Kennedy, Martin | Ramspeck | Zimmerman |

NAYS—164

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Dworshak | Keefe | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Allen, Ill. | Eaton, N. J. | Kilday | Rogers, Mass. |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Elston | Kinzer | Routzohn |
| Anderson, Calif. | Englebright | Kleberg | Rutherford |
| Andresen, A. H. | Fenton | Knutson | Sandager |
| Andrews | Fish | Kunkel | Schafer, Wis. |
| Angell | Ford, Leland M. | Lambertson | Schiffler |
| Arends | Gamble | Landis | Seccombe |
| Ashbrook | Gearhart | Lanham | Secrest |
| Austin | Gerlach | LeCompte | Seger |
| Ball | Gifford | Lemke | Shafer, Mich. |
| Barton | Gilchrist | Lewis, Ohio | Short |
| Bates, Mass. | Gillie | McDowell | Simpson |
| Bender | Graham | McLean | Smith, Maine |
| Blackney | Grant, Ind. | Maas | Smith, Ohio |
| Bolles | Griswold | Marshall | Springer |
| Bolton | Gross | Martin, Iowa | Stearns, N. H. |
| Bradley, Mich. | Guyer, Kans. | Martin, Mass. | Stefan |
| Brewster | Hall | Mason | Sumner, Ill. |
| Brown, Ohio | Halleck | Michener | Talle |
| Carlson | Hancock | Miller | Taylor, Tenn. |
| Carter | Harness | Monkiewicz | Thill |
| Case, S. Dak. | Harter, N. Y. | Mott | Thomas, N. J. |
| Chiperfield | Hawks | Mundt | Thorkelson |
| Church | Heinke | Murray | Tibbott |
| Clason | Hess | O'Brien | Tinkham |
| Clevenger | Hinshaw | Oliver | Treadway |
| Cluett | Hoffman | Osmers | Van Zandt |
| Coffee, Nebr. | Holmes | Pierce, N. Y. | Vorys, Ohio |
| Cole, N. Y. | Hope | Pittenger | Vreeland |
| Corbett | Horton | Plumley | Wadsworth |
| Crawford | Jarrett | Poage | West |
| Crowther | Jeffries | Powers | Wheat |
| Culkin | Jenkins, Ohio | Reece, Tenn. | White, Ohio |
| Curtis | Jenks, N. H. | Reed, Ill. | Wigglesworth |
| Darrow | Jensen | Reed, N. Y. | Williams, Del. |
| Dirksen | Johns | Rees, Kans. | Winter |
| Ditter | Johnson, Ill. | Rich | Wolcott |
| Dondero | Johnson, Ind. | Risk | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Douglas | Jones, Ohio | Robsion, Ky. | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Dowell | Kean | Rockefeller | Youngdahl |

NOT VOTING—50

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beam | Curley | Keogh | O'Toole |
| Bland | Darden | Kerr | Pfeifer |
| Boehne | Dies | Lesinski | Shannon |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Eaton, Calif. | Luce | Smith, Ill. |
| Bulwinkle | Edmiston | McArdle | Smith, W. Va. |
| Byron | Engel | McGranery | Sumners, Tex. |
| Cannon, Fla. | Evans | McLeod | Taber |
| Cannon, Mo. | Fitzpatrick | McReynolds | Vinson, Ga. |
| Cartwright | Gartner | Magnuson | Welch |
| Casey, Mass. | Gwynne | Mapes | Wood |
| Chapman | Hartley | Myers | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Connery | Hennings | Norton | |
| Costello | Kelly | O'Leary | |

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia (for) with Mr. Taber (against).
Mr. Keogh (for) with Mr. Hartley (against).
Mr. Cannon of Florida (for) with Mr. Luce (against).
Mr. Pfeifer (for) with Mr. Gartner (against).
Mr. Bland (for) with Mr. Gwynne (against).
Mr. O'Leary (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).
Mr. O'Toole (for) with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Mapes.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Eaton of California.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Evans.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Costello.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Byron.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. Smith of Illinois with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Hennings with Mr. McGranery.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Wood.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 162, noes 117.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 162, answered "present" 2, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—211

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allen, La. | Durham | Kitchens | Rayburn |
| Allen, Pa. | Eberharter | Kocialkowski | Richards |
| Anderson, Mo. | Elliott | Kramer | Robertson |
| Arnold | Ellis | Larrabee | Robinson, Utah |
| Barden | Faddis | Lea | Rogers, Okla. |
| Barnes | Fay | Leavy | Romjue |
| Barry | Ferguson | Lewis, Colo. | Ryan |
| Bates, Ky. | Fernandez | Ludlow | Sabath |
| Beckworth | Flaherty | McAndrews | Sacks |
| Bell | Flannagan | McCormack | Satterfield |
| Bloom | Flannery | McGehee | Schaefer, Ill. |
| Boland | Folger | McKeough | Schuetz |
| Boren | Ford, Thomas F. | McLaughlin | Schulte |
| Boykin | Fries | McMillan, John L. | Schwert |
| Bradley, Pa. | Fulmer | McMillan, Thos. S. | Scrugham |
| Brooks | Garrett | Maciejewski | Secrest |
| Brown, Ga. | Gathings | Mahon | Shanley |
| Bryson | Gavagan | Maloney | Sheppard |
| Buck | Gehrmann | Mansfield | Sirovich |
| Buckler, Minn. | Geyer, Calif. | Marcantonio | Smith, Conn. |
| Burch | Gibbs | Martin, Colo. | Smith, Va. |
| Burdick | Gore | Martin, Ill. | Smith, Wash. |
| Burgin | Gossett | Massingale | Snyder |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Grant, Ala. | May | Somers, N. Y. |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Green | Merritt | South |
| Caldwell | Gregory | Mills, Ark. | Sparkman |
| Celler | Griffith | Mills, La. | Spence |
| Chandler | Hare | Mitchell | Starnes, Ala. |
| Clark | Harrington | Monroney | Steagall |
| Claypool | Hart | Mouton | Sullivan |
| Cochran | Harter, Ohio | Murdock, Ariz. | Sutphin |
| Coffee, Nebr. | Havenner | Murdock, Utah | Sweeney |
| Cole, Md. | Healey | Nelson | Tarver |
| Collins | Hennings | Nichols | Taylor, Colo. |
| Colmer | Hill | Norrell | Tenerowicz |
| Cooley | Hobbs | O'Connor | Terry |
| Costello | Hook | O'Day | Thomas, Tex. |
| Courtney | Houston | O'Neal | Thomason |
| Creal | Hull | Pace | Tolan |
| Crosser | Hunter | Parsons | Vincent, Ky. |
| Crowe | Izac | Patman | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Cullen | Jacobsen | Patrick | Wallgren |
| Cummings | Jarman | Patton | Walter |
| D'Alesandro | Johnson, Luther A. | Pearson | Ward |
| Delaney | Johnson, Lyndon | Peterson, Fla. | Warren |
| Dempsey | Johnson, Okla. | Peterson, Ga. | Weaver |
| Dickstein | Johnson, W. Va. | Pfeifer | Whelchel |
| Dingell | Jones, Tex. | Pierce, Oreg. | White, Idaho |
| Disney | Kee | Polk | Whittington |
| Doxey | Kennedy, Martin | Rabaut | Williams, Mo. |
| Drewry | Kennedy, Michael | Ramspeck | Woodrum, Va. |
| Duncan | Kennedy, Md. | Randolph | Zimmerman |
| Dunn | Kirwan | Rankin | |

NAYS—162

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alexander | Eaton, N. J. | Kinzer | Routzohn |
| Allen, Ill. | Elston | Kleberg | Rutherford |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Englebright | Knutson | Sandager |
| Anderson, Calif. | Fenton | Kunkel | Sasscer |
| Andresen, A. H. | Fish | Lambertson | Schafer, Wis. |
| Andrews | Ford, Leland M. | Landis | Schiffler |
| Angell | Gamble | Lanham | Seccombe |
| Arends | Gerlach | LeCompte | Seger |
| Ashbrook | Gifford | Lemke | Shafer, Mich. |
| Austin | Gilchrist | Lewis, Ohio | Short |
| Ball | Gillie | McDowell | Simpson |
| Barton | Graham | McLean | Smith, Maine |
| Bates, Mass. | Grant, Ind. | Maas | Smith, Ohio |
| Bender | Griswold | Marshall | Springer |
| Blackney | Gross | Martin, Iowa | Stearns, N. H. |
| Bolles | Guyer, Kans. | Martin, Mass. | Stefan |
| Bolton | Hall | Mason | Sumner, Ill. |
| Bradley, Mich. | Halleck | Michener | Talle |
| Brewster | Hancock | Miller | Taylor, Tenn. |
| Brown, Ohio | Harness | Monkiewicz | Thill |
| Carlson | Harter, N. Y. | Moser | Thomas, N. J. |
| Carter | Hawks | Mott | Thorkelson |
| Case, S. Dak. | Heinke | Mundt | Tibbott |
| Chiperfield | Hess | Murray | Tinkham |
| Church | Hinshaw | O'Brien | Van Zandt |
| Clason | Hoffman | Oliver | Vorys, Ohio |
| Clevenger | Holmes | Osmers | Vreeland |
| Cluett | Hope | Pierce, N. Y. | Wadsworth |
| Cole, N. Y. | Horton | Pittenger | West |
| Corbett | Jarrett | Plumley | Wheat |
| Crawford | Jeffries | Poage | White, Ohio |
| Crowther | Jenkins, Ohio | Powers | Wigglesworth |
| Culkin | Jenks, N. H. | Reece, Tenn. | Williams, Del. |
| Curtis | Jensen | Reed, Ill. | Winter |
| Darrow | Johns | Rees, Kans. | Wolcott |
| Dirksen | Johnson, Ill. | Rich | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Ditter | Johnson, Ind. | Risk | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Dondero | Jones, Ohio | Robsion, Ky. | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Douglas | Kean | Rockefeller | Youngdahl |
| Dowell | Keefe | Rodgers, Pa. | |
| Dworshak | Kilday | Rogers, Mass. | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

| | |
|---|---|
| Reed, N. Y. | Treadway |

NOT VOTING—55

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beam | Cox | Gwynne | Mapes |
| Bland | Curley | Hartley | Myers |
| Boehne | Darden | Hendricks | Norton |
| Buckley, N. Y. | DeRouen | Keller | O'Leary |
| Bulwinkle | Dies | Kelly | O'Toole |
| Byron | Doughton | Keogh | Shannon |
| Cannon, Fla. | Eaton, Calif. | Kerr | Smith, Ill. |
| Cannon, Mo. | Edmiston | Lesinski | Smith, W. Va. |
| Cartwright | Engel | Luce | Sumners, Tex. |
| Casey, Mass. | Evans | McArdle | Taber |
| Chapman | Fitzpatrick | McGranery | Vinson, Ga. |
| Coffee, Wash. | Ford, Miss. | McLeod | Welch |
| Connery | Gartner | McReynolds | Wood |
| Cooper | Gearhart | Magnuson | |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cooper (for) with Mr. Reed of New York (against).
Mr. Doughton (for) with Mr. Treadway (against).
Mr. Vinson of Georgia (for) with Mr. Taber (against).
Mr. Cannon of Florida (for) with Mr. Luce (against).
Mr. Keogh (for) with Mr. Hartley (against).
Mr. Bland (for) with Mr. Gwynne (against).
Mr. O'Leary (for) with Mr. McLeod (against).
Mr. O'Toole (for) with Mr. Gartner (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Mapes.
Mr. Darden with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Eaton of California.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Evans.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Connery.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Byron.
Mr. Smith of Illinois with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Shannon.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Keller.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], who was temporarily detained during the roll call. If present, he would have voted "yea." Therefore I wish to withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I desire to withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present," as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] would have voted "yea" if present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LARRABEE, Mr. REED of Illinois, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

### REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6577, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection, and the Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. BATES of Massachusetts.

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. GRANERY and Mr. MYERS, are absent on account of official business. If present, they would have voted "yea" on the recent roll call.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by me on May 21.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, 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 amendment numbered 114.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$203,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert $13,769,418"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "$14,697,732"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "$26,704,297"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$681,610"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$40,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 148: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 148, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said House amendment, insert "$46,965,730"; and the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32, 33, 141, 142, and 158.

M. C. TARVER,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
DAVID D. TERRY,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
GERALD P. NYE,
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments Nos. 19, 32, 114, 116, 141, 142, 147, and 158 and the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate Nos. 21, 26, 27, 33, 115, and 148 to the bill (H. R. 5269) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action recommended and agreed upon as to such amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

The following amendments are in adjustment of totals and allocations in conformity with the action on other amendments, namely, Nos. 21, 26, 27, 115, 116, and 148.

On amendment No. 19, Extension Service, additional cooperative work: Appropriates $203,000, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 114, wildlife restoration: Appropriates $1,500,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 147, farm tenant loans: Appropriates $40,000,000, instead of $24,984,500, as proposed by the House, and $49,984,500, as proposed by the Senate.

*In disagreement*

The committee of conference have not agreed to the following Senate amendments:

On amendment No. 32, appropriating $250,000 for a new Weather Bureau building.

On amendment No. 141, fire-erosion control, Everglades, Fla.: Appropriates $75,000 for fire-erosion control in the Everglades region in the State of Florida.

On amendment No. 158, Farm Credit Administration: Inserts language providing that employees are not to be held personally liable for fraud or misrepresentation of applicants or borrowers where the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration determines that such employees have exercised reasonable care.

M. C. TARVER,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
DAVID D. TERRY,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 32: Page 22, after line 17, insert:

"WEATHER BUREAU BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Weather Bureau Building: For the construction and equipment, on the site of the Weather Bureau in the District of Columbia, of the first unit of an extensible building for the use of said Bureau, including necessary alterations in the existing Weather Bureau buildings, to remain available until expended, $250,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, at this late date, with the necessity for this bill to get to the White House for signature before the close of the fiscal year, I am not specially disposed to oppose the bill. However, I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not call attention to the fact that the item now pending, on which the House proposes to recede and concur, calls for an appropriation of $250,000 for the first unit of an extensible Weather Bureau building. I have not seen the facilities that are being used by the Weather Bureau at the present time, but I understand they are quite adequate. I simply want to impress upon the House that we are today committing ourselves to the first of a series of expenditures for an extensible building that is going to involve infinitely more money than the $250,000 now carried in the bill. The proposal now pending before you is to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. If you approve it, it means that you place the seal of your approval upon this proposal. If you turn it down, it means that we will further confer on the matter and determine whether or not this unit ought to be undertaken.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe the New Deal ought to have a Weather Bureau to tell which way the wind is blowing?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the statement made in the hearings before the House committee on pages 286 and 287 explaining this item. This building is 51 years old. It has been occupied by the Weather Bureau for 40 years. It was constructed for the Mexican Embassy and was never intended for use as an office building. The officials who occupy it are so crowded for space that it is necessary to stack their files in the corridors of the building. Whereas standard regulations require that at least 100 square feet be available for each employee, there are in this building available only 68 square feet per employee.

The total amount involved in the construction of the three units which will be necessary in order to afford this Bureau the facilities it needs is $815,000, of which only $250,000 is being made available by this appropriation if it is agreed to by the House.

The Weather Bureau, according to the evidence before our committee, is the worst-housed of any bureau in the Department of Agriculture. It is today expending several thousand dollars per year in the rental of space outside of this building. There can be no question but that the additional construction sought here is very necessary. I can conceive of no reason why the passage of this bill, which has now been substantially agreed upon in all controversial particulars, should be delayed further by reason of a controversy over an item of this sort. I sincerely hope that the House will agree to the motion, agreed to in conference by all the conferees, as far as I am advised, with the possible exception of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the total cost of the building we are embarking upon?

Mr. TARVER. I stated that a moment ago, but the gentleman probably did not hear me. It is contemplated to construct three units. This appropriation of $250,000 provides for the first unit. The total cost of construction, to be apportioned over at least 3 years, will be $815,000.

May I point out to the gentleman and to the House that recently the Congress has very substantially increased the appropriations for the Weather Bureau, partly in order to enable it to make meteorological investigations in connection with commercial aviation. The number of its employees and the extent of its activities have been vastly increased. There can be no question but that provision must be made for additional space either by the construction of new buildings to replace these old, worn-out quarters or by the rental of proper quarters elsewhere in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is not this the identical amendment the House voted down when the report was here before?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. The House voted against receding and concurring in the amendment; but may I say to the gentleman that it would never be possible to secure legislation of the character involved in the passage of an appropriation bill unless one House or the other, with regard to disputed items, should be willing to make concessions. It is not possible for this House of itself alone to pass an appropriation bill, neither is it possible for the Senate to do that. This conference report and the action the committee of conference is recommending on these amendments that are not included in the report represent the judgment of the conferees upon these various disputed items, in an effort to arrive at a conclusion that would be reasonably satisfactory. There is no member of the conference who is absolutely pleased with everything that has been done. We have sought to reach a conclusion, however, that would fairly represent the wishes of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAYBURN). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 98, noes 82.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33: On page 22, after line 25, insert "Total, Weather Bureau, $7,181,570."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House further insist upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate No. 33.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 141: Page 92, after line 11, insert:

"Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For research and demonstration work in soil conservation control measures, including fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $75,000: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida for the same purposes."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For research and demonstration work in soil conservation control measures, including research and demonstration work in fire control and irrigation construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $75,000: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida for the same purposes."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, just to make a record on this proposal, this amendment No. 141 provides $75,000 for fire-control research and demonstration and emergency erosion control in the Everglades of Florida.

The strict fact of the matter is that nobody made any appearance before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture to request this sum. There was no testimony in our hearings. It was not until the matter came to the Senate side that it was presented, and the Senate finally wrote it in with a proviso, of course, that the money had to be matched by the State of Florida. This, of course, is a legislative provision written into the bill by the Senate, and therefore had to come back to the House for a separate vote.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. The fact that the Legislature of Florida met too late to appropriate its portion was the cause of the delay.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What I wanted to make emphatic, I will say to the gentleman from Florida, is that there has been no estimate for this. There was no testimony in the hearings and there was no request made of the House committee for this item. I appreciate, of course, it only involves $75,000, and I am not disposed to oppose it too emphatically at this time; but I believe in the interest of legislative integrity the House ought to be advised as to what the situation is and how this item got into the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. My understanding is, and it was so stated by the Senate conferees, that this condition in Florida which

necessitated this appropriation arose after the hearings in the House had been concluded, and it was for this reason that the matter was not presented to the House committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We were so informed, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, although that does not appear in the testimony on the House side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 87, noes 68.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 142: Page 92, after line 20, strike out "$23,645,584" and insert "$23,720,584."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this simply corrects a total. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 158: On page 108, line 5, after the parenthesis, insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no employee of the United States on whose certificate or approval loans under said act of January 29, 1937, as amended, or other acts of the same general character, are or have been made, shall be held personally liable for any loss or deficiency occasioned by the fraud or misrepresentation of applicants or borrowers, if the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration shall determine that such employee has exercised reasonable care in the circumstances, and has complied with the regulations of the Farm Credit Administration in executing such certificate or giving such approval."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 158, with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 158 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, add the following:

"Notwithstanding any such determination by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, this provision shall not be construed to prevent any criminal process against any person who was a party to or had guilty knowledge of such fraud or misrepresentation."

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me to offer an amendment?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I say that this is the last item in a bill which has required a great deal of time in conference. This is an amendment which was satisfactory both to the Republican and Democratic conferees, and I do not think the committee on this side should be requested not to follow the usual procedure at this time and allow the offering of a substitute proposition.

This is a proposal that all the conferees have agreed upon.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. I will be pleased to yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this proviso gives to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration the privilege of determining whether or not any employee should be held liable for any loss that might be occasioned through fraud or misrepresentation on the part of applicants or borrowers.

The House, on various occasions, has given unlimited power to the agencies administering farm measures, even going so far as to permit them to audit their own accounts or to have the last word to say in reference to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. As far as I am concerned, if I can prevent it, the House is not going to do this again.

It seems to me some other agency should also pass upon the recommendation of the Farm Credit Administration as to whether these officials should be held liable. If I had been granted the privilege I asked for, I would add to this proviso that the Comptroller General should also approve. We should not be letting spending agencies do their own auditing nor relieve their own officers of shortages that may occur in the administration of laws where they are spending large amounts of money, but there should be a check on them.

I realize that the hour is late to bring up this question, but the conference report has just been called up. I do hope the committee will be extremely careful in the future. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] knows what happened under the law letting one farm agency audit its own accounts, because there was a hearing before his subcommittee. Fortunately, the Committee on Expenditures was able to settle that matter by getting the General Accounting Office in the picture, and as a result about $500,000 will be returned to the Treasury on June 30 that would otherwise have been wasted. All members of the subcommittee handling the Agriculture appropriation bill agreed to that proposition. Again I say it is wrong to let a spending agency decide for itself whether or not any of its officials have been at fault in the handling of public money. That is what we have a Comptroller General for. He should be consulted and review the cases acted on, and if he finds the official was in no way involved, well and good.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I will not offer any objection to this compromise that the conferees have agreed on; but I serve notice in the future I am going to oppose legislation letting the spending agency settle such proposals. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

If the House will carefully examine the language of Senate amendment No. 158, they will find that it does not propose to absolve employees of the Farm Credit Administration from responsibility for any fraud or dereliction on their own part. It only relates to their being held responsible for fraud or misrepresentation committed by applicants for loans from the emergency crop and feed loan funds.

Recently the Comptroller General, in a decision which was somewhat surprising to me, because I did not believe, and do not believe now, that it clearly represents the law on the subject, held that an employee of the Farm Credit Administration who, upon the basis of a recommendation made by a county committee on the application of an applicant for a loan, certified to the correctness of the statements made in the application, with no fault on his part and no knowledge that there was any incorrect statement made in the application, was personally liable if the applicant, without his knowledge, had been guilty of fraud. It seems to me that is such a manifestly unfair situation that it ought to be corrected. While we have added some language by amendment to the Senate amendment which will further protect the Government in such matters, the amendment as it is now proposed certainly ought not to attract opposition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]. I want him to explain his views on this matter.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, of course, every precaution should be taken to prevent fraud. There is no institution within the Government more nearly free from any sort of questionable transaction than the Farm Credit Administration. No agency has operated on a more efficient basis. This amendment does not apply to the regular work of the Farm Credit Administration, but only applies to what is known as the seed and feed loans. That is an appropriation which was made to finance farmers who cannot secure credit elsewhere. The loans usually average less than $100. More than 100,000 of these loans are made each year. They provide just a bare pittance that enables the farmer who cannot get credit elsewhere, to make a crop, when he otherwise could not make it. Many of these loans are made in the drought and flood areas, where there is great need for an immediate small loan. If this application were left so that the disburser would have to make inquiry and be responsible on a $25 or $50 loan for representations made by

local committees or by the farmers, it would make it practically impossible of administration. They are current loans. If a man were going to disburse $50, if he were going to be personally responsible for it, it would be necessary for him to check up on every statement made by every applicant on these several hundred thousand loans. Generally there should be thorough responsibility. But this is a practical matter that calls for practical administration.

These have been very important loans. They have, in many instances, saved the farmers. It would be utterly ridiculous in connection with a $40 or $50 loan to go to the expense of sending somebody out 20 or 30 miles to check up on the individual statements made by the local committee or by the applicant himself.

Here is an interesting thing: There have only been very few cases of fraud in the hundreds of thousands of loans that have been made beginning away back in the twenties when the other party was in power. The loans have proved to be so valuable that both sides have provided for them practically unanimously every year. They are administered by one of the most capable and efficient field organizations to be found anywhere. It would be a tragedy to have their fine work handicapped by regulations that would so delay their work as to make it almost wholly useless.

I hope the House will agree to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the members of the conference committees of the House and Senate are entitled to the thanks of the Members of the House and richly deserve the sincere gratitude of the farmers of the Nation for the time and effort they have expended in bringing this agricultural appropriation bill to a successful conclusion. In view of my deep interest in the funds carried in this bill, I have kept in constant contact with the members of the conference committees and can testify to the devotion which they have shown to those millions who till the soil.

Of course, it is pleasing to me that a Senator and Representative from my own State were permitted to participate in these conferences, and I am convinced that many of the items carried in this bill are the result of their individual efforts. The junior Senator from Georgia, Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, was the chairman of the conference committee in the Senate, and the Representative from the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia, Hon. M. C. TARVER, was the second ranking member of the committee on the part of the House. Working with Senator RUSSELL was Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, of Alabama, whose interest in our agricultural problems has been an inspiration to me. Their untiring efforts have contributed a great deal in securing the successful passage of this bill. Of course, I am equally grateful to the other members of the conference committees for their efforts in behalf of the 32,000,000 people of this Nation who look to agriculture for a livelihood.

Now ready for final passage, the bill carries $225,000,000 for parity payments to the producers of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, and tobacco in 1940. It will be recalled that in the last session we secured an appropriation of $212,000,000 for parity payments for this year, and which the Department advises me will be distributed in August or September. This bill also carries $203,000,000 for use by the Secretary of Agriculture in the purchase and distribution of surplus agricultural commodities. I believe that this appropriation is going to prove very helpful in solving one of our most distressing problems—that is, in finding a market for the surplus crops and meeting the need of those in want. Most of this fund will be expended in handling those crops with the greatest surplus, particularly cotton, wheat, citrus fruits, peanuts, and dairy products.

In my section, peanuts have become a major crop. Last year, the Department of Agriculture authorized a peanut diversion program and it produced magnificent returns to the peanut producers. While the program cost over $3,000,000, it increased the receipts of the peanut producers by approximately $20,000,000, and I do not know of any Government program that has shown as fine returns for the amount invested. In the program last year the price of peanuts was fixed at $65 per ton and I understand there has been some doubt in the minds of officials of the Department of Agriculture as to whether they would to able to maintain that price for the crop this year. It was for that reason that many of us worked so vigorously for this $203,000,000, so as to be sure that ample funds would be available for another peanut diversion program and at a price at least as good if not better than the price fixed last year.

In this connection, I think it should be understood by all that this $203,000,000 appropriated in this bill for the handling of surplus agricultural commodities, including cotton and peanuts, is taken from customs receipts paid at our ports on foreign goods shipped into this country under our tariff laws.

The tariff has been a burden to the farmers for 150 years and I feel that the Congress is fully justified in appropriating for use by the farmers not only this $203,000,000, but the full amount received as customs receipts under our tariff laws.

It is also pleasing to me that we have been able to write into this bill an appropriation of $40,000,000 for the farm-tenant purchase program. Many of us have worked for weeks to make the amount $50,000,000, and I think that amount should have been appropriated, and we intend to insist upon that amount next year, but for the present have consented to accept the $40,000,000 agreed upon by the conference committee, for which Senator RUSSELL and Senator BANKHEAD have worked so diligently. I believe this farm-tenant purchase program is going to mean a great deal in the future for the farming population of this Nation. I can think of no life more discouraging than that faced by a tenant farmer—to be required to move from year to year, to change schools, churches, and friends, and never know what tomorrow will bring forth. I can think of no finer contribution to American citizenship than to provide a method whereby deserving tenants can buy a farm of their own, to be permanently established and have a home to love, to work for and to fight for.

The newspapers of the Nation have repeatedly printed articles with reference to this bill to the effect that it was a $1,200,000,000 bill for the farmers, and I think it is time that this impression was corrected. It is true that the money appropriated in this bill totals nearly $1,200,000,000, but if you will examine the bill carefully, you will find many items that cannot be regarded as of direct benefit to the people on the farm or treated as an agricultural appropriation. For instance, this bill appropriates $191,000,000 to the Bureau of Public Roads for the building of paved roads in every part of the Nation. Certainly, it should not be said that this $191,000,000 is for the sole benefit of the farmers, for industry and the general public receive just as much or more benefit from these paved roads than does the farmer. Also the bill appropriates $17,000,000 for the purchase of forest lands and $14,000,000 for the building of roads and trails through the forests. None of this should be charged to the farmer. The bill carries $7,000,000 for the Weather Bureau, and certainly the city man, the railroads, the shipping interests, the air lines and the general public receive more important benefits from this appropriation than does the farmer.

I have taken the time to go through the bill carefully and here are the items carried in this bill which should not be charged against the farmers of the Nation, totaling $253,000,000, and which brings the appropriations for the direct benefit of the farmers under $1,000,000,000:

| | |
|---|---|
| Weather Bureau | $7,181,570 |
| To enforce Meat Inspection Act | 5,433,000 |
| Greenhouses | 77,372 |
| Diseases of ornamental trees and shrubs | 265,392 |
| Arboretum | 54,587 |
| Improvement and diseases of rubber plants | 46,749 |
| Acquisition of forest lands | 17,004,000 |
| Water rights in national forests | 20,000 |
| Fighting fires in national forests | 100,000 |
| Wood-using industries | 100,000 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Forest investigations, etc | $678,403 |
| Forest management | 245,935 |
| Test of forest products | 700,000 |
| Forest survey | 250,000 |
| Forest economics | 149,295 |
| Forest influences | 139,152 |
| West Indies Forest Experiment Station | 30,000 |
| Forest administration | 607,500 |
| Soil control in national forests | 71,000 |
| Lands for Tahoe National Forest | 325,000 |
| Forest insects | 253,000 |
| Dutch Elm disease | 500,000 |
| Fur investigations | 91,000 |
| Buildings, etc., for wildlife investigation | 186,000 |
| Protection of migratory birds | 365,000 |
| Enforce Alaska game laws | 130,798 |
| Maintenance wildlife refuges | 680,000 |
| Migratory-bird refuges | 79,753 |
| Wildlife administrative expenses | 118,000 |
| Upper Mississippi wildlife refuge | 60,000 |
| Acquisition of migratory-bird sanctuaries | 125,000 |
| Aid to States in wildlife projects | 2,000,000 |
| Wildlife administration and investigation | 186,140 |
| Bureau of Public Roads | 191,000,000 |
| Food and Drug Administration | 2,932,758 |
| Liquidation of resettlement projects | 1,987,400 |
| Retirement of submarginal lands | 4,978,330 |
| Beltsville Center | 90,000 |
| Forest roads and trails | 14,000,000 |
| Total | 253,242,134 |

May I say in conclusion that I hope the day will soon come when it will not be necessary to draw upon the United States Treasury to supplement the income of the farmers of this Nation; but the Congress has passed numerous laws favoring industry and other classes of our population which have had the effect of reducing the returns from farm commodities, and until this inequality is corrected I feel fully justified in asking and expecting the Congress to make provision for the farmers of this Nation, who are in fact the foundation of our democracy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include a paragraph from a report by the House Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to thank the conferees for the consideration given to the item of $203,000 for the Agriculture Extension Service. The purpose of this appropriation was fully covered in the debate on the original conference report in the House last week.

The amount originally requested was $300,000; that was the amount authorized by S. 518 which was adopted by Congress a few weeks ago. Of that amount, $97,000 was to increase the agricultural extension work with settlers on Federal reclamation projects, as recommended by the Repayment Commission, appointed by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to a direction of the Congress. That is a worthy item and I hope that it may be included when next appropriations are made for a new fiscal year.

The remaining $203,000, the amount in the supplementary conference report adopted today, is the amount needed to maintain the regular extension service of county agents and home extension workers in 21 States at the level they have had for many years. Members will remember that authorization was given in S. 518 adopted by this Congress after the original agriculture appropriation bill had been considered.

The full $300,000 was then added to the appropriation bill by the Senate. The agreement on the $203,000 compromise will be appreciated by the farmers and farmers' wives who recognize the county agent and home extension work as a truly constructive service to agriculture.

Assuming the acceptance of the $203,000 figure means that the item as it now stands is for the regular extension work, I insert at this point the allotments to States concerned indicated in the report of the House Agriculture Committee on S. 518 (H. Rept. 384, 76th Cong., 1st sess.):

| | |
|---|---|
| Arizona | $6,954.31 |
| Colorado | 15,430.86 |
| Connecticut | 8,038.48 |
| Florida | 8,463.97 |
| Idaho | 9,452.27 |
| Maine | 3,842.36 |
| Maryland | 3,742.21 |
| Massachusetts | 7,130.11 |
| Montana | 19,672.10 |
| Nebraska | 6,683.54 |
| Nevada | 12,426.57 |
| New Hampshire | 4,151.71 |
| New Jersey | 13,949.41 |
| New Mexico | 8,330.89 |
| North Dakota | 6,418.37 |
| Oregon | 16,784.58 |
| South Dakota | 21,409.07 |
| Utah | 8,735.46 |
| Vermont | 1,521.83 |
| Washington | 906.24 |
| Wyoming | 18,996.48 |

The report further says:

These 21 States have received practically no increases in Federal funds for extension work since the initial Bankhead-Jones appropriation for the fiscal year 1936, while the remaining 27 States and Hawaii, because their shares of Bankhead-Jones increases exceeded reductions made in the other two funds, have received net increases each year.

Mr. THORKELSON rose.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THORKELSON. May I ask why I am not recognized to submit a request to extend my remarks?

The SPEAKER. Time in consideration of this amendment is under the control of the gentleman from Georgia.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join other Members in congratulating the conferees and the House committee on reaching an agreement with the conferees of the Senate that appears to be generally satisfactory. I assume, of course, that there will be no serious objection to this particular motion. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] that this is really a very important matter. It is money well spent, and so far as I know, there has been little or no objection to it.

While I am on the floor, permit me to say that I am especially pleased that this House, a few moments ago, approved the compromise agreement reached by our House conferees with conferees from the other body to appropriate $40,000,000 the next fiscal year to continue the splendid farm-tenant program under the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Of course, I am disappointed that the farm-tenant program is to be cut $10,000,000 below the amount authorized by the Congress for the next year. It just occurs to me that any cut below what has been definitely promised during the ensuing year in this important program cannot possibly be justified. But I am sure many will rejoice that a final agreement has been reached and acted upon by this House. I predict that every dollar of the $40,000,000 will be wisely loaned to deserving farmers during the coming year, and that all of it will come back to the Treasury with interest.

May I add that I am glad to have had a part in the fight to continue the farm-tenant program in the United States. It has been no small struggle to secure adequate funds to carry out the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Many appear to be under the misapprehension that this is an outright gift instead of a self-liquidating loan. May I express the hope that this great worth-while program will expand until every deserving tenant farmer of Oklahoma, as well as in other States where farm tenancy has grown to be a problem, who really desires to own his own farm, may have

the opportunity of proudly becoming a home owner. [Applause.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, once more, to preserve the integrity of the RECORD, let me say that as the bill left the House it included $25,000,000 for farm-tenancy loans. The Senate added a like amount—not the whole amount but merely another $25,000,000. In the final conference the amount was reduced to $40,000,000 instead of $50,000,000. I could not let this opportunity go by without expressing my views on the matter; and I did so vote in conference. I voted so because the testimony before the House committee showed that 40,000 farmers were either slipping into tenancy or had been dispossessed and were on the road to tenancy every year. Now, we come along and vote a very substantial amount of money to be used for the purpose of reducing farm tenancy, rehabilitating perhaps 4,000 or 5,000 farmers every year when 40,000 are being reduced to tenancy.

My objection to the program and my objection to the proposal made by the President in the recent spend-lend letter to Senator BYRNES relative to more money for farm tenancy is that we are barging out into a problem that is of astronomical proportions. I am not willing to commit myself, or my people, or this Congress, to that kind of program that will end not in $100,000,000 but in the billions if you follow it through logically. My basic opposition lies in the fact that it is a huge problem of which we can only scratch the surface. I do not believe, in spite of the fact that several votes have been had on this question in recent years, that the Congress quite knows what it is getting into in this farm-tenancy program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman knows that the House has gone on record several times and voted the full amount; and just a few moments ago the House confirmed the amount of $40,000,000 in this bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not unmindful of the fact that we have voted on it several times, but in spite of that I express the feeling that perhaps a great many Members did not quite see through this program or understand its full implications or perhaps the way in which this money was distributed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. With pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. In view of the vote just a few moments ago, approving the $40,000,000, does not the gentleman think that is confirmation of this program by the House at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know they voted approval, but I can only reiterate what I have said that any measure the House has proposed is merely a scratch on the surface of this tremendous problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman recall that Secretary Wallace testified before the Committee on Agriculture just as the gentleman stated that 40,000 farmers are being reduced to tenancy each year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the subject under discussion.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana objects.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MAHON. As a Member of the House and as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have been very much interested in the item which the House has just approved regarding farm tenancy. When this matter was presented to the House several days ago, I fully supported the motion of my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] which provided that we appropriate the whole $50,000,000 which Congress had previously authorized for this work next year. Failing to secure the $50,000,000, I am glad we at least have $40,000,000. This ought to provide for a substantial increase in the farm-tenancy program next year.

Certainly nothing could be much more important to the stability of the Nation than widespread rural-home ownership. Two out of every three farmers in many of our agricultural areas are tenants. This is a bad situation, and I feel that it is the duty of Congress to do everything possible to assist the program of home ownership on the farms. Home ownership promotes good citizenship, it promotes soil conservation and rural stability, it promotes most of those virtues upon which this Nation must rely for its future security.

Mind you, under this legislation we merely lend money at a low-interest rate to deserving farmers for the purpose of assisting them in the purchase of farm homes. The selections are made by the Farm Security Administration with the greatest care, and I am positively convinced that these loans will be repaid to the Treasury. In fact the purchasers paid last year 138 percent of the amount of maturities.

Every incentive to home ownership must be promoted. Nobody is deceived into believing that this appropriation of $40,000,000 will enable every farm family to own a home. But it will give further encouragement to our rural population and help in providing a solution to one of our major farm problems.

As long as I serve in Congress I shall do everything in my power to increase the farm income and to promote home ownership. I know something about the weary road that many of those who seek to live by tilling the soil must follow. The Government cannot provide a substitute for hard work, but the Government can well afford to encourage home ownership through this farm-tenancy program. I am for it strong. I am hoping we can do a much more extensive and a much better job of it in the future.

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

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] 2 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise in opposition, but I do wish to remark, following the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], that often I have recited on the floor of the House that the Treasury report lists as assets the notes of farmers dating back to 1921 for seed loans. It does not appear that they have ever marked off a loss, but still carry them as assets.

I cannot help but doubt that they have ever tried to enforce reimbursement on anybody if fraud on the part of the applicant had been proven. I simply reiterate these so-called assets, and I do wish that some committee would take action to mark off these losses. I do not think anybody wants to continue carrying losses as assets.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, how do you go about it, under the rules, to get a minute to talk on this thing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You do not unless the gentleman from Georgia yields.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what you call arbitrary control?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank you.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I may say that the gentleman from Michigan has not requested any time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I did a minute ago.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry. The gentleman usually is sufficiently vociferous that I can hear him very easily, but I did not hear him.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I guess I will rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman cannot do that now. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has been recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that I have been here 6 months and I have spent pretty nearly all of that time studying these various agricultural matters. I do not believe there is a Member in this room or on this floor who can stand up here and tell us what the Farm Security Administration has done with the money that has been appropriated to them already or what it is going to do with what it gets under this bill. I do not think there is a Member here today who would want to vote for the Farm Security Administration starting new farmers off with farms and giving them the money for 40 years at 3 percent and then go to the average farmer and expect him to vote for you next time when that farmer knows you are charging him 4 percent for the same money that the other farmer gets at 3 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then the gentleman feels that the average farmer takes the position of the dog in the manger. If he has to pay 4 or 5 percent he does not want his brother farmer to get anything for 3 percent?

Mr. MURRAY. If it is not, it should be that way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not sign the big conference report. This is a bill that exceeds in appropriations for agriculture any that we have ever had before. It was testified in the hearings by the Secretary of Agriculture that the total income of the farmers for the Nation was about $8,000,000,000. The appropriation for the Department of Agriculture is about one-eighth of the total income of the farmers of the United States. This does not include appropriations made by the State departments and aid to land-grant colleges. This just gives you an idea of what the percentage of the total farm income is that is appropriated in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, permit me, with proper humility, to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] for his graciousness and generosity in yielding to me 1 minute of the time which he controls.

Bear with me, please, while appreciation of the applause which just greeted me is expressed and let me convey to you the thought that there is a realization on my part that a part of it at least was at my expense, rather than as a tribute.

However, he who frequently and frankly states his views on highly controversial questions with more than the usual degree of positiveness should expect that others will follow a similar course.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] a few moments ago, when I was seeking information as to the method of obtaining time to speak on this occasion, somewhat facetiously said, in substance, that I speak frequently and vociferously. He was correct in that statement.

Those talks have at least one merit. They usually are limited to 1 minute. The vociferousness may be due in part to the difficulty of making one's self heard while audible conversation is being carried on by the Members of the House; in part, to the sincerity of my convictions.

The frequency of those utterances may be accounted for by the fact that day after day numerous complaints come to me from the men who ordinarily provide the jobs in this country and at this time would give employment, and as well from men who want to work, who would work, at the jobs which industry under ordinary circumstances would be able to provide, but who cannot work because of the National Labor Relations Act and the manner in which it is interpreted and administered by the National Labor Relations Board.

Sometimes, too, in these 1-minute talks I but act as the mouthpiece of some Member of the majority who conveys to me a thought or an unfortunate or a disagreeable experience which has happened to an employee or an employer in his own district, with the suggestion that I bring it to the attention of the House. Always am I glad to give utterance to these complaints. I realize that, under the present administration, even though experiences of constituents of Members on the majority side lead the Members irresistibly to the conviction that the N. L. R. A. must be amended and no matter how courageous the complaining Member may be, in view of the purge put on during the last campaign and the ever-increasing power and vindictiveness of the administration, many a man who would otherwise express his convictions on the floor knows that the exercise of discretion is the better course; that any other course might lead to his defeat, to his replacement by a less competent, less patriotic man.

It is regrettable that such a situation exists. It exists only because of misplaced trust, and it is my hope that after the next election no longer will the man who then sits in the White House be able to follow a policy of rule or ruin; that after 1940 the good old American custom of being permitted to express an opinion on the floor of the House without political reprisal will again be the privilege of Congressmen.

The country is asking, the country is demanding, that the Wagner law, so-called, be either repealed or drastically amended. Until the House takes up for consideration and disposes of this question of repeal or amendment of the Wagner law it is my present intention to, as often as may be permissible, call the attention of the House to the intolerable situation.

With reference to this farm proposition Secretary Wallace, testifying before the Agriculture Committee, said in substance that each year saw the failure of some 40,000 farmers; that each year some 40,000 farmers, if they continued to follow their occupation, became tenants instead of farm owners. If that be true, and the Secretary should know what he is talking about, where then is the logic or the good sense in appropriating some $40,000,000 to purchase farms to put men with their families into an occupation when we know that the end of each year will see more men fail at that occupation than we are able to put back into it?

Why ask men, men with families, to engage in an occupation before we have removed the causes which each year bring about the failure of 40,000 farmers? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the hearings indicate that while 40,000 tenant farmers are being added to the tenant population of the country annually, that is not occasioned altogether by the loss of ownership of farms, but is brought about by the coming to majority of young men of the tenant-farmer class, who themselves become tenant farmers after arriving at manhood. This does not mean that the tenant population of the country has been materially increased by reason of the loss of farms by those who have theretofore been landowners.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. St. Claire, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill

(H. R. 5610) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 15, 39, 41, 55, 75, 122, and 127; further insists upon its amendments Nos. 1, 59 to 71, inclusive, and 101 to the foregoing bill, disagreed to by the House; requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BURKE, Mr. KING, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NEUTRALITY ACT OF 1939

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 306.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 306, with Mr. CLARK in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in thorough accord with the statement repeatedly made heretofore on this floor to the effect that the whole people of America are keenly desirous of remaining aloof from war. I cannot conceive of any responsible group of our people not sharing that ambition. I believe that is the unanimous attitude of the Members of this body and of the body across yonder. There is certainly no one of us who would wish to bring on a general world war or the participation of the United States in it should it occur, the only difference of opinion being the difference in ideas as to the proper approach to that end, and these ideas are quite varied, indeed. This is by no means a partisan question. Every man and woman is entitled to his or her opinion. I concede to everyone the belief that his or her attitude, if carried out, would bring about that end.

What is the situation which confronts this Congress? It has been mentioned several times on the floor that we now have a piecemeal neutrality law but, as far as I have heard, reference has not been made to the fact that the Congress has never attempted to pass an ironclad, permanent neutrality law. I am sure this applies as well to yesteryears, since the laws and policies formulated then are not still in force, as it does to recent years.

In 1935, as you who were here will recall, the Congress passed the first modern neutrality law. The first section of that law was an embargo against the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. But was that a permanent provision? No; at the end of it there was the requirement that the section cease to exist on February 29, 1936. On that very day, February 29, 1936, the Congress amended the neutrality law and in doing so stipulated that that provision should expire on May 1, 1937, I believe, showing very plainly that the embargo against the shipment of arms was never intended to be a permanent part of the law of our land.

In 1937 the Congress passed an entirely new neutrality law and added to and coupled with that embargo a cash-and-carry feature, new at that time. At the end of that paragraph appeared the provision that the cash-and-carry feature should expire on May 1, 1939, again indicating that there was nothing sacred about the law, and not only that it was not sacred but that it was not intended as permanent legislation. So we were confronted this year with the knowledge that the cash-and-carry feature would expire automatically on May 1 of this year, and with the knowledge that when that happened we would be left with a piece of a neutrality law—a piecemeal law which was very dangerous as it was left.

Consequently the Committees on Foreign Affairs of both the Houses and the other body arranged to hold, and did hold, very extended hearings—open hearings—to which all concerned were invited. Everyone who had any idea about neutrality legislation was welcomed before that committee in the House, and I am sure the same was true in the Senate.

The hearings continued for approximately 30 days, as I recall, in an effort to do what? First, to remedy the situation resulting from the expiration of a part of this temporary neutrality law; and, second, to create a law which we propose as the first permanent law the Congress has ever passed on the subject of neutrality, and which we hope will tend to keep us out of war should war come.

I say permanent because it will be the first neutrality law without a provision for the expiration of some phase of it. Of course, changed conditions may prompt some future Congress to change it. And bear in mind that it is being proposed at a time when the countries of the world are at least ostensibly at peace. I am impressed with the thought that no one can legitimately charge that this proposed change in a temporary law before war occurs would indicate a desire on our country's part to favor one country or another in any prospective war. On the other hand, we are trying to establish permanent rules of the game now before war occurs so that in the event it does, we hope it will not prove necessary to change the rules in the midst of the game and thereby indulge in an unneutral act toward the country such change does not seem to favor.

After these hearings a bill was dropped in the hopper by the acting chairman of our committee. Something was said here yesterday about whether or not that was his bill. I wish first to pay tribute to the very excellent and able way in which the acting chairman of our committee, in my opinion, has handled the very difficult situation which confronted him. He has been indefatigable in his efforts, and always eager to be fair, absolutely fair, to everyone concerned. I want to go on record as being of the opinion that he has done a difficult task well. He introduced this bill and, as I say, the question was raised whether it was his bill or the bill of the State Department. I have not asked Chairman BLOOM who wrote that bill. It bears his name. But I do say this: If I had in mind introducing a neutrality bill, I certainly would not ask the advice of the Treasury Department or the Department of Justice or the Agriculture Department about how I should formulate it, just as I would not consult the doctor about a legal case or an attorney if I had typhoid fever. On the other hand, I would go to those professionally versed, those technically experienced in that peculiar line of endeavor, those familiar with foreign affairs. I presume that Chairman BLOOM in his good judgment did that very thing.

Every one of us fully realizes that with a body of 435 Members here and 96 Members across the building it is absolutely impossible for anyone to be entirely familiar, and it is ridiculous for one to claim that with all of his multitudinous duties he can be thoroughly familiar, with all phases of everything that is happening here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Consequently, we must trust to the leadership and guidance of someone familiar with foreign affairs. It is natural to look to the Secretary of State, just as it is natural in connection with other matters to turn to the heads of the departments concerned, or others professionally and technically qualified. For my part, I am perfectly willing to trust in matters of foreign affairs that very distinguished gentleman who so long and so ably served in this body, who served similarly in the other body for a number of years, and who, in my opinion, will go down in history as one of the great Secretaries of State of this Nation. [Applause.] I am perfectly willing to follow the suggestions of Secretary of State Cordell Hull in such matters, particularly at a time

so serious as we fear this to be. I say further that if Secretary Stimson were Secretary of State when an important matter such as this was involved, I would feel the same way. I do not believe we have ever had a Secretary of State or a President of the United States who would deliberately lead us down the road to war for an ulterior purpose. I do not think President Roosevelt would do it; I do not think President Coolidge would have done it, President Hoover, Harding, Wilson, or any other President. As a matter of fact, my confidence in the American people is such that I just do not believe men of that type, who would deliberately involve us in war against the wishes of our people, ever become President or Secretary of State. At any rate, this bill, no matter who authored it, we think in the committee is a good bill, which will contribute toward the peace of America.

Time is not available for me to discuss the details of the measure. Suffice it to say that it does, and very naturally so, I think, in the main carry out the ideas of the State Department. In case of war it requires a proclamation naming the states involved in it; the restriction of travel by American citizens on belligerent vessels; transfer of title before departure of goods destined for belligerents; continuation of existing legislation restricting loans and credit; regulation of solicitation and collection in this country of funds for belligerents; continuation of National Munitions Control Board and system of arms export and import licenses. In other words, it is practically the same as the present legislation with the exception that it drops the arms embargo in section 1 and substitutes what is tantamount to cash for the cash-and-carry provision which expired on May 1, but for the elimination of section 3 which has recently been agreed to, there would have remained much of the carry provision, but as it is, it only eliminates the embargo and retains the cash of the cash-and-carry.

Now, with what reception has the proposed legislation met in the country? As I read the press of the Nation, the responsible press, I think it has met with rather universal commendation. I read a paragraph from the June 15 issue of the Providence (R. I.) Journal. I do not know whether it is a Democratic or a Republican publication. I do not care, for this is not a partisan matter. I think it is rather typical of the press comment which has occurred:

> The neutrality bill, favorably reported by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is not the best measure Congress could adopt, but it is so much better than the existing law that it should be passed at the earliest opportunity. It is, at best, a compromise, but a compromise in the right direction, for, as a fixed legislative neutrality policy, it would be infinitely safer and more effective than the present law.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I am very much interested in this legislation. There is one point I would like for the gentleman to discuss for my benefit and that is the cash-and-carry provision. If this bill passes and it would transfer title at the water's edge if the belligerent nations want to buy our goods, what will be the status of the ships that carry this contraband of war, say it is carried in American vessels?

Mr. JARMAN. They will do so at their own risk in accordance with international law.

Mr. MAHON. Is there any legislation that states that or is that on the basis of international law only?

Mr. JARMAN. International law, insofar as the vessels are concerned. Section 2 after the proposed amendment will stipulate that citizens of the United States shall travel on belligerent vessels only at their own risk but it makes no reference to American vessels.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Alabama 1 additional minute.

Mr. JARMAN. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I hope that my dear, old friend, Dr. EATON, beside whom it is my pleasure to greatly enjoy sitting on the committee, and those who have given expression to a similar attitude, are correct in the belief that it matters not what legislation we pass here this week. I hope that no war is in the picture, no general war, and if one occurs I, above all, hope that America will not become involved in it. I must confess, however, that it is impossible for me to view the situation so optimistically. On the other hand, I feel that the situation confronting us here is probably one of the most serious ones which has confronted the Congress since World War days, and that the vote you will cast in a day or two will probably be the most important one that you gentlemen who were here in 1918 have cast since that time and certainly the most important one that we younger Members have ever cast. Consequently, I beseech you to have in mind when contemplating that vote only the best interests of this great country and people of ours. Please do not consider whether a certain vote would be beneficial to the Democratic or Republican Party, for or against President Roosevelt, or for or against Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy or any other country. I cannot too strongly urge you to have in mind only the performance of your duty under the oath you took in January to serve our country to the best of your ability. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER].

IS NEUTRALITY FOR PEACE OR FOR WAR?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to the debate on this neutrality bill, House Joint Resolution 306, I have been more and more impressed with the thought that the problem of neutrality is just a matter of exercising common sense and good judgment. That is what George Washington did, likewise James Monroe and other Presidents who were faced with the problem of foreign wars and international entanglements. Did they have any neutrality laws to guide them? No; they had only their fine, inherent, American common sense, and that is mainly what we need today.

We do not need to pass a so-called neutrality law. We do not need to continue year after year and Congress after Congress to take up our time and waste our energy in considering and debating bills of this sort which are of a very negative and questionable value.

The fallacy and ineffectiveness of such a pursuit is shown by the results of such attempts during the World War. Also, I have searched the pages of history for the past 300 years, and in every case where neutrality was sought to be invoked as a national program as a safeguard of peace, or as a guaranty against war, it failed. Either war resulted as an effect of the plans evolved, such as in the case of Catherine, Empress of Russia, back in the eighteenth century, or the international situation became so involved that it was necessary to resort to the most extreme measures to avoid more disastrous results.

Not that the ideal of neutrality as such is not a worthy one, and not that it would not be highly desirable and effective, if it could be applied according to the rule laid down in the dictionary. But rules governing human relations, and especially relations of an international character such as war, cannot be either so precisely defined or exactly applied as the ideal expressed by Webster's Dictionary.

His definition says "it is the condition of being uninvolved in contests or controversies between others—the state of refraining from taking part on either side."

By the nature of things, especially from the angle of business and nationalities in this country, we are not able to be neutral, and we cannot fit that definition. We are already taking sides in a real or in an imaginary war in Europe. We are already to a large degree either pro-British or pro-German in this country. We were in 1917. There must be something wrong with our national mind, including our so-called leaders of thought and action, when we can continue to mislead ourselves by talking about neutrality year after year as a means to such a highly desirable end as peace is.

WHAT IS THE TROUBLE WITH OUR THINKING?

What is the trouble with our thinking on this subject? The main trouble is, if you want my opinion, that we make the mistake of considering that the variable-meaning word

"neutrality" is synonymous with peace. History proves that it is not so at all. And in the United States today there are at least three main kinds of neutrality. To one person neutrality means one thing and to another it is still a different thing; but to us who are unsuspecting and who like nice-sounding catchwords and phrases it means peace, or at least a way to peace.

The three main kinds of neutrality in America indicate easily and clearly that at least two of the proponents of their type of neutrality are as far apart as the East is from the West, which condition certainly by no stretch of the imagination can be said to be conducive to or synonymous with peace. There is the dictionary kind of neutrality, which I have already pointed out we do not have in a nation so constituted as ours; secondly, there is the pro-English type of neutrality; and thirdly, the anti-English type. Which one are you for? This bill, expressing, as it does, the cash-and-carry theory of neutrality, is said to be the pro-British type. I assume that it is also, therefore, pro-Japanese, since these two nations alone in the world, except for the United States, are most able to buy goods, ship it on their own boats, and provide naval armament for the protection of their purchases in transit as provided for under cash-and-carry neutrality.

Is it not evident that any neutrality which favors one side or one nation over another is, by the very nature of the thing, not neutrality? What will the other side to which the act is detrimental say and do? No, such neutrality is neither synonymous with peace nor is it properly termed "neutrality." It might more appropriately be termed a "plan for war."

What we need in this country is not a neutrality act of this sort in the guise of peace but rather a constructive movement for peace. The people of this Nation want peace, and their democratic demands should be heard. Those who place their hopes for peace on any neutrality measure which the various factions in this Nation will make into law are due to be disappointed, I anticipate, for it will be only a vain hope, a snare, and an illusion, like a mirage beckoning a lost and thirsty traveler across an endless desert. And the end will be only the same—death, dried bones, destruction, and desolation.

Perhaps we could take a lesson in such problems from Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, who kept out of the World War, although they were much closer to it than we were, and who also had to stay neutral. They really did it, and thereby set for us an example. In delving into their problem and trying to ascertain the secret of their success in that respect, I found that they lost large numbers of ships and of people, but still they persisted in real neutrality. For instance, little Holland lost 290 vessels, with 201,797 gross tons, or 16 percent of the total tonnage of their fleet. They lost 1,025 men, leaving 568 widows, 1,648 children, 125 fathers and mothers, and 40 other dependent relatives, or 3,281 people altogether. We lost 343,090 tons; so Holland lost almost as much as we did, but she did not go to war. Norway lost 976,576 tons; Denmark, 210,880; Sweden, 180,415; but they used their common sense.

It has been said in the course of the debate on this bill that it is impossible to magnify the importance of this bill. That may be true; but there, again, the speakers are insinuating or making the bill connote peace. Ask yourself, "Is neutrality as in this bill really neutrality, and, therefore, is it really peace? Is this bill aimed at preventing or at heading off war?" No. An examination of it indicates that it is aimed at exactly the opposite; that is, at participation, by trade, in war—at aiding and abetting war. I presume, for that reason, it is very acceptable to the war profiteers and war mongers. In fact, all neutrality legislation has always aimed at aiding in the prosecution of war. In other words, the assumption of the proponents of neutrality legislation is that there will be a war; and they are making plans, if not to profit handsomely by it, then at least to take as much advantage as possible out of it.

In fact, I think it might be generally stated that the trouble with all or most of our peace plans and war preventatives is that they are not war preventatives; they are only peace plans of a selfish, introvert type to be utilized after war has broken out and the carnage rages.

OUR REAL PROBLEM NOT CONSIDERED

Another aspect of this whole matter of war and peace is entirely left out of consideration in this bill, and it seems to me that it is a much more important and serious matter as far as we are concerned. That is the situation in the Orient—the Far East—where we need to watch our step, not only because of our interest in China but also because of our interest and stake in the Philippines. Apparently the sponsors of this bill are contemplating only the European aspects. In other words, putting out the fire in the shed while the barn burns down. Any neutrality legislation to be worth while must attack and solve the Japanese problem. We need never become involved in Europe—but we are already involved in the Pacific with our $840,000,000 of investments in the Philippines and our sovereignty over those very rich islands, which, under the present law, is to continue until 1946.

Much has been said in the past about an impending Pacific era. Few of our people now realize that with Japan's invasion of China, which is in fact one of the most momentous events in all history, the Pacific era has been ushered in. It is here. Henceforth, what may transpire in this section of the world is likely to be of even greater concern to us as a nation than what may happen on the other side of the Atlantic.

America is essentially more of a Pacific than an Atlantic power. It is feasible to construct a bridge across the Behring Straits whereby it may be possible to drive our motor cars across onto the Asiatic Continent. In fact, the shortest distance from St. Louis, in the Mississippi Valley, to Hankow, in the Yangtze Valley, is along the great circle traversing the Behring Straits. Furthermore, we have a greater Pacific coast line than has any other occidental nation.

Modern means of communications have brought our Asiatic neighbors into a stone's throw of us. We can now hail them across the water. We cannot any longer build up walls of isolation shutting us away from the rest of the world. The Pacific Ocean is no longer a formidable barrier separating us from the Far East—better now called the Far West.

Because of the pull of destiny, we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars and sent tens of thousands of our nationals to China and Japan in efforts to carry American ideals and ideas to the Far East. Millions of Chinese and Japanese speak, read, and write English, and understand us and our institutions. How many Americans are there who possess a substantial knowledge of China and Japan and understand the psychology of the Chinese and Japanese?

Many Americans with little background in things Japanese but prominent in our business, industrial, professional, and other walks of life have visited Japan, and their Japanese hosts found it easy to fit them with Japanese glasses and ear trumpets, which enable them to see and hear the Japanese versions of far eastern matters. Some of these, after returning to America, continue to wear these Japanese glasses and ear trumpets, indicating quite clearly that our whole educational system is at fault in not furnishing our people with the means of a good education in the fundamentals of the civilizations and institutions of these important Asiatic people.

Japan moved into Manchuria, a territory larger than Germany and France combined, and now threatens to occupy an area greater than the United States with a population nearly three times larger, yet we show more concern over the taking of a few hundred square miles in Europe by a European power than we manifest toward what constitutes a major threat to our entire civilization.

If Japan succeeds in its conquest of China, it will not stop there. Japan's occupation of Hainan Island and the Spratly Islands indicates that it has greater ambitions. It aims to set itself up as master of the Pacific. With 150,000 Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands, how long will it be before it will demand that the Japanese flag be hoisted over this important American outpost in the Pacific?

Japan has exhibited a persistent interest in the rich fishing resources in the Alaskan waters. How long will it be, should it succeed in its ambitions on the Asiatic Continent, before Japan pushes its fishing fleet into our northern waters and begins colonization in Alaska?

With a Japanized China, here is where America will be hoodwinked into believing that it is going to get some good business. Exacting long-term credits, the Japanese will take American machinery, but only to build up industries whereby they may use Chinese labor on mere subsistence wages, so as to outdo the rest of the world in production costs and then flood the world with their cheap manufactured products. We shall then be faced with a real "yellow peril." Thus we shall be invited to furnish capital and equipment to help Japan undermine our wage scales and standards of living. Furthermore, Japan will be especially concerned with building up war industries on the Asiatic Continent, so that we shall be asked to help finance these, as we have been helping Japan to build up war industries in Manchuria. What sort of investments will these present for American capital? And still we seek to pass a neutrality law which fails to take this situation into consideration.

And so in conclusion, let us beware, beware of placing our hope in false cures, in neutrality which is not neutral according to a definition of common sense, and in peace measures which are really war abettors, for the day will surely come if we do not, when we will be weighed in the scales and found wanting. Unless we do an about face in these great problems, our people will continue to cry "Peace! Peace!" and there will be no peace. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is an example of an all too prevalent American idea that you can do anything you want by merely passing a law. Peace cannot be guaranteed by law. No neutrality act we can pass can keep us out of war, if our foreign policy is unneutral. Congress cannot limit the constitutional powers of the President of the United States in foreign affairs. Congress can, however, keep from him additional powers to be unneutral, such as are granted him by the Bloom bill.

It has been said that no new powers are granted under this bill. Under the Bloom bill, with the four amendments that have been suggested, the President can sell arms to one belligerent on credit and require another belligerent to pay cash. Under this bill he can bar shipments of arms or other supplies—get that—other supplies to any belligerent when he suspects, but cannot prove, that they are going to be transferred to a tender or supply ship, whatever that is, by requiring a prohibitive bond under section 7, while permitting shipments of arms to go to another belligerent in American vessels.

These powers are given because this law consists of 2 new sections and 14 sections from the old law, which contemplated an arms embargo. With the arms embargo in the law, the other sections fit. With the arms embargo out, the bill becomes a new means for unneutral acts on the part of the President, if he desires to be unneutral.

The psychological effect of this bill may be enormous. I, for one, hope that consideration of this bill will not take the form of a referendum as to whether we are pro-British or pro-Hitler. I hope that our consideration of this bill will tell to our people and to the world that we are against war; that we are for peace; that we are pro-American and not pro anything else; and that we are united.

I want to suggest that if this bill is disposed of one way or the other by a close vote it will show an apparent division in our people and on this floor that does not in fact exist.

The real issue in this bill arises from a fundamental difference as to the way to peace. The President's policy is to use the threat of our power to preserve a balance of power in Europe. Opposed to this is the traditional American belief that the way to peace is for us to be neutral, not biased; friendly, and not threatening. The President's theory is that if we stop war from starting we will not get into war. If we make a strong enough bluff we can prevent war from starting. The President has no more intention of taking us into war than he had 6 years ago of taking us into debt; but we have learned that despite good intentions, if you spend enough you get into debt, and if you threaten enough you get into war. [Applause.]

The road to war is paved with threats.

I have two criticisms to make of this policy. First, we have no assurance that the threat of our force will be sufficient to stop war in Europe. No one can give us that assurance.

Second, if the bluff does not work, we will inevitably go into war. When any international incident takes place on the faith of our promise to one side or threat to the other, the pressure to make good our bluff, to back up our commitment will be irresistible. If you think that our eventual entry into the next war is inevitable, then vote for the Bloom bill as is. The Nazis say it is going to be total war or total peace. If you believe that and believe we are going in if it starts—arms, ammunition, ships, and men—then vote for the Bloom bill as a desperate attempt to stop the starting of our war by a threat to one side and a promise to the other that if it starts "we're coming over, and we won't come back till it's over over there." But do not fool yourselves or our people or foreign nations. If we make this threat and it does not work, if our bluff is called, if this warlike bid for peace fails, if in spite of our threats or because of our promises, war starts, then we will never back up and we will never back down. That is the chance you take in the administration's gamble.

Now, I am opposed to taking that gamble. I think the way to peace is not to promise or threaten to fight anybody or help fight anybody. We cannot decide what other nations will do. But no matter what they do, we are not going over to the next war. They will have to bring it over here before we fight. [Applause.]

We cannot guarantee peace to the world. We cannot even guarantee that our policy will keep us out of war, but if you think that our entry into the next war is not inevitable, but is a possibility that you want to resist with all your might, early and late, vote against the Bloom bill as is. If you believe we have a duty toward world peace, and that duty is to stay out of war and war economy and war psychology, so that when other nations are exhausted, either by war or by frenzied preparation for war, to the state that they are ready to sit down around the table again and try to restore international peace and order and justice, we can then go to that table as the strong and neutral and friendly big brother of them all, and not the weakened and biased and hateful partner of one side—if that is what you believe, then vote against the Bloom bill as is. [Applause.]

The test will come on restoring the arms embargo. America has come to believe that the sale of arms to belligerents is immoral, un-Christian, and leads to war. Most experts on international law favor retention of the arms embargo. For instance, Professor Borchard, Dr. Lage, Walsh and Healey, of the School of Foreign Affairs, and Charles A. Beard, the eminent historian. Mr. Hull says that he can see no difference between the selling of arms to belligerents and the selling of anything else they may need. That is because he thinks of neutrality in terms of helping or hindering some other nation and not in terms of helping ourselves. [Applause.]

I emphasize this particularly: There is no principle of international law that requires us to sell arms to anybody.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SHANLEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Professor Borchard is against the arms and ammunition embargo?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. He is in favor of the arms and ammunition embargo.

Mr. SHANLEY. Has the gentleman authority for that statement?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. One of my colleagues will give the gentleman the authority for the statement.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, there is no principle of international law that requires us to sell arms to anybody in order to be neutral. There is a principle that requires us, if we sell anything, to do it impartially, and if we sell arms there is one way of getting into trouble.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the very compelling speech the gentleman is making I yield him 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Hull admits, however, that under international law arms are "absolute contraband"—I quote him—"subject to seizure by a belligerent."

Everyone admits that the international law of search and seizure has been repealed by the airplane and the submarine.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. By what authority may the airplane or the submarine repeal international law.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I shall state the answer.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the gentleman realize that that statement involves an entire surrender of all the ideals of civilization?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am astounded at that statement.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Every expert who has appeared before our committee has admitted that the airplane and the submarine completely change the law of search and seizure, because you cannot search and seize a surface vessel from the air or from under water. If you know it is a neutral vessel not carrying means of murder but a peaceful cargo, you will hesitate to molest it and offend a neutral. If, on the other hand, you know it is laden with arms, "cooperating with similarly minded governments," to use the President's term, you will sink it, for you will know you have nothing to lose, you will not be offending a real neutral, and you will be sinking absolute contraband.

There is a clear distinction between the selling of arms, which can only be used for murder, and other commerce which may be helpful to belligerents for peace or war. Everyone recognizes the difference in law and in morals between the sale of whisky by a saloonkeeper and the sale of a load of corn by a farmer, even though whisky can be made out of corn. That is the distinction between the sale of arms and the sale of anything else. Our purpose in an arms embargo is not to help or hurt any other nation but to protect ourselves, to keep ourselves at peace.

Mr. Hull and some of our colleagues apparently feel that we should arm the victims of aggressors. I feel that we should stop arming aggressors. The results of Mr. Hull's mistaken policy are apparent in the Orient where the evasion of our arms embargo law has resulted in the arming of Japan. I think we are making a great mistake trying to determine our possible conduct in a future war in Europe before we determine our present conduct in a present struggle in the Orient. [Applause.] We have let our excitement about what may happen to our remote interests in Europe blind us to what is happening to our immediate interests in the Orient, where our treaty rights are being violated daily. We should stop arming Japan instead of planning to arm Europe. [Applause.]

We have been told that the reason for repealing the arms embargo is that Germany has taken over 27 munition plants in Austria and 11 plus the Skoda works in Czechoslovakia. This argument came to us from the State Department and through administration spokesmen on this floor. Does that mean that we are to become the arsenal of Europe? I am going to vote against that.

There was no evidence before our committee that any nation wanted us to do this. The embroiled nations of Europe have changed their economy so as to produce all the arms they need. Within the past few days Chamberlain and Daladier have spoken of their tremendous capacity to produce arms. I think we should not change our peace economy into a war economy. We should furnish to all nations the products of peace and assert our rights as a friendly neutral to do so. We should furnish to no nation the means of murder in wartime. [Applause.] There is no proof that our munitions industry needs the stimulus of such a foreign war boom for our national defense. That sort of boom was described by our President in 1936 as "fool's gold" when he said:

> To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

Let us use these words of our President from 1936 to defeat the warlike policy of our President of 1939. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration at this time House Joint Resolution 306. We are called upon by this resolution to repeal and modify the existing law relating to neutrality. I am convinced that every Member of Congress is deeply conscious of the responsibility involved in dealing with this important subject. I also want to feel that every Member of the House is sincere in his or her convictions. Neutrality is something that cannot be invented, neither can it, in its strictest sense, be completely legislated. True neutrality comes from the enactment of clear-cut, unequivocal declarations of the policy and laws of a nation, impartially and unbiasedly executed by its Executive.

In the light of our past experience and with our knowledge of human nature, our unbiased and impartial conduct is highly essential to a conscientious discharge of our solemn obligations. Let us forget partisanism; let us forget every "ism" and every nation, save and except Americanism and America. Having turned our eyes heavenward for guidance at this momentous time and cleansing our thoughts of every unclean emotion, we must dedicate ourselves to the task at hand with utmost sincerity. I have implicit faith that we can legislate in a truly American manner. To allow fear, prejudice, partiality, or any other emotionalism to control our conduct, rather than calm judicious reasoning, is to be unfaithful to our trust.

I regard Judge John Bassett Moore and Prof. Edwin Borchard as the outstanding American authorities on international law and neutrality and want to quote the words of Prof. Edwin Borchard relating to neutrality. These views in the main are supported by Judge Moore. Speaking upon the subject of neutrality, Professor Borchard said:

> After 1914 a marked change occurred, especially in relation to Europe. For a variety of causes set out in numerous books, America lost its bearings. The magnitude of the European contest, association of cultural and economic interests with one side, and extraordinary ineptness in dealing with the legal problems involved, ultimately induced a state of hysteria which plunged the Nation into war. The European feud, more senseless than its predecessors of earlier centuries, was pictured as a struggle between morality and immorality, and in the search for an explanation to the American public for the country's departure from its fundamental traditions, there was invented at the last minute that curious battle cry of making the world "safe for democracy." This must have surprised some of the Allied Governments. It was in that era that there was born the ideal of allied force in the service of righteousness, later called "collective security," which has done so much to prolong the world's misery by viewing the world through the doctrinaire spectacles of political theology instead of with the open-minded detachment of a physician seeking a correct diagnosis of a social disease. The war produced a psychosis, continued in the Treaty of Versailles and its aftermath, of which articles 10 and 16 of the Covenant were an exemplification rather than an antidote. Historians and psychologists will in due course explain why some of the principal governments of the western world so long divorced themselves from reason and experience and immersed in illusions, permitted the corrosion of the political and economic structure.
>
> For it is an unfortunate fact that the attempt to maintain the adventitious status quo of 1919 through devices of the Covenant and by more formal military alliance resulted in an intensification of nationalism almost unprecedented. At the same time, the less informed were led to believe that phrases such as "collective security" interpreted by the League of Nations, manifested a growing internationalism and disposition to adopt peaceful processes in the adjustment of international differences. The disintegration, however, was a fact, the pacification but a fiction. When we consider the progress that had been made in the nineteenth and early

twentieth centuries in the development of arbitration and conciliation, it seems deplorable that since 1917 the world's moving forces should have come under the domination of a psychology which encouraged treaties and pacts signally devoid of conditions essential to international appeasement, while cherishing the delusion that peace was being promoted by arrangements for the use of combined force against any revolter against the status quo, vilified in advance by the opprobrious name of "aggressors." Of this process perhaps the most unfortunate phase was the popular illusion that peace might be assured by bestowing seductive names such as "collective security," "preventing war," "international cooperation," on contrivances, like sanctions, which were hostile and warlike in character. In defense of this form of deception, it can only be said that it was not new. Article 47 of the Treaty of Westphalia, 1648, embodied a similar device. As Judge John Bassett Moore has said, all human history is characterized by the tendency to seek salvation in phrases rather than in acts.

We were told during the Great War that the balance of power and military alliances were the source of the world's ills and that these ills could be cured by replacing alliances with a league of nations—once inadvertently called a "disentangling alliance." But just as an alliance is a combination of two or more nations seeking certain common ends, so the "collective security" of the League was marked by an identical characteristic—it sought the attainment of common ends by the use of coercion and military force. But it is to be feared that the education of men's minds to be compulsive features of "collective security" has had disastrous effects. It has diminished appreciation and respect for the less dramatic peaceful processes of effecting change and settling disputes.

But is it a fact that the destructiveness of modern war makes it more important than ever to avoid its recurrence. What has been done since 1917 is no contribution to that end. The interdependence of a narrowing world might have been remembered at Versailles. If the constant danger of war is to be surmounted, thought should be given to the revival of the well-tried methods of restoring trust among the nations and then working to develop the existing institutions for cooperative effort to appease, conciliate, and adjust conflicting claims. The task is now infinitely more difficult than it was before April 6, 1917, when the United States officially abandoned neutrality.

In the revision of the Neutrality Act, which will probably be undertaken in the January 1939 session of Congress, it is believed that Congress should either (a) repeal the entire act and depend on the rules of international law, the existing neutrality statutes, and the constitutional duty of the President not to involve the United States in a foreign war, or (b) reserving to itself, with the President, the privilege of determining the existence of a "state of war," Congress should retain the present act, amending it in the particulars above mentioned only. The second alternative is preferable.

I am firmly convinced of the wisdom of Professor Borchard's views. I do not believe that we can substitute anything more sound and advantageous to the United States.

The resolution, as presented to us, omits the arms embargo. This has been considered vital and necessary by this administration for the past 4 years. What, if any, reason exists for its abolition at this time? The only reason thus far appearing and advanced by those sponsoring the dropping of the embargo is that the Berlin-Rome axis is superior in armaments and also superior in capacity to produce armaments and munitions of war. This is a matter of testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have also been told in that committee that Britain and France cannot meet the present armaments of the Berlin-Rome axis, nor the productive capacity of the munition plants now in possession of such axis. To my mind this does not present a sufficient reason for the United States to become involved. In view of this expressed attitude, it amounts to an outright alliance with the so-called democracies of Europe. Is this justifiable? Is it neutral? I say to you that every conscientious American citizen who knows the importance of such action and of its consequent outright alliance with the so-called democracies of Europe is unalterably opposed to the repeal of our arms embargo law. I most firmly and unalterably oppose the repeal of our arms embargo law. We have deep sympathies in this country, much sympathy at this time for those of many nations. It is regrettable that conditions over the world are so chaotic and with so much hatred prevalent. Shall we become involved in this seething mass of distraction and ultimate destruction?

Never in the history of the United States have the words of our first President advising against meddling and entangling alliances been more valued and applicable than today. No American boy, with my vote, will ever cross the seas to engage in another futile war. My motto is, and has been, "not one drop of American blood shed elsewhere than in defense of America on American soil, and the last drop of blood of every American for the preservation of American ideals, institutions, and country."

As one of the family of nations today, we recognize certain obligations to all others within that family. This cannot be discharged by the mere shrugging of shoulders at what occurs in the world, neither can it be discharged by becoming involved. Our potential value lies in the fact that by remaining neutral, strictly neutral, and in exerting our continued efforts in behalf of peace, we may mediate as an impartial arbiter the troubles of others, but such mediation can only come, and our greatest value be utilized, when and if we approach all involved nations as their mutual friend.

Granting that ambitions exist in Europe, and granting further, whether or not they are justifiable, is it not far better that we, as one of the signatories of the Kellogg and Nine Power Pacts, and as the leading uninvolved nation can render far more valuable service to civilization by remaining absolutely neutral and placing ourselves in a position to offer peaceable settlement? Would it not be better to ascertain the objectives of Japan as well as the objectives of Germany, of Italy, and of all other so-called war desiring nations, and most carefully weigh the result of such inquiries and ascertain their reasonableness and prospects of amicable settlements? Is the world today without reason? Is the world without competent leadership to strive to attain such peace by logical and reasonable methods? Must the nations of the world continue to look upon war as inevitable, well knowing that in the end war utterly destroys and is the creature of impotent hatred, illogical and unnecessary? Our position, if we stop long enough to appraise it, is the favored. We are blessed with the opportunity of being the peacemaker. Shall we cast aside our opportunity?

The law we seek to enact is neutrality and impartiality, not an alliance and partnership that will inevitably lead us to a war soon after such becomes a reality. Not a single, sane, American citizen, notwithstanding that his or her sympathy may be with one or more of foreign countries, will ever again involve this Nation in a war, other than for defense of American soil, or in defense of our Territories, and in support of our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine.

I have not heard a single, sound, sensible, or patriotic reason suggested for the change of our law at this time. My sympathy goes to the unfortunates in other parts of the world. I am deeply sorry for them and regret that circumstances and conditions, in many instances, beyond the control of the affected individual, causes them to suffer. As a friendly Nation, interested in the preservation of the peace of the world, and manifesting as an indication of good faith, our impartiality and neutrality in its every constructive phase, we can and should use that good influence throughout the world to maintain such peace. The proposed resolution would utterly destroy for us every advantage we now have of this character. It is unnecessary for me to say that the next major war will carry civilization back hundreds of years, and, when ended, leave the world prostrate, impotent, and humiliated in the sight of our God. It is unpardonable. Our acts, motivated by the noblest intentions, can and should prevent such from occurring.

I am quite firmly convinced that we should approach this legislation calmly, patiently, and with the purest of motives, bringing into use our highest intelligence and seeking the light that will give to us the most highly satisfactory result.

I shall introduce an amendment to the pending resolution. That amendment will provide for the reenactment of the so-called cash-and-carry provision of our existing neutrality law, and which provision is the only one that expired May 1 of this year, and which will leave, as the same now exists upon the statute books, our neutrality law. This is done with the sincere hope that after calm and unemotional deliberation, we of the House will have done our duty in a manner that best befits the honor and integrity of our country.

I urge you at this momentous time to give of your very best intelligence and judgment to this proposition.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Does the statement the gentleman read from Professor Borchard state clearly that it is his view that we should retain the present embargo upon arms which is in the present act and not, as has been suggested, throw it away?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. His language is that the Congress should retain the present act, amending it in the particulars above mentioned, he says, reserving to itself with the President the privilege of determining the existence of a state of war.

Mr. SHANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHANLEY. Has the gentleman the entire speech there?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I have not all of it.

Mr. SHANLEY. There is another sentence. May I use your time to make this statement?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. No; I cannot yield for that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute to answer a question.

Mr. SHANLEY. I happen to have had correspondence from Professor Borchard and I certainly do not want to put it in the RECORD without his express permission. I think I can enlighten the gentleman. The quotation the gentleman has given is correct, because I have a copy of it here. May I say, though, I will give the House the benefit, if I can obtain permission from Professor Borchard, of exactly how he feels on the present neutrality bill, the Bloom bill, and also the amendments. I trust that his general thought on embargoes, which I am trying to express, his long-range policies, divorced from all outside things, will be driven home to the Members of the House by the statement I just made. Later on I will develop that thought. I sincerely thank the gentleman for allowing me to take his time.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHIFFLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman will remember that Professor Borchard in 1936 appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee, and in speaking about the neutrality law said, "It will contain an arms embargo provision as well as a prohibition of loans."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, this particular legislation now before the House of Representatives is not a neutrality bill. On the contrary, it embodies two adverse principles. In the first place, it repeals the arms embargo. In other words, the munition makers of the United States are definitely interested in this bill to the end that they might sell implements of death and mass murder to the nations of the world. In the second place, it is a delegation of further powers to the President.

It has been well said that "in this short bill there are 29 places in which we find such phrases as 'when the President deems it wise,' or 'when the President proclaims,' or 'when the President shall find.' "

Section 1 of the bill begins with these words:

> That whenever the President shall find.

Section 2 of the bill contains this language:

> Except in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President shall prescribe.

Section 3 contains a like statement. Section 4 deals with bonds, securities, and other obligations of the government of any state involved in war, and it ends with this proviso:

> *Provided*, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interest of the United States, he may, at his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credit and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of the character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions.

Said section 4 contains two further delegations of the President to make rules and regulations.

Section 5 authorized the President to make such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. Section 6 merely excepts American republics from the act.

Section 7 of the bill contains this language:

> If the President, or any person thereunto authorized by him, shall find, * * * he may prohibit.

Section 8 begins with these words:

> Whenever during any war in which the United States is neutral, the President shall find.

And the same section carries a provision that exceptions may be made by the President.

Sections 9 and 10 grant no specific authority to the President, but section 11 begins with these words:

> The President may from time to time promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be necessary to properly carry out any of the provisions of this joint resolution.

The remaining sections of the bill deal with the penalties, definitions, appropriations, and repeal of the prior act.

While the proponents of this bill flatly deny that this is a delegation of power to the President, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] attempted to encourage us with these words:

> I would rather, however, have the destiny of this Nation and its foreign affairs in the hands of Franklin D. Roosevelt than in the hands of Adolph Hitler, Benito Mussolini, or that son of heaven over in the Orient.

This is, indeed, encouraging, and I want to thank the gentleman for calling it to our attention.

That same gentleman from Pennsylvania did make a statement with which I can agree 100 percent. He said:

> Neutrality is a matter of human behavior.

I wonder how he would classify the behavior of the President of the United States and some of the members of his Cabinet in some of their recent statements, wherein they have preached a doctrine of hate against certain European nations. I wonder how he would classify the behavior of the proponents of this bill, who repeatedly have taken the floor and with passion kindled the fires of hate against Germany, Japan, and other nations of the world. That same gentleman bemoans the fact that the arms embargo is an aid to aggressor nations. I, then, assume that by his behavior he has already selected the aggressors. Yet in another breath he says that it is not our fault that some nations of the world do not have a navy with which to come and buy arms and ammunition. But in that case it is all right to aid and assist the nations who do control the seas. He contends that it is unneutral to create a situation which aids a nation with a large army, but a neutral act to aid a nation that has a large navy. That gentleman, in commenting upon the aid that this bill will give to Great Britain, said:

> I prefer indirectly to aid those nations which have demonstrated a friendly attitude toward us than to abet the onward march of totalitarian powers.

If neutrality is a matter of human behavior, is such a declaration a neutral one?

It is well that we ponder the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] when he said—

> If communistic Russia enters into an alliance with Great Britain, as now seems probable, the bill becomes also a Russian munitions bill.

We are at peace with all nations. I contend that our attitude should be one of peace toward all nations including Germany, Japan, Italy, France, and England, and all the rest of them. The people of those countries are all good people. It is the people who fight the wars not the governments. Admitting that modern transportation and communication have brought the world close together, we should take a lesson from those great, far-seeing, Christian nations of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway who steered clear of the folly of the last World War. I hope that the Congress will pursue a policy

of peace toward all nations and will reject this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I desire at the outset to depart for a moment from my prepared remarks in order to refer to a matter which is germane to the present discussion and of vital importance. We are here considering a bill by which we hope to contribute to the unity of the people of the United States, and to secure for them the blessings of peace. There can be no effective unity and no promise of permanent peace that does not rest upon tolerance, mutual respect, and the broadest possible friendship among all classes and groups of Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color.

This morning my attention was called to certain remarks on the subject of communism which were inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2804, by a Member of my own side of the House. In the course of his address, and with no apparent relevance of justification, he proceeded to read off a list of the names of committee chairmen who are members of the Jewish faith. I quote the paragraph:

> The leaders in Congress are well known, but the chairmen of the committees often remain in obscurity. We have the following distinguished gentlemen occupying the following important positions as chairmen and ranking members of committees: The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], now acting chairman of Foreign Affairs Committee; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee; the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], chairman of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIROVICH], chairman of the Patents Committee and ranking member on the Civil Service and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], ranking member on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I cheerfully acquit my colleague of any intent to question the patriotic character of these our fellow Members or to infer that they are in any way associated with or sympathetic to any "ism" of whatever kind or description. Such a suggestion would be infamous. Yet even the gentleman will admit that his reference, taken in relation to its context, lends itself to a shockingly untrue and cruel inference. Even the shadow of that inference must be removed. Some voice of protest and apology must be raised from my side of the aisle.

I have the honor to be one of the Representatives of the greatest cosmopolitan city in the world. It owes its creation, its prosperity, its character, and its infinite variety to the fact that people of every race, creed, and color have contributed to it their industry and peculiar genius. In my own district I last year had occasion to deliver a high-school commencement address to a class of 450 pupils, and I was told by the principal that it included representatives of 59 nationalities. Fifty-nine different racial cultures, but all Americans. Picturing the lands from which the parents of those boys and girls had come, the hope and joy with which they had turned their eyes toward these shores of freedom and opportunity, I felt that that was the most inspiring audience I had ever faced. It was an epitome of America; a symbol of our country at its best.

Among the 22 Members of this House who represent that great city I am the only Republican. I am, I believe, the only Protestant. I would be unworthy of my city, untrue to the confidence of the people who sent me here, if I did not take this occasion to utter on behalf of these colleagues of ours, most of them from New York, the profound regret which I know is in the hearts of us all. The glory of America is that in a world of intolerance and hate we here have kept bright the torch of tolerance. In this House sit men of every creed and color, and this is not true of any other great legislative body in the world. We glory in this distinction. That any remark, however innocently intended, should stain the pages of our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by seeming even remotely to countenance race or religious intolerance, is an occurrence which must have brought to all of us a sense of profound regret and sorrow. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I will address myself very briefly to the bill.

Nearly 50 earnest patriotic Americans, including recognized authorities on international law and leaders of organizations devoted to peace, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Whatever the views of any Member of the House may be on neutrality legislation, he can find in the printed volume of the committee hearings eminent authority to support his position. If you favor the Neutrality Act now on the statute books, you are in distinguished company. If you prefer the bill here proposed, you need feel no embarrassment; leading international lawyers agree with you. If you would have no Neutrality Act at all, wise and famous folk are on your side. An eminent professor of international law who poured into our ears 30 minutes of fervid appeal for the act of 1937 was followed immediately by an equally eminent scholar who flatly contradicted everything the first gentleman had said.

Where the doctors so violently disagree the layman may be pardoned if he approaches the whole question in a spirit of humility and with a certain degree of skepticism. Let us consider briefly what common-sense facts there are on which we might all agree.

First, we are certainly unanimous in the conviction that never again must American boys be sent across the sea to fight on foreign soil. That certainly is a unanimous sentiment in both Houses of this Congress. The World War cured us permanently of any naive belief that we can by war effect a permanent peace. It was said on this floor yesterday that we ask nothing as a result of the war and got exactly what we asked for. Eugene Debs expressed it better. He said all we got out of the war was influenza and the income tax. He was right and was sent to jail for it. [Laughter.]

Second, we are confronted with the fact that we are not here weighing the merits of the proposed bill against a perfect neutrality act. There can be no perfect neutrality act. We are considering the proposed bill against the law now on the statute books—a law providing a mandatory embargo without the cash-and-carry provision. If we vote down the proposed bill, the present act will continue to be the law.

It has been said again and again that the operation of the present act does not result in neutrality.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, the operation of the present act does not result in neutrality.

It favors strong nations as against weaker nations, and warlike nations against peace-seeking nations. The strong warlike nations are already armed and supplied with munitions. Under international law the weaker or peace-seeking nations have a right to purchase their means of defense in the markets of the world, our own included. The present law denies them that right. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] observed in his testimony before the committee, if France had had a similar act during the struggle of our American colonies for independence, that struggle would probably have been lost.

The first question to be decided, therefore, is this: Do we want this session to Congress to adjourn with the present Neutrality Act on the books, knowing that it is not a real neutrality act at all but is, in fact, a law that makes us a silent partner of nations that have prearmed?

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the honorable Representative from New York yield?

Mr. BARTON. I shall be happy to yield after I conclude the main part of my statement.

This is my second question, and I would like the members of the Committee to favor me with their special attention on this: Is not the proposed act, the act which we are now considering, after all, a much more realistic thing than the law

now on the books? I do not see how we can get anywhere if we are not frank about these matters. Let me give you an illustration that I advanced in the committee hearings. It takes into account a new factor in the international situation to which little reference has been made but a factor with which I have been familiar for many years in my own business activity; I refer to the radio. Have you ever stopped to think that if another world war were to come it would not be fought alone on Flanders fields but would be fought in every home, apartment house, and farmhouse in America? We would not see it with our eyes but we would hear it. Thirty million radios would bring it to our very firesides.

Suppose that this Congress should adjourn on August 1. Suppose that on August 2 London or Paris should be bombed from the air. I am not naming any aggressor nation. Just suppose that either of those beautiful historic capitals were suddenly and without warning attacked. Suppose that out of our 30,000,000 radios should come the crash of the dome of St. Paul's Cathedral or the tower of Notre Dame. Imagine the screams of women and the cries of children piercing the air of our living rooms. Does anyone in this House believe that any mere statute could stand a single day against the tidal wave of moral indignation that would sweep across our land? Would not an outraged public opinion compel the President to call us into immediate emergency session for the repeal of section 1 of the present law? Is not this a realistic appraisal of the situation? [Applause.] If it is realistic, if the odds are overwhelming that we would be called upon to repeal section 1 after hostilities started, why is it not wiser to effect the repeal now before any hostilities begin and while our action may perhaps serve in some small measure to prevent their beginning? If we wait until the war has started, our action becomes an act of war. Will that not more seriously threaten our peace than as though we face the facts and act now?

The amendments mentioned yesterday will remove certain objections which might have compelled many of us to oppose the bill. I congratulate the majority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on their wisdom and open-mindedness toward suggestions from the minority. There is one other amendment which I understand may be offered tomorrow, and which, I hope, will have the thoughtful consideration of the Committee. It will propose a modified embargo, relating not to the broad classifications of "arms, munitions, and implements of war," which are phrases that can be stretched to include almost any product or material, but limited only to "lethal weapons."

What our people object to principally is the manufacture and shipment of the guns and shells with which slaughter is accomplished. They object for two reasons. First, they do not want to be partners directly in the shedding of human blood. Second, they do not want to dislocate their own economy to build up a huge industry in the manufacture of ammunition and arms. Now we are speaking frankly, and I think honestly there is not the same general objection to the purchase by foreigners of our airplanes, trucks, automobiles, petroleum, cotton, or even scrap iron, though it is recognized that these are essential to the successful conduct of war. These are not primarily lethal weapons. An embargo limited to lethal weapons might well satisfy the desires of those of our fellow citizens to whom the embargo idea has become a symbol and a hope. On the other hand, the foreign nations which may find themselves attacked are not short of lethal weapons. They have already dislocated their economy to erect vast plants for the making of guns and ammunition. What they need are the other materials and products that we have in abundance.

If a compromise is possible on the middle ground of a modified embargo, it would surely represent a consummation devoutly to be hoped for. It would comfort our own people. It would be an adequate warning to aggressor nations, and at least a partial reassurance to nations likely to be attacked. It would render obsolete 3 months of high-powered oratory which has already been manufactured for discharge in another body. An atmosphere of peace and goodwill would descend upon the Capitol and we could all go home.

I earnestly commend this further compromise to the majority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Yesterday, along with many other able speeches, we were enlightened and inspired by the remarks of the genial gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON. I gathered from his observations that he regards all neutrality laws as a delusion, but as between two evils he would choose the lesser. I am happy to find myself in such distinguished fellowship, for his views and mine are much alike. My chief objection to so-called neutrality legislation is that it tends to lull the Nation into a false sense of security. The habit has grown in the past 6 years of deluding our people with the notion that age-old problems can be waved away by the too simple expedient of passing a law. A good test of any proposed piece of legislation is this: Does it offer an easy solution to a problem rooted deep in human nature and human experience? If the answer is yes, the proposal is probably of little or no real value. Expedients such as manipulating the currency, increasing public debt, and price fixing by bureaucratic degree have all been tried again and again. They seek to substitute legislative legerdemain for sound thought, hard work, and a realistic facing of the facts. Inevitably, they fail.

The same criticism lies against so-called neutrality laws. They offer too much at too cheap a price. The real price of peace is eternal vigilance against propaganda, foreign or domestic, and a stern determination to resist all waves of mass hysteria.

To this must be added a willingness on the part of the American people to sacrifice time, thought, and effort for the election of representatives whose devotion to peace is beyond all doubt. Said the President on August 14, 1936:

> The effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and the Secretary of State.

These are true words and no legislation can change them. Peace should be an issue in every national campaign. The true safeguard of peace is not to seek to tie the hands of the people's elected representatives but to elect representatives whose judgment and self-control the people are not afraid to trust. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, the honorable Representative from New York is well aware that the situation in Europe has developed to the point that there are two groups of nations, "axes," as they are called in modern parlance—Moscow-Paris-London and Rome-Berlin-Tokyo. The gentleman says that the President should have as much authority as possible.

Mr. BARTON. I say the President does have.

Mr. TINKHAM. Does have.

Mr. BARTON. Under the Constitution.

Mr. TINKHAM. Under the Constitution. Laws can be passed, however, which can curtail some of the powers. What I desire to ask the gentleman is this: Has not the President reiterated statements, and has not the Secretary of State likewise stated, where their position is and with what axis it is?

Mr. BARTON. I do not so interpret the messages of the President. I am willing to go along to the point of believing that every President of the United States, whether he has come from our side of the House or the other side of the House [applause]——

Mr. TINKHAM. That makes no difference.

Mr. BARTON. Has sought to keep this country out of war.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. The President of the United States made a speech at Chicago in which he wanted to quarantine certain nations.

Mr. BARTON. I think he did.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman made a statement in which he said he thought that there would be reaction on the part of people listening to the radio in case Paris or London was bombed. Would not the same thing happen if St. Peter's in Rome or the Vatican was bombed?

Mr. BARTON. I think there would be the same reaction. I think that when you are here trying to enact an embargo with the idea that it can stand up against an outraged public opinion, manufactured through 30,000,000 radios, you are dealing in something utterly unrealistic.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], a distinguished World War veteran.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult to intelligently discuss this neutrality bill, inasmuch as we have been informed that the bill as it will be finally presented is not the bill now before the Committee. Apparently it has been agreed to accept four rather important amendments. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, so that he will not be misled by the applause from the Republican side, that we are not unanimous over here that we want to go back to international law if by so doing it means going back to international world conditions as they existed from 1914 to 1917.

At the outset may I state that I do not pose as an authority on international law. I am not even a common garden variety of lawyer, but I am here as a Representative of 421,000 men, women, and children now residing in Hartford County, State of Connecticut. As the Representative of those people, I consider it my solemn duty to aid in the enactment of any law that will lessen the likelihood of our becoming involved in any future war, and the opposition to the enactment of any law that increases the likelihood of our becoming involved in a foreign war.

I am convinced that the enactment of House Joint Resolution 306, now before us, will definitely increase our chances of participating in another war, and for that reason alone I shall vote against this resolution. In the first place, it is my sincere belief that if we enact this resolution we will have placed our country right back where it was in 1914. We will have made of the United States a huge ammunitions dump. What have we left from that great crusade of 1917? We entered the World War to fight a war to end all wars—to make the world safe for democracy. We won the war but lost the peace; we failed to carry our objective. Hence, all we have left to our advantage is the lesson we should have learned from our past experiences, especially our experience during 1914 to 1919.

I say to the Members of the House that if we today are going to forget the lesson of the World War, then the sacrifices of those who participated in that war will have been in vain. Who is there here today who will say that the shipping of munitions and other supplies to Europe was not a factor in our becoming involved in the World War. Within my district are many manufacturers of munitions and war materials; that industry is a perfectly legal one, employing hundreds of men and women, but I feel confident that if they felt that selling munitions to a foreign country which was engaged in a war would increase the danger of our becoming involved in a war, they would not want to sell such munitions. The owners and employees of those factories are loyal peace-loving Americans, but they are not war mongers.

In any discussion of the question of neutrality it is essential that one bear in mind the strict definition of the word itself. A standard dictionary defines neutrality as "that state of being a neutral nation during a war. Neutrals may not lend money to either side, guarantee a loan, or allow the passage of belligerent troops through their borders. A neutral refrains from interference in a contest; is friendly to each of two or more belligerents or at least does not take the part of either or any belligerent." Such is real neutrality, and if we are to be successful in drafting a bill which will maintain such neutrality, we must keep this definition always before us.

It is my opinion that our neutrality law should act automatically to prohibit the sale of war materials to both belligerents in the event of either a declared or undeclared war, and should even extend, in essential cases, to the complete cessation of all trade with belligerents. Our neutrality law should not empower any one person to determine the existence of a state of war, as the Bloom bill would do, for immediately thereby the idea of neutrality may be nullified by an unneutral personality. In this regard, I would amend section 1 (a) of the Bloom bill, which now reads—

> That whenever the President shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states—

to read—

> That whenever there exists a state of war between foreign states.

And for the purpose of clear definition, a state of war should mean not only aggression and active combat but the more subtle modern type of invasion whereby troops of one power invade and possess territory of another power, overpowering resistance.

I earnestly feel that an effective neutrality law can be drafted only if that law strictly prohibits commerce with belligerents, and financial aid, either directly or indirectly. In this regard I would make only the exception of permitting traffic in medical supplies with belligerents. For purposes of regulation, the authority to determine the application of a neutrality law should be automatic and should not be left to the discretion of any individual. The act should be so drafted, and all terms should be so defined that an embargo would immediately become effective on war materials, general commerce and travel would be prohibited, and all financial dealings with each belligerent would be prohibited.

As a signatory of the Kellogg Pact to outlaw war, the United States pledged itself to deny aggression as a means to the settlement of international disputes. In this regard then, is it not compatible with the American spirit that we draft a neutrality law providing for the severance of trade relations with belligerent nations? Only by a complete withdrawal of American interests from foreign disputes can we preserve an American neutrality. It is purely a question of gambling the loss of dollars in trade against the loss of life, morale, and property as a sacrifice for neutrality.

It would appear that the entire crux of the question is centered in the idea of control—whether or not it is wise to place the power to regulate the application of neutrality in the hands of any one person. There may have been a time when it was wise and necessary for Congress to give broad discretionary powers to the President, but the need of granting such powers certainly does not exist today. In case of emergency Congress, with our rapid transportation, can be assembled within 36 hours. If we are to have a neutrality act which is to function for the avowed purpose of keeping America out of war, would it not be better to frame an act which would be automatic, which would function of itself, and would thereby eliminate the element of personal control? Human nature is fallible, and to leave within the power of any one person complete control over the lives of the citizens of a nation is an idea which has been alien to the American system of democracy and government throughout its history. Would it not be better to frame an act which definitely limits and defines the ideas which the American people wish to see put forth as a basis for the establishment of this country as a neutral nation? It is not a question of politics or personalities but it is a question of vital importance to the future of our country and the well-being of our people. If we can legislate in a manner to preserve peace for our Nation, let us so legislate as to be certain of the accomplishment of our aim. If the day ever comes when the democracies of the world are threatened, let the President come before Congress

and say just what nations he wants to aid and to what extent.

Certainly our country has gained little from its participation in the World War. We have profited not at all either materially or spiritually, and it is a sad commentary if we should prove by our actions here at this time that we have not even profited by the experience. Victimized by rampant propaganda and carried forward by enthusiasm of expanding trade and commerce, we found ourselves involved in 1917 in a war which was not of our making. If, 22 years later, we have not learned to recognize those elements which embroiled us at that time, and if we cannot so regulate our actions as to prevent a repetition of the tragedy of 1917, then our participation in the World War can be written off only as a complete loss.

Neutrality is by very nature a spiritual quality, intangible but real. By this very fact it might seem fallacious to attempt legislation to control neutrality. However, by the very passage of a sound and reasonable neutrality act, one which contains within itself adequate provisions and limitations of a strictly defined nature, we would crystallize and give expression to the preponderent spirit of the American people. It would seem only logical, therefore, that the power to interpret and regulate the application of any neutrality legislation should be preserved to Congress itself, to those persons who by their very position are in close touch with the spirit of the average American citizen.

I should like to see a neutrality act which would carry of itself specific authority and regulation of our commerce, our financial relations, and the general attitude and actions of our citizens with respect to belligerent countries. Such an act should definitely limit to the extent of complete curtailment all trade and financial assistance to any and all belligerents in the event of either a declared or undeclared war. I would even go so far as to provide that all passports issued for travel in countries in a state of war or endangered by war should carry the proviso that such travel is completely at the risk of the individual and his protection will not be guaranteed by this Government. These provisions might be criticized as being too stringent, but we must bear in mind that most wars arise from the so-called "international incident," and that strangely enough it is often the curiosity of John Doe traveling in foreign countries with the bland assurance that as a citizen of the United States he is secure in all circumstances that bring about these incidents.

There is no question in my mind but what this is the most important and far-reaching legislation that we will be called upon to consider during this session. I have had hundreds of letters from constituents and, almost without exception, they have urged me to vote against this so-called Bloom bill. These letters do not come from an organized minority, they come from average citizens—men and women who vividly recall the heartaches they endured during the World War; fathers and mothers who have sons now of military age, and who have no desire to see those sons called upon to participate in a foreign war. I am convinced that the citizens of the United States long years ago determined that never again should our young men be called upon to fight on a foreign battlefield. If the adoption of this bill increases the possibility of our becoming involved in a war, then certainly every Member of this House is justified in voting to defeat the measure. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the hour is growing late and I appreciate fully that many members of the committee desire to go to their offices, complete the work of the day, then go to their homes. Of course, under the time limitation it would be impossible for me to discuss this whole matter thoroughly, but under these peculiar circumstances I do not regret the time limitation because it would be an imposition upon the Members of this body to demand that they stay here for any great length of time at this late hour.

Mr. Chairman, the present so-called Neutrality Act reached the statute books in 1937. On March 18 of that year the measure was debated on the floor of the House. I took part in that debate and registered my profound conviction that the portion of the act which has to do with the embargo against the exportation of munitions would inevitably place the United States in an embarrassing position in the future, that it would inevitably ally the United States, unwittingly of course, with the more powerful and aggressor nations as against the weak and struggling and that in such a situation lay a grave danger to the peace of the United States. I spoke as best I could in that tone and expressed my regret at the inevitable passage of the bill at that time. Upon the roll call I was one of 13 Members of the House to vote against it. I am still of that opinion. I believe the existence of that embargo against the exportation of munitions in the permanent law is a source of danger. With all my heart I hope it will be eliminated.

If certain highly objectionable features of this bill now pending before the Committee, especially that feature known as section 3 having to do with the area of combat operations, are removed from this bill, and the repeal of the embargo provision still remains in it, I shall vote for the bill.

That attitude is not a new one upon my part. Perhaps I am justified in repeating it on this occasion, because at least it can be said to be consistent with my record in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I desire, if I can in my inadequate way, to bring certain considerations before the members of the Committee. Frankly, I have never had any faith in the ability of the Congress to write into the statutes of our country a rule of conduct which will be proof against all future events. I think it impossible for us to do so, although I am willing to admit there is a body of public opinion that seems to believe it can be done—that by the mere passage of a law the country can be kept out of war.

No two wars have sprung from the same origin. History teaches us that. Nor have any two wars ever proceeded along parallel lines. Each had its own peculiar outstanding characteristics and sudden and unexpected developments. No two wars have ever been confined to the same geographical area. Sudden departures from war-torn areas occur and the scene shifts to new areas hitherto free from the curse of war. It is beyond our power to judge the future with sufficient accuracy to warrant us stating in a statute just exactly what the United States will do in the face of all events to come.

From the beginning of all these discussions, commencing in 1935, I have entertained that conviction, and upon more than one occasion in public and in private have ventured to express it. It is a dangerous thing for us to write down a rule of conduct binding and inflexible and then to find, as we inevitably will find when some unexpected and unpredictable crisis overtakes us, that our rule is out of date and worthless; indeed, dangerous; and, finding that, change the rule by our own act. The change will inevitably inure to the advantage of one belligerent and the disadvantage of his opponents. We may not intend it so, but it will be so. And when we change the rule—and in this respect I do not quite agree with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY]—when we change a rule that we ourselves have made, after the game starts, then we have done an unneutral act.

I am not speaking about the rules of international law. I am speaking about the rules that we propose to adopt to govern our own conduct, our own rules. When we change those after the conflict starts we are in grave danger of getting into trouble.

Much has been said about the function of the President in the conduct of foreign relations. It is superfluous to remind you that the President speaks for the Nation in the face of the world. Under the Constitution he is the only one who can do so officially. True, every wise President consults not only those in his Cabinet but leaders in the Congress before he makes some tremendously important utterance. But it is his utterance, and in the power to make those

utterances he possesses under our Constitution a very great power over our destiny and over the destiny, perhaps, of the world itself, in view of the position to which we have now risen in the family of nations.

I have been opposed from the beginning to the delegation of discretionary powers to the President in these so-called neutrality acts.

Perhaps my reason for this opposition may seem a little unusual; at least, it has not been emphasized in the debate up to this point. It is not because I distrust American Presidents that I dislike seeing extraconstitutional powers delegated to them in these neutrality acts, but it is rather because I have such a regard for the Presidency and fear so greatly that by these thoughtless delegations of power we shall undermine the integrity of the Presidential office in the face of the nations of the earth.

What do I mean by that? I mean just this. All these bills we have been having here for the last 4 years have sought to delegate and have delegated discretionary powers to the President; in fact, I think it impossible to draw a so-called neutrality act without delegating such powers. I cannot quite agree with the gentleman who preceded me in this debate, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], that we can draw an act that will enforce itself automatically. I do not believe that can be done. I think it is an impossibility as a matter of bill drafting. If we are to have neutrality acts, we cannot avoid depositing power with the Chief Executive to invoke their rules and regulations, and that is the granting of a discretionary power which I think is bad for the Presidency.

Whoever occupies the White House in a time of world trouble undergoes a terrific strain. His mind should be clear. Of course he thinks first of his country. Yes, first, last, and all the time he thinks of his country, his country as one unit. He knows that when he speaks not only his home country listens but all the nations of the earth listen.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, place upon the President of the United States some of these extraordinary discretionary powers and, according to my way of thinking, you put him upon a spot not only before his own people but before the peoples of the earth. You say to him in one of these neutrality acts, "You may use your discretion as to whether or not a state of war exists upon some spot of the earth. If you think a war exists, then an embargo goes into effect. If you do not think it exists, an embargo does not go into effect." You say to him that under certain circumstances which the Congress recites, "If you make up your mind that your act will inure to the peace or the neutrality of the United States you may invoke certain cash-and-carry rules and regulations covering the commerce of the United States."

It has even been suggested, although it is not contained in this legislation, that the President of the United States be authorized to select the aggressor, to name the aggressor. I am against that as I am against all the other delegations of discretionary power, for once you force the President into possession of discretionary power extraconstitutional in character you open up the way for him to be pulled and hauled in every conceivable direction by warring groups and factions. [Applause.] You open up the way for propaganda, domestic and foreign, propaganda moving through devious channels, with plausible motives, propaganda all designed to reach the White House and get the President. And he must stand there in the gaze of all mankind, a mankind that knows he possesses these extraordinary powers, these discretionary powers, with everybody waiting to see which way he will jump. I tell you it is an unhealthy thing for the Presidential office, as well as being an extraconstitutional power and contrary to the spirit of our institutions.

The President of the United States should not be subjected to any such strain. He carries a heavy enough burden as it is, God knows, when the world is afire. We should not add to that burden by forcing him, through the passage of legislation such as certain provisions of this bill, to make decisions all alone, which decisions may have the most profound effect not only upon the history of his country, but the history of the world.

I am a great admirer of the Presidential office in the American scheme of government. It was a blessed thought on the part of the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States to establish such an office, under the Constitution, and for 150 years its occupants have performed their constitutional duty with respect to foreign relations and have enjoyed the respect of mankind. Let us never legislate in any such fashion as will even tend to undermine the integrity and the influence, world-wide, if you please, of the Presidency of the United States. [Applause.] This is my principal reason for opposing the delegation of discretionary powers, as I said a moment ago, not because I distrust the motives of Presidents, but because I have such a deep concern for the integrity and influence of that great office.

It may not seem to you to be analagous, but may I remind you for a few moments of the battle that occurred in the United States Senate in connection with the proposal that the United States become a member of the League of Nations under a covenant. I opposed the United States going into the League of Nations under the terms of that covenant, because I wanted my country to be free to do what was best for the United States come what may, unbound by any agreement or contract, implied, direct, or indirect. I feel just the same way about these so-called neutrality acts. The thing that disturbs me most about them is the fact that when we pass them we are deliberately, to the extent proposed in the law which we do pass, tying the hands of the Government of the United States. We are announcing in advance that we will do a certain thing under circumstances which we cannot anticipate. We try to describe those circumstances in the act, but we cannot come anywhere near it, and yet we give assurance to the world in these acts that we will do a certain thing. I do not think that we should ever promise the world to do a certain specific thing in advance of an unpredictable crisis. [Applause.]

Many people are of the belief, and I honor their beliefs, that in neutrality laws lies safety. I disagree. I think the safety and the peace of the people of the United States lie in their retention of the right to do what is best for America when the time comes. [Applause.] My plea is for freedom of action, and that is all. Freedom to do what is best for us, no binding rules, no inflexible regulations, maintain our self-respect, work our best for peace, but be forever free.

I feel that way about these neutrality acts, just as I did about the Covenant of the League of Nations. That was a proposal to take away from America a portion of her freedom of action, and these neutrality acts, by implication at least, propose that we shall announce in advance that we no longer demand or shall exercise complete freedom of action.

I would welcome the proposal of an amendment upon this floor to this bill striking out the whole of the bill except the last section [applause], repealing all existing neutrality acts and declining to enact any additional ones, and go back to the principles of international law which the whole world understands and under which we maintain our freedom to do what is best for us and our destiny.

This is not a partisan question. By no means is it a partisan question. It is a question which may affect the destiny of the greatest Nation upon the face of the earth—the last great Nation—perhaps there are one or two others, in which the institutions of liberty are still secure; and the best way, in my humble judgment, to keep our free institutions secure is to maintain our freedom to act as we think best for those institutions. So I make my plea, which I have done upon many an occasion in the past, that we acknowledge our inability to write a neutrality act with any degree of faith in us that it will work.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 6 additional minutes.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the honorable gentleman answer a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In just a moment.

I have faith in our people. I have faith in our Congress. I have faith in the occupants of the White House as they have come and gone. I believe we can use our best judgment when we see exactly what is facing us, but I challenge the assertion that we can use accurate judgment with respect to the unpredictable, and that is what these neutrality acts invite us to do. Which is the sounder judgment, the judgment reached by the Congress and the President jointly in the face of an emergency, the whole dimensions of which we can measure at the moment, or the judgment of the Congress far in advance of unpredictable emergencies? If we have faith in ourselves, faith in our people, we will abandon these attempts, and we will do just what we did prior to 1935, and maintain for ourselves freedom of action. True, we may make mistakes from time to time, but what human being does not, and what group of human beings does not? But that is the American way. The freedom of America is the thing we have at heart, and we cannot gain it, neither can we sustain it by bartering it away by suggestions, direct or implied, that such-and-such a neutrality policy will help one country as against another.

Already we have heard in this debate that this bill is to the advantage of a certain group of countries and to the disadvantage of another group of countries. That is a poisonous suggestion to come before the Congress; yet it is inevitable if you are going to proceed with neutrality laws. If we had no neutrality laws, that issue would not come before the Congress of the United States. When it fails to come, when we keep it out of these doors, we are a free people—free to govern our own destiny. That is all I have to say. [Applause.]

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. TINKHAM. I want to ask only one question of the honorable Representative from New York. In view of his statement, is he opposed to the proposed law now before us?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated at the beginning of my remarks that if section 3, which is the area of combat operations provision, which I regard as highly dangerous and a perfect example of unwise delegation of discretionary power, against which I have been enveighing—if that is taken out I shall then rejoice that the embargo section, the embargo against the exportation of munitions, is repealed. I have always been against that embargo.

Mr. TINKHAM. But you will vote——

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will vote for the bill.

Mr. TINKHAM. You will vote for a neutrality bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. May I enlarge upon that?

Mr. TINKHAM. Yes; I wish you would. I think you are inconsistent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think I have made it plain that with section 3 out of the bill and the repeal of the embargo left in the bill I shall vote for it, but I have always made it plain that I do not think even what is left will serve the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Under the conditions which the gentleman has named, with section 3 out and the other three amendments that have been suggested in the bill, it would then be possible for our President to permit the sale of arms on credit to one belligerent and require cash from another; to prohibit, by means of a prohibitory bond, the shipment of supplies to one belligerent when he suspects that it is going by way of a tender, while permitting such supplies and arms to go on American ships to another belligerent. No such powers have ever before, even under existing neutrality legislation, been given to a President. Does the gentleman feel that such responsibilities should be placed upon the occupant of the Presidential chair by voting for this bill after the amendments have been placed in the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not believe that the President should have those powers; no. It is a question in my mind of weighing the advantage of getting the embargo out of the law and having less dangerous features remain in the law. If I had my way I would wipe out the whole thing.

Mr. TINKHAM. Why not vote against it, then?

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman has said that if section 16, which repeals all neutrality law, were substituted for the entire bill, he would be for it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. BARRY. Has the gentleman any objection to offering that, which I believe will carry in this House?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am a great believer, even in this case which I regard as nonpartisan, in majority responsibility, and personally I would prefer to see such an amendment offered by a gentleman on your side of the House. I will certainly support it. [Applause.]

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. From 1914 until 1917 billions of dollars worth of munitions and war supplies were shipped by the United States to the Allies in the World War. Was that policy in any way responsible for our final participation in that war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is divided opinion upon that. Some people say "yes." The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] believes that that and similar things dragged us into the war. Others believe that was not the reason for our going in. I am one of those. But we can do anything we please about it, when the time comes if you do not bind yourselves in advance. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, for many years I have been watching the current of international affairs. For 50 years I have visited Europe, and in 1912 I predicted a great war between England and Germany.

I was educated to be a professor and writer of history. I am thoroughly convinced, with my 50 years' experience in Europe and my reading of history, that if this bill is approved by this House and finally becomes law it means war for the United States. [Applause.]

For more than a year and a half the President has been talking constantly of war. First came his so-called "quarantine speech" at Chicago in October of 1937, in which he said that there was no escape for the United States through mere "isolation or neutrality." Then he went on to say that the "peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort to quarantine and stop aggressors."

Last January, in a message to the Congress, President Roosevelt stated that whereas words were futile, there were many methods of bringing aggressor nations to account. He failed to explain, however, how hostile methods could be kept from provoking war.

A few weeks later, at a secret meeting at the White House of members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the President was reported to have said that America's first line of defense was in France. Was that unneutral or was it not? Was it looking to war or was it not? Was this not a complete abandonment of the American traditional policy of no entangling alliances and of no intervention in the political affairs of Europe?

In April, on his return from Warm Springs, Ga., as a sequel to his widely quoted remark: "I'll be back in the fall if we don't have a war," the President publicly adopted an editorial in the Washington Post as stating "exactly" his foreign policy.

This editorial which he adopted as stating "exactly" his foreign policy:

By "we" he undoubtedly meant western civilization. * * * In using the collective "we" the President told Hitler and Mussolini that the tremendous force of the United States must be a factor in their current thinking.

Was that a suggestion of neutrality?

During all this time President Roosevelt and members of his Cabinet have been deliberately attempting to implant in the minds of the American people a hatred of certain foreign nations with which we are at peace, and are doing their best to foster the belief that if Great Britain or France were attacked, the United States would have to take part to save the democracies of the world. He made no reference to Russia, of course; yet Russia is allied with France, and France is allied with England, and it now seems highly probable that Russia will become directly allied with England. The United States would not be fighting for democracy with Russia an ally of France and of England. And how long would the country support a Congress that placed at this disposal of communistic Russia the resources, the blood, and the treasure of the United States to maintain the communistic system of government and the communistic political power?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable Representative from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that only a few months ago the French Government was in complete control of the Communist-Socialist coalition under Mr. Blum, spelled B-l-u-m?

Mr. TINKHAM. That is true; but they have since changed to a dictatorship. They have appointed a Premier to have full authority. They have surrendered parliamentary control to a dictator. They are no longer a democracy.

I say to this House that the issue of war is now before us and that we should not allow ourselves to be deluded by fallacious arguments into taking absolutely wrong positions as we did 20 years ago. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, why should the United States arm the rest of the world? I should like that question answered.

Why should the United States give belligerent power to Russia? If Russia is in alliance with England and England controls the sea, then Russian boats can come here and get war supplies if you repeal the salutary provision in the present neutrality law which forbids the exportation of such supplies.

Why should we consider the interests of any other country except our own? The one question to be answered is, Is it in the interest of the United States and of United States peace, of the integrity of our country and of her institutions, that we send arms and ammunition abroad?

The sale of arms and ammunition was the first long step taken by the United States toward our involvement in the World War in 1917. If permitted again it may well once more involve the United States in a European war.

As a matter of common sense and rationality, we know that the elimination of the arms embargo cannot promote our peace.

It has been repeatedly argued that there is no distinction between the sale of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations and the sale of many other materials which can be made into arms and ammunition. The following article which recently appeared in the press answers such arguments completely:

In recent public statements regarding the administration's amendment of the Neutrality Act to permit the sale of arms and ammunition to belligerent nations, administration spokesmen such as Secretary Hull and Senator PITTMAN have advanced the argument that there is no logical difference between the selling of such articles as high explosives and machine guns and the selling of commodities like wheat, cotton, motorcars, or typewriters.

Therefore, they say, unless we are prepared to forego exporting our cotton and our wheat, logic compels us to abandon our present policy of regarding the sale of arms to belligerents as unneutral and to adopt instead a policy of selling arms to belligerents just as we would permit the sale to them of cotton shirting, wheat flour, or canned peaches.

This argument, it is submitted, is specious, sophistical, and dangerous nonsense. It is based on a premise which is false in history and false in fact.

The fact is that arms and ammunition are by their nature highly specialized commodities, which are specifically and primarily designed for the destruction of human life and the destruction of property, and which are adaptable to very little else. As such they have a very special status in commerce, a status which is fundamentally different from that of the ordinary objects of trade which are useful in peace as well as in war.

This fundamental difference of character between arms and other objects of trade has been recognized throughout the history of international law in the form of the distinction made between absolute contraband and conditional contraband of war. A neutral shipping arms to a belligerent has always done so at his own risk. The arms he ships are subject to seizure and forfeiture as absolute contraband of war by other belligerents. His government is unable to protest such seizure without incurring the charge that by seeking to protect the unneutral conduct of one of its citizens it is itself acting unneutrally.

All the more fully is this charge incurred when the Government itself is the moving force in the shipment of arms. In such cases a government which seeks to arm one belligerent as against another is generally regarded as acting unneutrally and as inviting by its own act the possibility of warlike reprisal on the part of the offended nation. As in 1917, a nation which fails in the performance of its neutral duties may well find itself involved in a war which a more meticulous observance of neutrality might have avoided, a danger which will not be escaped by trick transfers of title which deceive no one.

Against this, the right of a neutral to ship ordinary articles of commerce to belligerent nations has always existed on an entirely different footing. In theory, such shipments are immune from seizure, provided it can be shown they are not destined for use by the armed forces of a belligerent. And in practice neutrals have been successful in maintaining this right, depending on their military and naval strength and their determination to assert their rights as neutrals. Mr. Hull himself has justified a recent loan to invaded China on the ground that it would not be used for belligerent purposes and has apparently succeeded in imposing his point of view upon Japan in this instance.

It is true that in recent years the development of war on a "total" scale has largely obliterated most outward distinctions in the treatment of absolute contraband and that of conditional contraband. Nevertheless, the mere fact that absolute and conditional contraband are often treated alike in modern warfare does not make them alike in fact or affect the fundamental difference in their nature.

Arms and ammunition are fundamentally different from other articles of commerce, no matter how the contraband lists of warring nations may read. To maintain that they are not is to ignore both history and common sense; as well say that a bushel of grain and a quart of rye whisky are essentially one and the same thing. They are not the same thing by nature and cannot be made so by fiat with any profitable result.

Secretary Hull and Senator PITTMAN presumably know this; to think otherwise would be to insult their intelligence. But if they do know it, surely they should not allow themselves to be used to confuse our thinking at a time when we are weighing the grave issues of war and peace which are involved in the administration's current attempt to scrap neutrality as an effective national policy of the United States.

A very serious alteration of national policy is under consideration. It should be decided on the basis of truth and facts, not upon glib demonstrations that black is white.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, because of the condition of my throat I am unable to address the Committee. I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, isolation is an institution for impotent nations. The road which leads to this institution is a one-way road and over its gates should be engraved these words of Dante, "Abandon all hope, ye who enter here." If we ever permit ourselves to be committed to this institution, either by a domestic policy begotten of ignorance, shortsightedness, or timidity, or if we allow foreign influences born of an avaricious desire for economic supremacy to force us into it, then we are lost as a nation. In either case, if we are

confined within the somber bounds of isolation, we will fall a speedy victim to the cancer of internal disorders.

There are powerful influences from without, which are endeavoring by every possible means to neutralize our influence in the world, either in peace or in war. These influences have been active with their propaganda ever since the World War, seeking to sell the idea to the American people that our participation in the World War was actuated by unworthy motives. To this one they say, we were duped into the war to pull Great Britain's chestnuts out of the fire. To another they say we went to war to save our international bankers. To another they say that France was the aggressor nation. They even dupe some of our own prominent citizens into making the charge that our munitions manufacturers dragged us into the war in order to provide a market for their lethal appliances.

Although they have never produced one iota of proof in support of this statement, it has through much repetition been accepted as truth by many of our overcredulous citizens, and incidentally has been a fertile source of revenue for some of its proponents. The debts owed us by France and Great Britain have been kept fresh in the minds of the American taxpayer; but the debts owed us by Germany and nations under German influence have been discreetly kept in the background.

For all that has been said regarding our entry into the World War, in the light of recent events in Europe, there should be little doubt in the mind of anyone what would be the conditions in Europe today if Germany had been the victor in that struggle. If we had not entered the war, there is no doubt but that Europe would have been under the iron heel of Germany these last 20 years. Germany made no effort to conceal the fact that her intention was to make France pay the cost of the war and to reduce her to a state of slavery. It was also her intention to demand the surrender of the British Fleet and thereby bring England into a state of subjection. Can we now doubt that she would have used this fleet to impose her will upon every nation within its cruising radius and would have soon come into conflict with the Monroe Doctrine?

What the fate of the other conquered nations would have been is made clear by the Treaty of Brest Litovsk after the collapse of Russia in 1917. This was the most ruthless treaty of modern times, the conditions of which were ended only by the Allies' victory on the western front. By this treaty the Ukraine, from which Russia receives 70 percent of her iron and coal and 50 percent of her wheat, was taken from Russia and required to furnish the Central Powers 1,000,000 tons of foodstuffs annually. The indemnities and territorial seizures of the Franco-Prussian War are also matters of history. The terms of the treaty following that victory of German arms was for its time many times more severe than the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, but they were met by the French without tears or pleas for mercy.

Her declaration of February 1, 1917, that any ship of any nationality found within 100 miles at sea from the British coast would be torpedoed without warning, was what brought the United States into the war. This meant that we were not privileged to carry on trade with any of the neutral nations of Europe. It meant a restriction of our rights as a neutral nation. We were denied access to the markets of a portion of the world.

Six months before we entered the war German submarines sank four foreign vessels off the coast of Massachusetts. The real facts of those days have been forgotten, while the misstatement of the propagandist has been remembered. The many acts of sabotage committed in our own territory against our own industrial plants seem to have been forgotten, as well as her brazen attempts to endanger our relations with Mexico.

It was too much. The press, the church, the overwhelming mass of our citizens demanded the protection of our national rights and war was declared. For anyone to maintain that such was not the case, is a confession of ignorance or an admission of a disregard for the truth and an insult to the good judgment, the integrity, and patriotism of the overwhelming majority of both Houses of Congress who voted to declare war.

Some of those engaged in promoting this theory of an isolated Utopia have the audacity to say that we would have been better off if Germany had won the World War. Some even make the statement that we entered the war on the wrong side. With them it is not a matter of peace or war; isolation or commercial intercourse; but a matter of "whose ox was gored." There can, however, be no doubt in the mind of any responsible student of international affairs, either past or present, that life in the United States would have been radically altered if we had not intervened in the World War.

Then, of course, under our very liberal laws and more liberal attitude of tolerance, organizations have sprung up which seek to bind racial groups together for purposes which, to say the least, are of a very questionable nature.

Organizations have been very cleverly brought into being for the purpose of arousing antagonism in this Nation against our citizens of Jewish extraction, with the hope of justifying the actions of other nations in their barbarous treatment of these people. They have been materially aided in this program by the activities of some members of the Jewish race in promoting subversive doctrines; which has prompted counter activities from some of our citizens, who having finished their careers find time hanging heavy on their hands and are more burdened with patriotism than they are with sound judgment.

I must say that this propaganda seems to have been widely accepted, at its face value, without any attempt on the part of its credulous acceptors to analyze either the propaganda or the motives or the extent of the knowledge of those who distribute it. Apparently it is circulated to keep this Nation out of war. If its instigators were sincere and unselfish, their efforts would be commendable. Their intention, however, is to cripple this Nation in order that we will be unable to protect our national interests and our lawful rights, either in peace or in war. They know, what the average citizen too often forgets, that the purpose of war is not war as such; but only as a means to an end. That end is the control of markets, sources of raw material, and the trade lanes leading to them. Wars are but commercial contests grown out of normal control.

These propagandists seek to leave the impression that any effort to protect our commercial interests is a blot upon our national escutcheon. They would instill into the American mind the idea that trade is a low-down occupation, something akin to procuring or dope peddling and unworthy of national protection.

They coin the phrase "dollar diplomacy" and weep about the fancied defacement of the American flag with the dollar sign. The fact of the matter is, we are a commercial nation and we live by commerce. Commercial considerations guided the hands which wrote the Declaration of Independence; steadied the eyes which sighted the guns at Saratoga, Trenton, and Yorktown, and inspired the brains which drafted our Constitution. Commerce is as American as corn mush, bourbon whisky, turkey and cranberries, or well-cared-for teeth.

The commerce of the Nation is the commerce of the people of the Nation. It is the commerce of those who labor in the mines, in the mills, and on the farms, as well as that of the bankers, the importers, and exporters. It is not alone the commerce of Wall Street; but just as much that of Main Street and the streets across the railroad tracks. It is the commerce of the Smiths and the Joneses, the Murphys, and the Cohens, the Strobinskis and the Picolonics, and also that of the Morgans, the Schwabs, and the Grundys. If we permit our commerce to be destroyed, or even to be restricted, either by propaganda or by the sword, our whole people will suffer; but those who will suffer the most severely will be those who labor with their hands. Their standard of living will fall as it fell when our own tariff destroyed our foreign trade and they will revert to status of the peasants of medieval Europe.

There was a day when the American clipper ship carried the trade of the world. The far corners of the globe and the smallest islands of the lonely seas saw the Stars and Stripes flying over holds filled with the products of American farms and mills. These ships brought back to our shores in exchange the products of distant lands which contributed to the upbuilding of this Nation. Those were the days when an infant nation sent its few ships half way across the world to force the Barbary pirates to respect our commercial rights on the Mediterranean Sea. A few years later we refused to allow either a timid domestic or a hostile foreign policy to curtail our freedom of the seas, and our sailors, cutlass in hand, carried the issue to the decks of the British Navy and won.

For a hundred years our right to the freedom of the seas was never questioned. No nation had the hardihood to challenge it. The attitude of this Nation toward the protection of commerce was too well known. We were a healthy growing nation and our people were too occupied to be ashamed of their commercial instincts. The slavery question had absorbed the minds of the professional reformers until after the Civil War; their attention was then focused on the question of equal rights for the freed Negroes for the next 20 years and then came the noble experiment.

Never looking behind to observe the failure of their achievements, these self-appointed guardians of the public conscience flew into the peace-at-any-price movement with all of their customary contempt for either truth or fact. A new crusade was on. From across the seas various influences having axes to grind sensed the willingness of strong arms to turn the grindstones. Among these influences, those which for obvious reasons wished to discredit our entrance into the World War were quick to take advantage of the situation. An unholy alliance sprang up between the advocates of subversive doctrines and many of the advocates of the gospel. Each desired disarmament for a different reason, but the desire was a common denominator which brought about a disregard for the real interest of the Nation.

Then comes the proselyte preaching the virtues of those systems of government from which every vestige of democracy has been eradicated. Supposedly they advocate a policy of national self-sufficiency arrived at by a rigid system of regimentation which has wiped out the individual in thought, action, or desire, and which will achieve a national economic security which will enable a nation to live indefinitely, as a hibernating bear lives over winter—on its own fat. Such an economic security may be attained by destroying the freedom of the individual, but such security would be a reversion to the serfdom of the Dark Ages, and we hope America is headed forward. A policy of isolation would result in a similar loss of individual liberty to our citizens.

We are by no means a self-sufficient nation either in war or in peace, and we can only become so by the surrender of many of those commodities which we hold to be essential today. We are the world's largest consumer of tin, but produce none. Manganese, tungsten, chromium, nickel, and many other essential metals are almost in the same class. Coffee, tea, silk, and many of our drugs must be imported. If we are to procure those commodities which we lack, we must export commodities to pay for them. Such a simple, fundamental axiom of economics should be apparent to everyone.

It is high time that the American people began to think for themselves. It is high time that they exert themselves enough to shove aside the veil of propaganda and review the history of their Nation for the past 150 years. There they will see what influences contributed to the unprecedented upbuilding of this Nation. Ahead of us is a future as brilliant as is the past—providing we do not heed the siren call of the propaganda-inspired isolationist, who believes that the solution of all of our problems, foreign and domestic, is to be found in an ostrichlike policy of isolation.

We cannot solve our international obligations by a policy of isolation any more than an individual can satisfy his creditors by evading them. We can, of course, adopt the policy of the man who, having lost his ambition or desire to face the responsibilities of citizenship and desiring to shun them, becomes a hermit. It is doubtful, however, if we would be allowed to pursue such a policy in peace, if we were to adopt it. We did not allow Japan to do so, and many other like examples exist in the history of the world. If we are to keep step with the march of progress and advance in the scale of civilization, we must associate ourselves with those nations whose institutions, political philosophy, and social customs are compatable with our own. As opposed to the theory that "right makes might," which can do nothing except foment strife in this world, we must express our intention to assist those nations which stand for international as well as national justice.

If we wish to be an influence for good in this world, we cannot be so unless we are free to act to protect our interests as the occasion may demand. We cannot be in position to do this if we are committed in advance to any certain method of procedure. For our own protection, we should always be in position to retain the initiative. We cannot do so if we are bound by so-called neutrality laws. We existed as a nation for a century and a half without such laws. We grew and prospered during that time. I therefore propose an outright repeal of all of our present laws relating to neutrality, in order that we may once again be free, unhampered, and uncommitted in this respect.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I confess a feeling of very great humility in coming before this body to discuss a most important issue, and especially in view of the remarkable and able presentation by both sides on this question. I am sure that every Member who has been on the floor of the House this afternoon has had a very liberal education in the subject of neutrality and in international law.

I am simply going to take this occasion to introduce a few thoughts in reference to neutrality, to make some comparisons that perhaps will throw a little light on the path we are traveling in enacting or attempting to enact this so-called neutrality legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the people of the United States are opposed to any legislation that takes from the Congress the power by which it alone may decide whether the Nation shall enter war or remain at peace. It was the intention of those who framed the Constitution that the power of Congress "to declare war" should exclude all power on the part of the Executive to make war; otherwise, the provision is meaningless.

Abraham Lincoln recognized the wisdom of the purpose of those who framed the Constitution that the power to declare war or to make war should never be entrusted to one man but, on the contrary, should be vested in the Congress. I quote what Lincoln had to say on this point:

> The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved so to frame the Constitution that no man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

President Wilson, speaking at Chicago, January 31, 1916, gave expression to the same doctrine in these words:

> This war (the World War) was brought on by rulers, not by the people, and thank God that there is no man in America who has the authority to bring on war without the consent of the people.

Again on the following night, at Des Moines, he reiterated more at length the same thought:

> I was saying the other night that I know of no case where one people made war upon another people. No government can make war in the United States. The people make war through their representatives. The Constitution of the United States does not give the President even a participating part in the making of war. War can be declared only by Congress, by an action which the President does not take part in and cannot veto. I am literally, by constitutional arrangement, the mere servant of the people's representatives.

Mr. Chairman, it is one thing for an Executive to enunciate a doctrine and quite another for him to adhere strictly to it. I am sure that the membership of the House will recall that long before President Wilson had uttered the words which I have quoted he had said in a letter to Floor Leader Underwood that—

> The foreign policy of the Government * * * lies outside the field of legislation.

This communication was directed to Floor Leader Underwood in October 1914.

Mr. Chairman, he stated a fact and he stated the law. I say, without disrespect or partisan bias, that neutrality is far safer in the hands of the Congress, where the Constitution places it, than it can be if entrusted to the power and discretion of any Executive. It is far easier for nations at war to bring pressure and influence to bear on one man than it is to make it felt upon 531 House and Senate legislators, registering the will of 130,000,000 peace-loving people.

I say without fear of successful contradiction that once a President yields to the influence of foreign propaganda and assumes an unneutral attitude, all the executive propaganda agencies reflect and react to it and immediately swing into action in support of the position taken by their Chief. The facilities of education and communication now under the control of the executive branch of the Government, and financed largely by the public, for the manufacture of public opinion surpass that of any propaganda agency in the world. This power, unless wisely and discreetly used, constitutes a serious threat to the safety of the Republic, and if used to foment a spirit of war under powers delegated to one man, the consequences to free government and to harmonious relations with foreign governments are not pleasant to contemplate.

It was Henry Clay, I believe, who once said:

> Either Congress or the President must have the right to determine upon the objects for which a war shall be prosecuted. There is no other alternative. If the President possess it * * * where is the difference between our free government and that of any other nation, which may be governed by an absolute czar, emperor, or king?

Mr. Chairman, this so-called Bloom neutrality bill disclosed the real purpose of the Executive as it was first drawn, but which has recently been modified to quiet the fears it has aroused in the minds of thoughtful persons throughout the land. The light of experience should guide this House, never losing sight of the beacon light of the Constitution which, when followed, has marked the course of safety for the Republic.

I have referred to the power of foreign war propaganda as a source of danger and, therefore, a warning against Congress attempting to delegate one iota of its power to declare war or make war to the President of the United States.

Do the Members of this House not recall that President Wilson, speaking in Milwaukee in 1916, assured his audience of his peaceful intentions in these stirring words:

> I pledge you that, God helping me, I will keep you out of war.

I believe then as I believe now that he voiced the sentiment and the hope of the vast majority of the people of this country.

I remind the Members of the House that as late as January 30, 1916, President Wilson, in an address to the New York Press Club, interpreted the prevailing sentiment when he said:

> I get letters from unknown men, from humble women, from people whose names have never been heard and will never be recorded, and there is but one prayer in all of these letters: "Mr. President, do not allow anybody to persuade you that the people of this country want war with anybody."

This, please remember, was the state of public opinion 9 months and 7 days prior to a declaration of war by the Congress. Throughout all this period foreign propaganda was doing its deadly work and it was chiefly centered upon the executive branch of the Government.

In Paris, July 4, 1917, Lloyd George in an interview made the statement:

> We not only desired the entrance of the United States into the war; we solicited it.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the pacific utterances of President Wilson in the early part of 1916, it is interesting to trace the psychological change that took place under the pressure and influence and solicitation from abroad. When President Wilson saw the various attacks by German submarines on American vessels and felt the effects of the intensive propaganda of the Allies he laid the groundwork for the declaration of war by Congress.

In support of this statement let me quote from the speeches made by President Wilson in the 1916 preparedness campaign. Here is the argument he used in a speech made in Pittsburgh.

Please do not misunderstand me. I make the statement now that President Wilson, I believe, was acting in the best of faith. I am of the opinion that he sacrificed his health and his life in what he assumed was a patriotic cause; but he was not infallible, any more than any other President has been or is likely to be. He was simply a fallible man, the victim of foreign propaganda and persuasive, persevering diplomacy. Here is what President Wilson said at Pittsburgh:

> I should feel that I was guilty of an unpardonable omission if I did not go out and tell my fellow countrymen that new circumstances have arisen which make it absolutely necessary that this country should prepare herself.

Mr. Chairman, does this have a familiar ring to it? Have recent preparedness authorizations and appropriations been made as a result of a similar appeal? There is something familiar about recent utterances emanating from the White House and the statement made by President Wilson in Kansas City in 1916 when he warned:

> I cannot tell 24 hours at a time whether there is going to be trouble or not.

Have we heard anything within recent months from administration sources relative to protecting our commerce from aggressor nations? You will recall that as the war spirit gathered momentum in 1916 our commerce and its preservation entered the picture. At St. Louis President Wilson appealed to the interests of that area of the country in terms of commerce in these significant words:

> One commander of a submarine * * * might set the world on fire. * * * There are cargoes of cotton on the seas; there are cargoes of manufactured articles on the seas; and any one of the cargoes may be the point of ignition.

Again at Topeka, Kans., he made a direct appeal to the self-interest of the wheat farmers and also to the cotton farmers. President Wilson's approach to the subject of commerce, as now stressed by the administration, causes me to quote him briefly:

> There is one thing Kansas ought to be interested in, and that is that we must maintain our rights to sell our products to any neutral country anywhere in the world. We should be allowed to send the wheat that grows in the Kansas fields and this cotton in our Southern States to neutrals who need them, without interference from any of the warring nations.

If I may be permitted to inject a thought here, I shall remind the House that not long ago the trade agreements were to restore permanent peace, good will, and prosperity among nations, but now, as in 1916, we hear it proclaimed vociferously and belligerently that our rapidly declining export trade must be expanded and our foreign markets protected from penetration and domination by aggressor nations.

I do not want to see the alleged interference with foreign commerce used as an excuse for any unneutral act on the part of this Government as it was in 1917. I believe the course for this Nation to pursue in the event of a foreign war is one of strict neutrality under international law. All powers relating to this subject should remain in the hands of Congress. The Congress should guard against any delegation of power to the Executive by which he can make war.

If there is any doubt in the mind of any Member of this House that foreign propaganda directed at one man, clothed with uncurbed power, can lead a peaceful people into war, then I respectfully submit additional proof of the fact.

Mr. Chairman, there were three speeches made in the British Parliament April 18, 1917, lauding President Wilson and acclaiming the participation of the United States in the War:

Earl Curzon said:

A twice elected President, representing 100,000,000 people of the most peace-loving and least aggressive nation of the earth, has summoned his people to arms with a trumpet call.

Mr. Asquith in his speech said:

What, then, has enabled the President, after waiting with the patience which Pitt described as the first virtue of statesmanship—to carry with him a united nation into the hazards and horrors of the greatest war in history?

John Dillon, speaking on the same occasion and to the same point, said:

The difficulties with which President Wilson has been confronted in the last 2½ years have not been sufficiently appreciated in this country. He had to keep the Nation united and bring it united into this war. He had to deal with a people who had a deep-seated and ineradicable hatred of war. To bring the United States into the war was to make them go against the deepest instincts of the soul of the race.

Mr. Chairman, the Bloom bill before us, even in its present deleted form, ought not to be enacted into law. It should be recommitted.

I repeat that this bill should be recommitted and that Congress should deal with the subject of neutrality when and if a foreign war develops. At present this Republic is at peace with every nation in the world. But, unfortunately, unneutral and highly inflammatory statements have been made by some of the high officials of this Government and by the Chief Executive as well, which will cause those nations so criticized and condemned to question the sincerity of the professions of impartiality on the part of the United States Government toward them in the event of their becoming involved in war.

The unfriendly and belligerent sentiment expressed by the executive branch of the Government toward nations with which the United States enjoys peaceful relations will subject every word and every delegation of power in the Bloom bill to the closest scrutiny to ascertain wherein its provisions favor one nation against the interest of another.

The efforts of the Congress to enact neutrality legislation has been frustrated, made utterly futile by the reckless public utterances of the very officials this bill proposes to clothe with powers to execute and enforce its provisions. I deplore the fact that the Congress should be placed in such an embarrassing position; but such being the situation, I firmly believe that if Congress feels impelled to speak on the subject, then a declaration by the Congress to adhere to the rules of neutrality under international law would be the only safe, fair, open, and above-board course to follow. This, at least, would be notice to all nations that the House of Representatives, reflecting the sentiment of 130,000,000 people, proposes that the United States, impelled by the traditions of the past, convinced by the logic of experience, and actuated by the hope that eventually nations will build upon the foundations of law and not force—that the United States will hold itself apart from conflicts that may arise among nations with which this Republic is at peace. This would be a contribution to a better feeling among nations.

It is impossible to enact this legislation, tainted as it is with an effort to yield the issue of impartiality into biased and hostile hands, without placing the United States in a most compromising position. Under the Bloom bill the President is given unlimited power. It gives him dictatorial power to decide the issue of peace or war. If the House is determined to pass the Bloom proposal for the purpose of Executive appeasement, then the measure should be amended by adding provisions to keep this country out of war. I would not give the President power to decide combat areas or the issue of war or peace, but if such a provision is to be included, then let it be defined, for example, "when and if armed forces cross the boundaries of another country." The President acted on that fact in Ethiopia but he did not so act upon the same fact in the case of China.

Let it be provided in the bill that Americans who sail on belligerent ships do so at their own risk and provide that this be written into their passports. If the membership of this House shall insist that this Nation shall become the arsenal for favored belligerents, then provide that all contraband goods shall be sold on a cash-and-carry basis.

I repeat again that this Bloom bill should be recommitted. The closing days of a session of Congress is not the time to hurriedly formulate and rush through legislation of such transcendent and far-reaching importance.

I would respectfully remind my colleagues that much of the distress to which this Nation has been subjected had its inception in our departure, during the World War, from the traditional policy of neutrality under international law. I wish to fix the exact time and the circumstances when the Government took this fatal step. If you will examine the Democratic Congressional Campaign Book of 1914 you will find an explanation by Secretary of State William J. Bryan of the Wilson position on neutrality. Here is what Secretary Bryan said:

It is inconsistent with the spirit of neutrality for a neutral nation to make loans to belligerent nations, for money is the worst of contrabands—it commands all other things. A very forcible illustration has been used in support of this proposition, namely, that, as a neutral government does all in its power to discourage its citizens from enlisting in the armies of other countries, it should discourage those who by loaning money, would do more harm than they could do by enlisting. The Government withdraws the protection of citizenship from those who enlist under other flags—why should it give protection to money when it enters into foreign military service? There is only one answer.

This position on neutrality, taken in 1914, was abandoned in 1915 when President Wilson gave his consent to the first Anglo-French loan. I say here and now that the essence of neutrality is the equal treatment of the opposing sides, and whenever a nation that assumes to be neutral deviates from this course it sooner or later becomes involved as one of the belligerents.

The only escape the people have from participating in a foreign war is to preserve strict neutrality, and the constitutional means to that end is through the legislative branch of the Government. I hope this House will today assume its full constitutional responsibility as the guardian of the peace of this country. This can be done by the defeat of the Bloom bill or by its recommittal to insure a return to our traditional practice of insisting upon neutrality as defined and enforced by international law. I am opposed to the Bloom bill as a dangerous departure from real neutrality.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago today the Treaty of Versailles was signed. It was erroneously called a treaty of peace, a settlement of the war "to make the world safe for democracy," the "war to end wars." After the signing of the treaty Woodrow Wilson cabled the American people that the treaty would be "the charter for a new order of affairs in the world." He envisioned the United States as a member of the League of Nations, thereby binding our country to help enforce the provisions of that treaty that was founded, not on peace, but upon the hatred and the conflicts that had been a part of the life of the nations of the Old World for more than a thousand years.

During the time of the writing of this treaty, and during the controversy in the Senate of the United States over its

ratification, President Roosevelt was a part of the Wilson administration in the capacity of an Assistant Secretary of the Navy. Then too he occupied that position in the administration during the fight to drag the United States into the League of Nations. As a candidate for Vice President in 1920 he advocated our entrance into the League.

Today, as President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt carries on the theorist's dream that would make us a part of the jealousies and strife of the Old World.

The pending so-called neutrality resolution is known to have the support of the administration. It was reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with the recommendation that the resolution be passed.

Section 3 of the resolution provides, as follows:

> Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a)—
>
> Finding that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and so forth—
>
> and he shall thereafter find that the protection of citizens of the United States so requires, he shall issue a proclamation, whereupon it shall be unlawful, except under such limitations not inconsistent with the provisions of this joint resolution as the President may prescribe, for citizens of the United States or vessels flying the flag of the United States to proceed through any areas defined from time to time by the President to be areas of combat operations and as specified in his proclamation.

As is pointed out in the minority report of the committee:

> Under this authority the President may also prescribe any limitations or exceptions he may desire upon the travel of American citizens or vessels any place in the world, outside an American republic. This power is without precedent in American history; with this power the President can effectively quarantine an aggressor from American ships and citizens by simply naming the aggressor as a "combat area."

We well remember that speeches in which talk of "determining the aggressor" and threats of "quarantine" and resort to "methods short of war" were heard. We all know that economic war can be just as deadly and end just as disastrously as any war begun with bullets. The policy of the administration to the contrary notwithstanding, the United States and especially its President, whether he be Woodrow Wilson or Franklin D. Roosevelt, or whoever he may be, is not destined to superimpose any judgment on foreign nations in their age-old controversies and, further, has no commission—except perhaps self-styled—to play the role of policeman to the world.

Mr. Chairman, we want no part of the dictatorships of the Old World. May the day never come in America when any one man, be he ever so great and ever so good, shall have the power, lonehanded, to involve us in a conflict that will only end with the marching off to slaughter of the youth of America.

We cannot assure neutrality for America by the mere enactment of laws. It is not possible to write a neutrality law that will keep us out of war if our foreign policy is unneutral, if we continue to talk of and endeavor to put into operation "economic sanctions," "quarantine," and "methods short of war."

Wars do not begin in these days by formal declarations. Rather they begin with the movement of troops and the crack of rifles. If we involve ourselves in the controversies of foreign nations we will have a war, despite all our efforts at writing neutrality laws, and all the strifes and controversies of Europe and Asia combined are not worth the shedding of the blood of American men and women.

We will have more at stake in the next war than the loss of physical assets—even more than the loss of lives of those men and women who would answer the call when their country called. Democracy is on trial. Since the close of the World War more than 20 democracies have "folded up." The future of democracy depends upon its success in the United States. We can do more for the peace and the happiness of the world by making democracy work at home than by assuming the role of policeman for the world and in so doing jeopardize those very rights and liberties that some seem anxious to have us fight to preserve.

More than added laws on our statute books, America needs men in public office who will not throw bitter epithets across the seas—men who realize their own limitations and do not feel the impulse to rule the world—men who are endowed with a little of that sense of brotherhood and respect for the rights and opinions of others that are so essential to the realization of peace, not only in the world, but here at home as well. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES].

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bloom neutrality bill inviting us to get into another world war. I voice the protest of practically every citizen of my district. Not one has asked me to support it. I have here scores of letters and a list of 870 names of people who have written me, and I may say these letters have come in within the past 2 days, all opposing this bill. Not one single soul in the State of Wisconsin has written asking me to support this bill.

I speak for more than that. The voiceless lips and silent tongues of 50,000 American soldiers and sailor dead call to me to oppose this bill leading us into war.

We do not check depredations of international outlaws by reading them statutory homilies on neutrality. This law would be ineffective and as impotent as was the Covenant of the League of Nations—the world's greatest gesture at a neutrality law—to save Manchuria, to preserve Ethiopia, to guaranty the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia, or to hold back the bloody surgery of Japan in its dismemberment of China.

> Why give up our own to stand on foreign ground?

On this question of neutrality there is a saving grace from casuistry, sophistry, and fatal promise, in the words of James Madison:

> We are always to keep in mind that it is safer to trust the consequences of a right principle than reassurings in support of a bad one.

In our relations with foreign nations we have a right principle, international law; the bad one, un-American in its conception, useless in its application, statutory neutrality.

I may here call the attention of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to the singular fact that his quotations from Washington, which he read to bolster his support of his bill, referred basically to the international code and to no statutory regulations. President Washington was speaking in an advisory capacity as well. The treatises of Grotious had been written a hundred years. That was the first attempt to set down international law in orderly form.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a volume of the United States Statutes of the Thirteenth and Seventeenth Congresses, from 1813 to 1823. On page 447 you will find a neutrality law, which is the law of 1818. It had to do with the shipment of arms. It was an embargo against the shipment of arms and was the statutory law of the United States on neutrality until 1937, although, may I say, it was scrapped by President Wilson in order to provide him with an excuse to get into the World War in 1917.

Diplomacy and its code—international law—are the outgrowth of the conflict of nations in recent centuries, the slow but steady development and triumph of justice and the principles of humanity over tyranny and force, resulting in the amelioration of the horrors of war and the greater reign of reason. Diplomatic history treats of high motives and the progress of just principles, and in recent times the wars of the nations and their political disputes have resulted in the evolution of a recognized code of universal and impartial justice as applied to the governments of the world. There is no more striking illustration of this fact than the diplomatic history of the United States. A new nation in a new world, untrammeled by the traditions and institutions of past ages, born to power and greatness almost in a day—from the beginning of its political existence it made itself the champion of a freer commerce, of a sincere and genuine neutrality, of respect for private property in war, of the most advanced ideas of natural

rights and justice; and in its brief existence of a century, by its example and its persistent diplomatic advocacy, it has exerted a greater influence in the recognition of these elevated principles than any other nation of the world.

Before the Constitution was adopted Benjamin Franklin had long advocated principles of neutrality, which was to mind our own business. He advocated an end to privateering and the exemption of private property on the sea from confiscation in war. It was called "a beautiful abstraction," "a dream of the philosopher who thought to mitigate the cruelties of war." These provisions were incorporated in our first treaty with Prussia in 1785. When the treaty came to be renewed in 1799, these provisions were omitted.

In the declaration of Paris in 1856, adopted by the great powers of Europe, privateering was abolished. We advocated at that time as an amendment that private property of belligerents at sea be exempt from capture. Because of refusal of the great powers to admit that principle, the adhesion of the United States to the Paris declaration was withheld. While many treaties were adopted before the Constitution, they have strong influence upon our early diplomacy and relationship with other nations. We were willing to consecrate these advanced principles with greater guaranties and privileges to commerce and the recognition of a genuine neutrality not born of statute law but as a measure instigated by a recognition of international rights and to alleviate the horrors of war with restraint upon its destructive propensities.

We began in this world as a new Nation, with a definitely declared idea that difficulties between nations involving ourselves might better be settled by arbitration.

Suddenly the United States was confronted with its first and greatest decision. The new nation must either become an ally of a nation in Europe or choose isolation without entangling foreign alliances. It was a critical moment. France in war with most of Europe demanded we discharge our obligation under the treaty of 1778. Great Britain said if we did it would be tantamount to a war against her. Enter then the people. There was a great popular cry to support their friend of the Revolution.

But a change came. The bloody excesses of the French Revolution smeared the treaty of 1778 and blotted it out. Jefferson alone stood for keeping our obligation. The conflict raged. Washington thereupon issued a proclamation of neutrality. What the chairman of the committee read here yesterday as that proclamation was written by Attorney General Edmund Randolph. It was not produced under any statutory law but under international law as a base, but also molding a new structure and having a greater influence on international law than any single document in a hundred years. It was the first neutrality proclamation ever issued by any head of any nation in the world's history.

And there was no Bloom bill to guide either Edmund Randolph or George Washington.

Madison expressed his extreme regret at the President's action and declared:

> The proclamation was in truth a most unfortunate error. * * * It will be a millstone which would sink any other character.

Jefferson expressed his disgust at the proclamation.

The power of the President to issue such a proclamation, without any domestic legislation respecting offenses against neutrality, was seriously questioned, and the next year, in 1794, an act was passed defining what were offenses against neutrality. That was our first real neutrality act. It had its foundation on international law. It was carefully revised in 1818 and remained unaltered until the passage of the neutrality law of 1936.

This law forbids any person to enlist within the United States to serve against a country at peace with the United States; to fit out or aid in fitting out vessels; or to set on foot, or prepare the means to set on foot, any military expedition against a friendly nation. It, however, does not prohibit the sale and shipment of arms or warlike supplies, this being recognized as a legitimate commercial enterprise, but such articles become subject to confiscation by the belligerents as contraband of war.

During this period of 100 years since 1818 to 1918 Europe fought a score of wars. We got into none of them. Territories were annexed, boundaries changed, kingdoms were absorbed; Poland and Hungary, Greece and Italy, Spain and France, Prussia and Austria, Russia and Turkey, all were in wars. Schleswig-Holstein was lost to Denmark, Alsace-Lorraine to France.

Did the White House issue letters or proclamations? No. We minded our own business, kept our home fires burning, busy in building the greatest Nation since God said, "Let there be light."

The Holy Alliance died, the flags of Spain and Portugal were hauled down from the flagstaffs of the American Continent, the Monroe Doctrine was born.

Our ships sailed the seven seas carrying our commerce. We kept our fingers out of the international buzz saw.

Only once did we go out with our Navy to do police duty. The daring Decatur, glamorous figure of our Navy, with a few soldiers and sailors brought the Barbary pirates to their knees and halted for all time the exaction of tribute.

Having these pages of history in mind, having the picture of the utter failure of our neutrality in the World War—even the law of 1818—and since the adoption of the present law, why proceed to the reassurings of a questionable law?

Neutrality is a question of national honor. You cannot legislate honor into anybody. You may incite enmity or establish fear—not honor.

Neutrality is no remedy for war. It will not stop war. It is more likely to incite war when written into statute law and power be given to an Executive to administer it.

It is appalling to know that from the day Christ was crucified on Calvary there has never been a year without a conflict of arms, either a civil war, international duel, or one involving many nations; and the two moving causes of war have been attributes of human nature expressed in individuals and spread to groups and later to be all-embracing for all peoples. They are: Greed—to get what others have; self-defense—to hold what one has and get more if possible.

Greed has been the impulse of war. It conquered and enslaved. It hitched human beings to chariot wheels. It looted cities and carried off women and slew the men. It made armies and navies. It filled a room full of gold belonging to the Incas and treacherously slew the giver. It stole from savage Indian and cheated him in payments. It tortured and squeezed and trampled, ravaged, and raped, steaming its face in the hot blood of a thousand million victims. It died as it lived, perished as it performed, by the sword. It made Alexander weep and filled Caesar with ambition. Greed is like the Illinois farmer who said he wanted no more land, "only what j'ined his'n." On the other hand, the nation attacked summoned its array and defended frequently to make sortie, win a war, and levy tribute on the aggressor.

Let us expand these two causes of war and see if there is a justification for any war that has been fought, if we can visualize the aggressor and the other party to war.

(1) Desire for power and territory.

(2) Desire for plunder and loot.

(3) Ambition to rule in place of another.

(4) Religious wars—Moslem and Christian.

(5) Desire for greater self-expression culminating in revolution.

(6) Support of a ruling family in some nation other than the one making wars.

(7) No just cause but under treaty contract to become an ally.

(8) Desire for trade monopoly.

(9) Protection of a nation's interests in another country.

(10) Protection of concessions made by one nation to another.

(11) Pique, pride, and egotism.

I know of no other causes that are not expansions of these 12. All are based on the original two I have named. We have written our histories in blood. The procession of the years has pages blotted with sanguinary illustration. We have apotheosized heroes of conflict until we have forgotten about the common people. I want to know more about

those masses, those great populations who toiled and staggered under taxation to make armor and armies. I want to know how these men and women with families, sordid and simple, it is true as they were, filled with superstition and fear—how they looked upon war. I would like to know how this common man liked the toil of march and the terror of battle. Did he welcome death as a release? Did he rejoice in conquest as his leader did—in drunkenness and debauchery and lechery, his exploits sung by a court fool to the music of the lyre. I do not know that he was awed by every natural phenomena and omens and signs were his daily portion. What matter now that we have reduced to mathematical formulas those things that were considered manifestations of a Jehovah or of a demon. We are still afraid. We have made war more terrible. Saul slew his thousands, David his ten thousands, but modern mechanized war slays its millions. It is this fear of war that brings war and so long as there is that physical fear we shall in wisdom be prepared to fend off an enemy.

Fear served its purpose during our colonial days. We joined in the wars which ravaged Europe by fighting for England in America. We went forth on the high seas as privateers seeking Spanish galleons and were just a little short of piracy in the law of admiralty. We fought the French and Indians because they were allies against Britain. We took scalps because that was a token of our prowess. We became as savage as the savage because of war's brutalities. We did heroic, dangerous, and daring things for that was in our blood to so perform. We met treachery with honesty. We wore our own home-made uniforms and fought for King William and Queen Anne and King George. We helped make a present of Canada to the British to have and to hold forever, but we also opened the way to the Ohio for Yankee pioneers by saving Braddock's army from utter rout.

Napoleon said, in his cold blood, that one could not make an omelet without breaking eggs. We could not have peace, independence, a constitution, or a government over here unless we had fought the war of the American Revolution. The alternative was being a subject people and there was little in the atmosphere here which would permit such an existence.

I am not apologizing for that war. I say that if there is any glory in being a citizen of the United States, it came from that war. It wrote something into the minds of the people that had never been there before. It was the expression, "We the people." Magna Carta wrested from King John by the barons of England did not have that as an expression meaning what it did after Yorktown. That war lighted the lamp of liberty, set it on a high hill, a beacon to all nations. "Take hope," it said to all outraged people. "The star of liberty is shining for you. There will come a day when you can think and speak and not be sent to prison or executed" From that day to this mankind has been traveling upward with plodding though often with weary feet to the establishment of freedom for humanity. Often we have seen only "as through a glass darkly" but some day we shall be face to face. And we fought another war to preserve the geography as well as the principles of that nation so ordained.

I am opposed to war as a settlement of any question arising between established nations. Any such war can be settled by peaceful arbitration.

For any of these purposes before recited a nation starting a war will be guilty per se of international offenses. How can a nation be stopped if in its management it desires war? What will stop it? It cannot be done by a neutrality law. There are responsible nations as well as irresponsible ones. Nations are exactly like people in every community. When human beings are perfect, when man no longer is selfish, when Christ's Golden Rule animates the human race, when we have erased poverty and greed and stupendous riches that flaunt themselves in the faces of the poor and capable, when we have given greater time to giving than we have to getting, we may be able to shout to nations spread all over the world that we want peace and intend to have it, for in peace we have the highest expression of man's spiritual elevation and Christ-like interpretation of consideration for the rights of others.

Until then there will always be danger of war somewhere. When the footsteps of man are walking, the path lighted from the incandescence of the Holy Grail, we shall have no more wars. When we can sleep without policemen we shall have no wars. When bandits cease to rob and kill we shall have no more war. When thieves no longer break through and steal we shall have no more war. When we are willing to live with neighbors without lawsuits we shall have no more war. When we are more concerned with giving than grabbing we shall have peace. Not until then—never. Until then we shall always have the danger hanging over us. There are reckless drivers on the international highways even as there are reckless ones on the roads of America.

Our answer must be an America for Americans. Every letter I receive, hundreds of them, plead with me to give the President no more power for war. They cry out to let Congress and the people decide.

I shall vote to support the people and George Washington.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably and unequivocally opposed to this bill. I am opposed to it because it is not a neutrality bill but rather is it an un-American, 10 Downing Street bill. It is a most brazen attempt to write into law a policy of intervention in the existing international racket of finance and munitions manufacturing. It is a deliberate and considered legislative proposal which will lead this Nation into the snare and the delusion of British political and financial chicanery and treachery. It is a practical legislative answer to the prayer of British propagandists that we repeal or effectively annul the present barriers to American involvement in the European mire once again. Mark me well, Mr. Chairman, the next British proposal to this House, and in the near future, will be a play for debt settlement on the basis of a dime on the dollar. First, this British attempt to make the United States an arms and munitions hell for her own purposes and then the next logical step will develop whereby we shall be asked to soften the provision of the Johnson Act to finance our poor, innocent British cousins in their struggle to continue their position of domination in world trade and world finance. I am not going to be a sucker for the devilish intrigue and propaganda now being dished out to us once again as window dressing for the purpose of a repeat sale of the 1917 gold brick.

In conformity with this attitude, on the 6th of June I introduced in this House a bill to amend the so-called Johnson Act, an act entitled "An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States." The purpose of my bill was twofold. First, it defined the term "default" by inserting under section 2 of the aforesaid act the following new subsection:

(b) For the purposes of this act, a foreign government, political subdivision, organization, or association shall be deemed to be in default in the payment of its obligations to the United States whenever any amount of principal or interest of any such obligation is due and unpaid according to the terms of such obligation. Such default shall not be deemed to be cured or to have been cured by renewal, adjustment, waiver, part or token payment, or any other act constituting less than full and complete payment of such obligation according to its terms.

Secondly, my bill proposes further to amend such act by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

SEC. 3. In the event that any foreign government or political subdivision thereof or any organization or association acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof which is in default in the payment of its obligations or any part thereof to the Government of the United States, cures such default as provided for in subsection (b) of section 2 as hereinabove amended, the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States," approved April 13, 1934, as herein amended, shall continue to apply until a period of time, equal to the period of time between the original date of

default and the date of curing such default as hereinabove provided for, shall have elapsed subsequent to such curing of default.

The purpose of my proposed amendments to the so-called Johnson Act, Mr. Chairman, is to insure that no financial legerdemain be performed by schemers at home or abroad to tear down the protection of that act by paying pennies where dollars are due, and to provide that these long-forgetful but now suddenly penitent foreign debt defaulters, should they, in any way, shape, or manner, make settlement of these debts to us, be made to wait as long thereafter to borrow from us as they waited to pay after existing debts were due. The intent is to let them make settlement, if they will, and then permit them to prove the sincerity of their new-found honesty by waiting awhile before again attempting to make suckers of the people of the United States.

My bill is now in the hands of the Committee on Foreign Affairs where, because of the approaching termination of this session, I fear, even as the international bankers and the scheming diplomats of Europe undoubtedly fervently hope, it will die.

It was my intention, Mr. Chairman, to offer that same proposal as an amendment to this misnamed neutrality bill, but the Parliamentarian of the House has deemed its subject matter not germane to the pending bill. I bow, therefore, to the superior wisdom of the Parliamentarian insofar as parliamentary limitations are concerned. But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the gentlemen of this House that the question of defaulted debts and the whole subject of financial relations between this Nation and its European debtors are not only germane to any discussion of neutrality and the preservation thereof but are predominantly vital factors in any such discussion. And I say to you that the movement is and has long been under way so to aline this Nation with certain foreign debt defaulters as to make the United States the avowed ally of those foreign debt defaulters and their protector against their enemies—a movement so far advanced that, by means of stringent legislation to defeat financial trickery alone, may we hope to preserve even the ghost of neutrality or swerve this Nation from a path inevitably destined to plunge us into war.

Upon the occasion of my introduction of this bill to amend the Johnson act, Mr. Chairman, I invited the attention of this House to the then awaited visit of the King and Queen of England, a visit in my opinion deliberately planned to set the stage for the opening of debt-settlement discussions, probably on a dime-on-the-dollar basis. I invited attention to the fact that any such settlement would tear away the protection of the Johnson Act and enable these war-threatening Europeans to raid our Treasury anew for their warring, leaving Uncle Sam to hold the bag as they did two decades ago. And, Mr. Chairman, I asked what intelligent American, guiltless of ulterior motive, is willing to see that protection destroyed and to send our wealth again to the warmongers of Europe, to set aflame the seething hell of hates and touch off the volcano of destruction, to permit these foreigners to squander first our money for their warring and then the flower of our manhood to snatch them from their self-dug pit.

I held then, and I hold now, that the visit of royalty was but part and parcel of a deliberate plan to effect such picayune settlement of Great Britain's long-defaulted debt to us as would enable that nation to victimize Uncle Sam anew. Let the skeptic but weigh the indisputable evidence blazoned for all to see in the public press. If there be doubt that this visit of royalty was impelled, not by sincere friendliness, such as motivates the visit of a good neighbor, but by the selfish desire of Britain's schemers to open the way to financial dealings directed toward destroying the protection of the Johnson Act, let the doubter but read the International News Service dispatch sent from London under date of June 22 containing the following:

Harried by totalitarian foes on both ends of Eurasia, Great Britain today negotiated a move to seek a debt settlement with the United States and thereby consolidate advantages gained by the King's visit to America on the day of His Majesty's return.

Instructions already have been sent to Sir Ronald Lindsay, the Ambassdor in Washington, to approach Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and negotiate a solution satisfactory to both countries.

Sir Ronald was told to point out that while the debt cannot be paid in full, either the principal or interest might be paid, preferably the principal.

The Cabinet was understood to be in agreement that it might be necessary, because of the heavy rearmament drain on British finances, to raise a loan to begin reservicing the American debt.

Such a loan also would be available to Americans on the assumption that renewal of payments would lower the bars of the Johnson Act.

There we have it, Mr. Chairman, out in the open and rancid with unabashed British gall. "A move to seek a debt settlement, and thereby consolidate advantages gained by the King's visit to America." "Negotiate a solution satisfactory to both countries." "While the debt cannot be paid in full." "To raise a loan to begin reservicing the American debt." And, with unmitigated gall, the British propose to make that loan available to Americans "on the assumption that renewal of payments would lower the bars of the Johnson Act." They propose to let our own citizens lend them the money with which to pay off such fraction of what they owe this Government as will enable them to lower the bars of the Johnson Act and so be free to raid our wealth anew. "And thereby consolidate advantages gained by the King's visit to America."

And, if that evidence proves insufficient to convince the skeptic, Mr. Chairman, let him weigh the King's own words, spoken at a state luncheon in London on June 23, 1939, as reported in a dispatch by the Associated Press:

King George reported formally today on this regal job of selling Great Britain to the United States * * * by modestly asserting that he and Queen Elizabeth had "in some sort succeeded" in their mission.

What sort of friends are these, Mr. Chairman, who speak of advantages gained from a neighborly visit and refer to that visit as a mission in some sort successful? What good neighbor, guiltless of ulterior motive, visits his neighbors with intent to gain advantages over them or refers to such visits as "missions"? What sort of neighbor would men deem such a one as came under the guise of neighborly affection only to confess his visit but a brazen attempt to take advantage of them and openly to boast of having succeeded in that mission?

Why continue such transparent hypocrisy when we and all other intelligent Americans well know that the advantages sought by the recently staged Charlie McCarthy act with wily Chamberlain in the role of Bergen were opportunities to tear down the protection of the Johnson Act, to inveigle this Government into letting Great Britain escape paying her long-defaulted debt in honest fashion, to open the way for a new assault upon first our material resources and then our finances and, inevitably at last, upon our sympathy to the end that the might of our arms be turned once again to save Great Britain from the fruit of the folly of her leaders?

Nor is this desire to make dupes of the American people confined to British minds alone, Mr. Chairman. Already the propagandists of the international bankers and of others seeking profit bring forth their song of Circe in eagerness to befuddle and beguile the minds of the American people, to soften them for the killing.

Speaking of propaganda, it is my intention to ask for unanimous consent in the House to insert at this point certain statements with reference to propaganda of the past and propaganda which we may expect in the future as this war and munitions racket becomes more intensely developed.

The excerpts to which I refer are taken from publication No. 10 of volume 2 of the Propaganda Analysis, published by the Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc., 130 Morningside Drive, New York City, which is entitled "Britain Woos America" and reads as follows:

Propaganda alone will not win the next war, but it will help. Of this all statesmen are convinced. Day by day, since 1914, propaganda has become more and more important to government, and especially in time of war. No sooner did we declare war against Germany in 1917, for example, than President Wilson appointed

George Creel to organize the Committee on Public Information; and on the Committee he put the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of State. Lord Northcliffe's work in the British Ministry of Propaganda helped to crack German resistance, not alone in the front-line trenches but also behind the lines. When the Italian armies went into Ethiopia, with them went specially trained propaganda experts, who could speak English, French, and German and had first-hand acquaintance with American, French, and British newspaper methods.

In Germany, where the war machine is most highly developed and where all industry already is organized for war, the leading figure, next to Adolf Hitler and Field Marshal Hermann Goering, is Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels, the Minister of Propaganda and Public Enlightenment. And rightly so, for propaganda has been Germany's advance guard in her Drang nach Osten. If Germany walked into Austria, Sudentenland, and Czechoslovakia without resistance, it was partly because her propaganda had undermined resistance first.

Britain knows this only too well. It cannot have been entirely by accident that Propaganda in the Next War, by Capt. Sidney Rogerson, is third in the series of books on The Next War, edited by Capt. Lidell Hart, Britain's foremost writer on military affairs. First in the series is Sea Power in the Next War; Britain's strength lies in her control of the seas. Second is Air Power in the Next War; air power is considered the "great imponderable." Then comes Propaganda in the Next War. The next war, says Captain Rogerson, "will greatly increase the importance of propaganda, especially among the citizens of the home front, not only to stiffen their morale against the threat from the air, but to instruct them in the technique for meeting it."

Already Britain has begun to build up her propaganda armaments, though in much the same leisurely fashion in which she is building up her military armaments. For years German and Italian radio stations have been whipping up Egypt and the Near East with propaganda broadcasts in Arabic. In self-defense Britain last year inaugurated Arabic-language broadcasts, too. Since the Munich crisis the short-wave station at Daventry has been sending out news broadcasts in German, broadcasts which are causing so much trouble for the Nazi Government that when Adolph Hitler delivered his Wilhelmshaven address every newspaper in Germany is reported to have reprinted the penalties for repeating or publishing them.

Moreover, there is talk in Britain of reviving the old Ministry of Propaganda. "We need it to fill a glaring gap in our defense system" noted Commander Stephen King-Hall's news letter recently.

If war comes, Britain's propagandists will have to fight on four different fronts. At home they will have to bolster morale, prod the people into hatred of the enemey, keep them from cracking as casualties mount and terrifying air raids blast homes and factories to debris. Behind the enemy lines they will fight to destroy morale. Abroad, in the colonies and in the dominions, they will fight to put down unrest, wipe out disloyalty to King and mother country. In Egypt, in Palestine, throughout India, and even in some of the dominions there are those who hate British rule. For years they have been agitating to shake it off. If Britain goes to war, will not these malcontents seize their opportunity to revolt?

The United States will be the fourth great propaganda battleground, as, indeed, will be all the neutral countries. Britain might have been able to defeat Germany in 1918 even if the United States had not entered the war. But if Britain could not have borrowed money here, if Britain could not have bought food and munitions, the peace treaty might have been made at Berlin, not Versailles. It may be that Britain and her allies will have an easier time in the next war than in the last. Nevertheless, they will feel infinitely more confident if they have what Captain Rogerson calls our "benevolent neutrality." At the very least, the British would probably like the United States to repeal the Johnson Act, to amend—if not repeal—the Neutrality Act. Britain would like to borrow from us and to buy munitions from us, and it can do neither if those acts remain in force.

At this time I will quote for the purpose of emphasis one paragraph which I believe is particularly interesting in view of my pending amendments to the Johnson Act which comprise the basis for these remarks of mine:

The United States will be the fourth great propaganda battleground as indeed will be all the neutral countries. Britain might have been able to defeat Germany in 1918 even if the United States had not entered the war. But if Britain could not have borrowed money here, if Britain could not have bought food and munitions, the peace treaty might have been made at Berlin, not Versailles. It may be that Britain and her allies will have an easier time in the next war than in the last. Nevertheless, they will feel infinitely more confident if they have what Captain Rogerson calls our "benevolent neutrality." At the very least, the British would probably like the United States to repeal the Johnson Act, to amend—if not repeal—the Neutrality Act. Britain would like to borrow from us, and to buy munitions from us, and it can do neither if those acts remain in force.

So far has this poison spread that a United Press dispatch from Tulsa, Okla., dated June 24, tells us that the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in convention assembled had before it a resolution approving "a plan for creating a war-debt commission to examine methods suggested for payment of war debts." Could there be any relationship between that resolution and another likewise before the junior chamber recommending military training of enrollees in all C. C. C. camps?

What profits any discussion of neutrality or any effort to insure neutrality which ignores the deadly peril lurking behind this talk of war-debt settlement? What profits such discussion or effort in the face of the fact that all men know the fondness displayed by this administration for Great Britain and her allies as against the totalitarian countries? The constant presence of our Ambassador at the conferences of Britain's leaders during the crisis attendant upon the shame of Munich, the blustering of our President as he cried to the totalitarian countries the threat of meeting force with force, the magnificence of the welcome accorded Britain's King and Queen, and now this sudden desire to settle debts long ignored and to make friends of a people long sneered at as Shylocks, where, Mr. Chairman, can such manifestations find place in a picture of neutrality?

I say to you that they can find no place in such picture. And I say to you that no neutrality legislation can be worth a continental unless that legislation considers and embraces such financial aspects of the relations between this and other nations as are represented by these long-defaulted debts and this sudden fanfare concerning settlement.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, it seems quite apparent to me that we have only two courses to pursue in the light of our experience of 1917 and the international situation which exists today:

One is the course of intervention by the United States in world politics, world intrigue, and world prejudices. The pending bill and the announced program of the President and the Secretary of State will inevitably lead us along this road to involvement and intervention.

On the other hand, we have the traditional American course of isolation. This course is predicated on our historical position of no entangling foreign alliances. If we choose to take this course, then we should establish more mandatory embargoes on arms, munitions, and materials of warfare. We should determine our own program and our own destiny on a nationalistic basis. We should force ourselves to a complete severance from the involving processes incident to and necessary for the continuation of the racket of international finance, economy, and double-crossing diplomacy. My vote will be recorded not only in support of isolation but also in support of measures which will insulate that isolation.

A law strengthening the loan prohibition of the Johnson Act would be a long step forward in the development of that insulation.

What better measure of assurance of neutrality and the prolongation of world peace could be devised than that which would prohibit the acquisition of that money and that support without which the guns of Europe must remain mute?

The Johnson Act is a tremendous headache to those who would involve us in the international maelstrom. In the interests of neutrality and isolation it must be strengthened. Let the pending bill be defeated and let us enact legislation designed to keep this Nation out of foreign wars.

The amendments which I have proposed to the Johnson Act will help materially to effect this purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the district which I represent, in the very heart of Ohio, is a typical American district. It is one of the great agricultural districts of America. While it has no large cities within its borders, it does contain numerous small industrial centers, the products of which are known and used throughout the world. Settled more than a

hundred and twenty-five years ago by pioneers from Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New England, the citizenship of the district is almost entirely native-born. We have no foreign population; no class ties with lands across the seas; no attachments to any other flag or government except the American flag and the Government of the United States. Our citizens have proven their patriotism and their love of country by answering the call to the colors in every conflict in which the United States has taken part. Gallant sons lie buried on every battlefield where the American flag has led our troops.

My constituents hate war. They love peace.

It is in such a citizenship that I believe you can find the truly American viewpoint concerning the problem that confronts us today. The farmers, the workmen, the businessmen, and all the other citizens of my district realize the threat of war that hangs like a black cloud over the so-called civilized world in which we live. They are fully informed as to the content, the intent, and the portent of the legislation we are now considering here. They know the recorded history of the 6,000 years of warfare in the Orient and are fully aware that for almost 3,000 years Europe has echoed to the march of armed men and has been ruled by military might and power.

The World War and the sacrifices it demanded are still a vivid memory. The futile attempt of the League of Nations to bring peace and order is known to all. They watched as the civilized world stood by during the ravishment of defenseless Ethiopia. They have shuddered at the atrocities of the undeclared war in China, as that helpless nation fell victim before the armed might of an invader despite the solemn pledges of nine great civilized powers to protect her territorial and political integrity. They remember the fate of Austria and Albania. The crisis of last September and the total disregard of solemn treaties that brought about the sacrifice of gallant little Czechoslovakia on the altar of European power politics is still a fresh memory.

They know that free and representative government has practically disappeared across the seas. They realize that another great holocaust of war threatens civilization.

They know we have had a neutrality law in the past—one which gave to the President power and authority to declare a state of war existing, and that placed an embargo on the shipment of war materials to warring nations. They know, too, that the President has not yet, officially at least, recognized that a state of war exists in China. They do not question but that our President of today wants peace to continue. However, they cannot help but remember that another President was reelected in 1916 on the campaign cry of "He kept us out of war," and that within 6 months thereafter America entered the World War.

They believe that many of the statements in reference to the international situation attributed to the President have not been diplomatic or conducive to peaceful foreign relations. Remembering the words of Washington, they are opposed to foreign entanglements. Still suffering from American losses of men, money, and materials in the World War, they are determined that we not become involved in another. Realizing that our country is the last stronghold of democracy, they believe we can best serve democracy by protecting and preserving it rather than by risking it as a pawn in the game of internationalism in which we have no real national interest. Believing in constitutional government, they demand and insist that the Congress retain unto itself the power, the right, and the responsibility to speak for the people as to war or peace. They insist that the power of the President of the United States be limited to that given the Chief Executive by the Constitution.

The people of my district are opposed to the Bloom neutrality bill. They know we cannot legislate peace, but that we may legislate war. They insist that America play no part in the power politics of Europe. They believe the way for us to stay out of war is to keep out of European and international affairs; to attend to our own business and to permit other nations to attend to theirs; to straighten out our own domestic affairs before attempting to dictate to the peoples of other lands; to be prepared to fight to the death to defend our own land, but to refuse to send a single American soldier to fight on foreign soil.

Such are the almost unanimous opinions and desires of the people of a typical American district. I believe the great proportion of all American citizens have the same opinions and desires.

Therefore, I shall vote against this bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, when we vote on this bill tomorrow or the next day our vote will be heard around the world. Our responsibility to the American people is a very heavy one. The Congress of the United States alone has the power to declare war. But today history has granted us an opportunity to prevent war, to so influence the course of world events that war in other parts of the world will be avoided and our own peace thereby assured.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and particularly the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], think the United States should not try to influence other nations. But the fact is that we have no choice in the matter. If we fail to pass this bill, if we follow the gentleman from New York, we shall none the less exert a profound influence on the decisions of other nations. We shall tell them, "If you want to plunge the whole world into war, that is all right with us. We mind our own business. Whatever you do, the United States will avert its eyes and with its hands tied behind its back give you free reign to rule and ruin the world." That is the message that Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese war machine are waiting for. That is the signal they hope to get from these shores; the green light for war they hope will be flashed from this House.

That is what the gentleman from New York and others call "refraining from influencing the decisions of other nations."

The American people are also awaiting our action.

They have already expressed themselves in thousands of letters, resolutions, petitions, and in the various polls of public opinion. The increasing popularity of President Roosevelt testifies to the popular support for his foreign policy which grows with the people's growing understanding of world events.

The majority of the American people overwhelmingly favor repeal of the mandatory arms embargo. They read the papers. They read of wars and the threat of more wars. They read that small nations have lost their independence and other small nations are threatened with invasion and annexation. They read that millions of soldiers are under arms and more millions being mobilized. And when they are told that the seat of the war danger is in the White House in Washington, the American people indignantly repudiate such slanders against their Government and their great President. They know better. They know the war makers.

The American people are not afraid to have the United States "influence" the decisions of the war makers. On the contrary, they demand that their country, the most rich and powerful in all the world, exercise to the full its moral and economic power to influence the decision for peace.

I am reluctant to believe that the Members of this distinguished body have less common sense than the people as a whole. All of us surely know that the war danger is real, and not a figment of the Roosevelt imagination. Did the President invent the death of independent Austria? Was the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia a hallucination of the Secretary of State? Is it just a New Deal nightmare that Poland is in danger? Is it only to the inward eye of Democrats that the war clouds are discernible today?

Even the most confirmed isolationists cannot deny the plain facts. But they evade the implications of those facts. The gentleman from New York yesterday cried out that the

President and Secretary Hull are and always have been "internationalists." That is supposed to be the worst name you can call a good American. The rich vocabulary of the gentleman from New York contains no worse epithet than "internationalist."

But let us look at this terrible word and see what it really means. An internationalist is one who admits that there are lands beyond the borders of the United States. He even admits that what happens in those lands may affect the American people, their trade, their prosperity, and their peace. Secretary Hull once voiced this terrible doctrine of internationalism in a very simple sentence. He said, "War anywhere threatens peace everywhere."

The Bloom bill also recognizes that war anywhere threatens peace everywhere. And in my opinion the passage of this bill will serve the interests of peace everywhere, by to some extent lessening the danger of war in Europe. To my mind the best proof that the Bloom bill will have this effect is to be found in the press of those nations which are today mobilizing and preparing for war. The American people, and the devotees of peace in every land, will welcome the passage of this bill as a step toward peace. But Rome and Berlin are shrieking that it is a form of "war-mongering," and Hitler and Mussolini, through their controlled press, tell us to vote down the Bloom bill. With whom are you going to vote? With the American people; or with the war lords of fascism?

The Bloom bill is a step toward peace. But in my opinion it is a hesitant step. I would prefer to see this country step out more firmly, more boldly, in the direction of blocking the way of those who prepare the mad adventure of war.

I hope that this House will write into the Bloom bill a statement of policy, along the lines of the bill introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Utah, Senator THOMAS, and in the House by myself. I hope we will incorporate in the Bloom bill some statement to the effect that it is contrary to the policy of the United States to sell arms, ammunition, or the raw materials of war to any nation which engages in an act of aggression against another nation. I hope we will make it a cardinal principle of American foreign policy to distinguish between treaty violators and those who adhere to their treaty obligations. I believe that the United States has the right, the duty, and the will to distinguish between right and wrong, between the innocent and the guilty. I believe it has the power and the prestige to makes its moral judgments felt in the world, without resort to arms.

I realize that the majority of the House does not share my views on this question, at least at the present time. But in respect to the far eastern situation I believe that the majority of the House, like the majority of the American people, has passed judgment. According to the last Gallup poll, 72 percent of the American people want an embargo against shipment of arms and raw materials to Japan. Are we going to implement the will of the people by amending the Bloom bill to end our participation in Japan's war guilt? I sincerely hope that we will.

At the present time the United States is the main arsenal from which Japan obtains the sinews of war. Without our complicity she could not continue to invade China and destroy the homes and the lives of millions of Chinese people. In my own district, out of the harbor of Los Angeles, I have watched the boats set sail loaded with oil, not for the lamps of China, but for the airplanes of Japan. I have seen the boats go out loaded with scrap iron, with precious cargoes of automobile parts, machinery for making arms, alloys, airplanes, and airplane parts. The Japanese plane which bombed the *Panay* moved under the power of American oil. The people of my district want this death trade stopped. They see with their own eyes how we build up and encourage the aggressor in the Far East. They want to end this suicidal policy, and they want to end it now.

In 1938 we supplied 56 percent of the most important war materials imported by Japan. This was an increase over 54.54 percent in 1937. We are selling more oil, more aircraft parts to Japan all the time. The more our own vital interests are involved in the Japanese aggressions in the Far East, the more fully we participate in helping the Japanese war machine to cut our own throats.

Recent developments in the Far East and the newest provocations of the Japanese militarists have been directed most dramatically against the interests of Great Britain. But there is no question that our own vital interests are also involved. I suppose we shall hear some more in the course of this debate of that old chestnut about pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire. I am not interested in England's chestnuts. But I am interested in the security of America. The policy of the present British Government is one which I cannot but regret. I should dislike very much to see us tie our own foreign policy to that of Mr. Chamberlain. But that is exactly what we shall be doing if we refuse to defend our own Far Eastern interests merely because Great Britain refuses to act. I hope that we shall pursue an independent and wholly American course in the Far East. I hope that regardless of what other nations do or fail to do, we shall wash our own hands clean of our present share in Japan's war guilt.

While I regard it as unfortunate that the Bloom bill as reported out of committee does not provide for an embargo against Japan, I believe that indirectly it will, even in its present form, influence events in Asia as well as in Europe. Japan remains tied to the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis and operates as an axis partner. Therefore the Bloom bill, by giving pause to Rome and Berlin, will inevitably make itself felt in Tokyo as well. I shall vote for any amendments to strengthen the Bloom bill further by incorporating in it specific legislation dealing with the Far East. But even if such amendments are defeated, I shall certainly vote for the Bloom bill as an instrument for peace and national defense. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the adoption of House Joint Resolution 306 now under consideration by the House. The preamble of this resolution reads as follows:

> Whereas the policy of the United States in foreign wars not affecting the defense of the United States is a policy of neutrality in accordance with the rules of international law; and
>
> Whereas the United States stands for restating and strengthening the rights of neutrals at the earliest practicable time; and
>
> Whereas it seems advisable, until these rights can be restated, to diminish the risk of this Nation becoming involved in foreign wars by restricting the exercise of certain neutral rights of our citizens.

The resolution restates in substance the existing neutrality law. However, there are a few vital changes proposed in the resolution under debate, but the first and most important change is the one that omits the "arms embargo" contained in the present law. To avoid confusion in this discussion I would like to direct your attention to the existing law, section 1 (a), Public Resolution No. 27, Seventy-fifth Congress:

> Whenever the President shall find that there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more foreign states, the President shall proclaim such fact, and it shall therefore be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation, or to any neutral state for transshipment to, or for the use of, any such belligerent state.

This is contained in Public Resolution No. 27, Seventy-fifth Congress, and is chapter 146, first session (S. J. Res. 51).

I have read the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House entitled "American Neutrality Policy." These hearings started on April 11, 1939, and continued up to and including May 2, 1939, and they cover 639 printed pages. I regret that the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee were not confined to this resolution. It would appear that more than 16 different resolutions and bills were discussed by the various witnesses, with the result that we are free to select the testimony which appeals to our individual fancy.

This is an extremely important resolution and it should only be considered on a purely patriotic basis. I am sure that every Member of this House is concerned about the future of our country, and I am hopeful that your vote will be cast as the result of serious and mature consideration of the facts presented, being mindful only of the welfare of our beloved country.

I am sorry that this legislation did not originate in the Senate, because the Senate has peculiar knowledge of foreign affairs derived from participation in the making of treaties with foreign governments. The debate in the Senate would serve as a guide for Members of the House, but, without the information and advice of the Senators it is incumbent upon every Representative to exercise unusual care in arriving at his decision.

From what I learn there will be several amendments offered by the Committee to this resolution, none of which will be directed to section 1, which, in my opinion, is the most controversial section.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I just wish to say that the present neutrality act was written in the House and not in the Senate.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. If the gentleman had followed what I said he would know that I was not referring to the present act at all. I was referring to the knowledge of the Senate on all matters affecting foreign affairs.

I do not know what prompts the proposed amendments, but I do hope that when an amendment is offered to restore section 1, arms embargo, of the present law, that it will be accepted by the committee.

As long as I can remember, matters of foreign affairs have always been the subject of great mystery. Treaties were arranged, loans were made, help was extended to foreign countries, and all sorts of things were done under the name of diplomacy. Frequently months passed before the people of the country knew what had transpired. A biased press, a high-pressure campaign of false propaganda, and unfaithful public officials have often conspired against the best interests of the people of our country. This great mystery still persists.

We are not debating a novel or new question. In the preamble of this resolution, in the first paragraph, it states "in accordance with the rules of international law."

In 1625 there was published a book by Hugo Grotius, a Dutch jurist, entitled "De jure belli ac pacis"—of the law of war and peace. In that book Grotius laid down the following principles:

(1) War should be carried on only for a just cause, and for the purpose of defense.
(2) Do no more injury to the vanquished than is strictly necessary.
(3) Force alone ought not to regulate the relations of peoples, for there is justice between States as well as between individuals.
(4) To observe treaties is the wisest practice and the greatest strength of sovereigns.

In 1814 this work was translated from the original Latin by the Reverend A. C. Campbell, A. M.

Since Grotius wrote this famous treatise, there has been little change in international law. The principles established by him have been generally accepted by all nations. Our understanding of international law is predicated upon these same principles.

I believe that it is of utmost importance for us to make progress in this very delicate and involved situation by going slowly. In my experience as a member of legislative bodies, dating back to 1924, I have been impressed by the flurry and excitement that usually accompanies consideration of this type of legislation. Men who never crossed the ocean or shouldered a gun and men who never had any interest outside the confines of their district will issue pronouncements of far-reaching consequences and will demand support for legislation on the ground of party loyalty, while in reality the question to be decided is a most nonpartisan issue as well as being international in scope. Some of us who have had slightly more experience in these matters know that human nature is pretty much the same all over the world and regardless of a man's political or religious belief or nonbelief, he is moved by the same impulses, but his reaction depends upon his place of birth. If his native land is involved, he probably accepts the doctrine of Decatur—

Our country in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be in the right, but our country right or wrong.

I stand solidly behind the well-established policy of neutrality as contained in international law, and I hope that my country shall always be guided by these well-established practices rather than by the question of the hour, or by political expediency.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I feel confident that if the resolution (H. Con. Res. 21) introduced by me on May 3, 1939, were adopted, the position of our country, namely, that we would not declare war unless attacked or the principles of the Monroe Doctrine jeopardized, would be so well known in every chancellery throughout the entire world that we would have no reason to consider the pending resolution. I regret that support of this resolution has been made on the ground of party loyalty because there is nothing in the platform of the Democratic Party that imposes any obligation upon Democrats to support this resolution. At this time I want to make it clear that my decision to oppose this resolution has been reached after careful study and consideration. Deep down in my heart I believe it would be a serious mistake to adopt the present resolution, but if we must have a change I believe it would be far better to repeal the entire law. The people of my district are scared to death that this resolution will lead to war. God knows they have enough to worry about without this problem. For all of these reasons, I hope the resolution will not be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute additional to the gentleman in order that I may ask him a question.

Did I understand the gentleman to say that he would vote to repeal all the neutrality legislation and go back to international law?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I stated that unless we allowed section 1 as it exists to remain in the law and amended certain other sections I would be opposed to the proposed resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. I am asking the same question I asked of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I am not bound by Mr. WADSWORTH'S answer, nor influenced by his personal views.

Mr. BLOOM. I would like to know what is in the gentleman's mind, what his thoughts are with reference to neutrality?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I shall be pleased to restate my views for the gentleman. Briefly, I do not believe it possible for any man, whether he is the President of the United States, the King of England, or any other ruler, to carry out the provisions of this proposed legislation, but I do favor legislation dictated by common sense and actual experience.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another half minute.

Will the gentleman answer "yes" or "no"; if an amendment is offered by someone to strike out everything in the bill, leaving only section 16, which repeals the laws passed in 1935, 1936, and 1937, would the gentleman vote for that?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Do I understand from your question that you intend going back to the law as it has existed for 145 years?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Yes; I believe I would vote for that change rather than the present proposal.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman would vote for it? The answer is "yes"?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLOOM. The regular order is that I have the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but the gentleman yielded half a minute to Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY and was talking himself.

Mr. BLOOM. I yield the gentleman another half minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. My answer to the gentleman is I am against all legislation which makes a mystery of or leaves in any doubt the present foreign or international policy of our country. [Applause.] Let the world know where we stand and let that stand be against war and in favor of peace. The American people and my constituents in particular are peace loving and hate war. I intend to be guided by their wishes and shall oppose and vote against any legislation which in any way might endanger the future safety of our citizens or the security of our beloved country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, the question of neutrality, which the House is now discussing, is one of the paramount issues before the American people today because it concerns the welfare of the United States and of the 122,000,000 of people residing therein. I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents from the Sixth District of Michigan on the subject of neutrality, the great majority of which have been opposed to the pending resolution—House Joint Resolution 306—because of the delegation of power therein contained.

Historically the fundamental position which America was to take among the nations of the world was laid down by Washington in his Farewell Address. This Congress and preceding Congresses have fully appreciated the important truths contained in Washington's Farewell Address. Each year on Washington's Birthday the House listens to the reading of that famous message, and each year pertinent truths therein contained are forced upon our minds indelibly. In this Farewell Address Washington advises "Justice toward all nations, avoidance of inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for other nations."

In this message he cautions the American people to avoid entangling European alliances as follows:

> Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand on foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

The message to avoid entangling alliances is especially pertinent today. Friendships between nations may be severed just as the friendships between individuals are severed by misunderstanding, by personal ambition, or otherwise. We have had a recent experience, as the result of our entrance into the World War, with the ingratitude of certain European powers with whom we were associated in that great European struggle. I am not only alluding to the nonpayment of those debts owed to us through our World War affiliations, but I am also alluding to other matters that have arisen. I think that it is self-evident that we will never have any guaranty of isolation from war unless we are willing to pay for it.

The best way to keep out of future wars is to remove as many as possible of the causes that contributed to our involvement in past wars. This is the prime purpose of our neutrality legislation. It should be American legislation, designed to help preserve the peace of America. There is no proper place in such legislation for futile and dangerous attempts to insure peace throughout the world, to punish far-distant aggressors, or to equalize the existing inequities between nations. Picking the aggressor is a most difficult and dangerous task. The unequal application of our neutrality laws is not neutrality, but nonintervention, which almost inevitably would defeat the prime purpose of this legislation to help keep us out of foreign wars. Such proposals amount to sanctions. Sanctions have been tried and have failed.

We are not going to have freedom from war unless we are willing to give up the trade profits that drag us into war. Is it not better to give up millions in war profits, if that be necessary, without the surrender of a single life, rather than go into a war that will cost billions in money, the deaths of untold numbers of fine American youth, and that may mean the ultimate destruction of our free Government?

Any bill that would take the war power out of the hands of Congress and place it in the hands of the President, who already has too much power in respect to making war, is an unwise bill. The power to fix the guilt of a foreign nation is too dangerous a power to exercise, unless we are ready to follow it up immediately with our battleships. A vast trade in war supplies built up with a belligerent would be a tremendous force to upset the neutrality of the United States. It stands to reason that the beneficiaries of such trade would expect our Governmet to protect their profitable business, and all this would add to our difficulties in maintaining a status of neutrality and would certainly greatly increase the probability of America's becoming involved in war.

Let us turn for a moment to the crisis formulating in the Far East, due to further Japanese aggression. I wish to call the attention of Congress to the part that American trade with Japan plays in the whole Sino-Japanese drama. In 1938, the United States exported to Japan $10,142,000 worth of automobiles and trucks, most of which were used in the undeclared war on China. In the same year we supplied Japan with $52,850,000 worth of cotton, much of which presumably was transformed into explosives. We also sold to Japan in 1938, $5,728,000 worth of chemicals, $27,000,000 worth of American oil and gasoline, $22,000,000 worth of iron and steel, including scrap material, which Japan made into bombs and shells, guns, and other implements of war.

The Washington Post, in a pertinent editorial in their issue of June 23, has this to say with reference to the Japanese proposition:

> It should be fairly obvious that the United States, by adhering to a dispassionate noninterventionist policy in the Far East conflict, has found itself, nevertheless, in the unenviable role of silent partner to the Japanese invaders. American manufactured and raw materials have undeniably enabled Japan to prolong and intensify her subjugation of China. And as her campaign has progressed, Japan's arrogant defiance of international treaties and her disregard of the rights of other interests in war-torn China have reached unprecedented heights. While accepting all she can get in the way of war supplies from other powers, Japan has attempted by high-handed tactics, which in any previous era would have called for prompt and drastic reprisals, to cut off all foreign trade with her luckless victim.

At the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War, Theodore Roosevelt said:

> All officials of the Government—civil, military, and naval—are instructed to abstain from either action or speech which can cause irritation to either combatant. It is always unfortunate to bring Old-World antipathies and jealousies into our life, or by speech or conduct to excite anger or resentment toward our Nation in friendly, foreign lands; but, in a Government employee, whose official position makes him, in a sense, the representative of the people, the mischief of such actions is greatly increased.

The President, being the representative of the people, especially in foreign eyes, might well take note of these words uttered by his illustrious namesake.

Our greatest guaranty of peace is to mind our own business, keep out of the quarrels of European or Asiatic na-

tions, and to maintain such a navy, air force, and army as will insure this hemisphere against aggression. If the United States adheres closely to Washington's caution of avoiding entangling European alliances, and also adheres to the old, historic Monroe Doctrine, her position in the New World will be greatly safeguarded.

In the views of the minority, set forth in the report of the Neutrality Act of 1939, it is stated:

No neutrality law at all would be better than this resolution, which, in the name of neutrality and under the guise of preventing provocative acts of American citizens, gives the President additional powers to be unneutral.

Under this resolution as it comes from committee, the President, after making a "neutrality" proclamation, can authorize the sale of arms on "ordinary commercial" credit to one side and deny such sales to the other side; he can permit our vessels to enter the ports of one belligerent loaded with needed supplies, while barring our vessels from the ports of another belligerent; he can prevent a foreign vessel carrying arms from leaving our ports by requiring a prohibitive bond whenever he suspects that the shipment will be transferred to a tender belonging to a belligerent but "the evidence is not deemed sufficient to justify forbidding the departure of the vessel," while permitting exactly the same sort of a shipment to proceed to another belligerent.

No President ever had such power before. The President has no such power under our Constitution or under international law. Congress alone can give him this power. To urge that the President would not misuse this power is not to state a reason for granting it.

The views of the minority further states:

In spite of the mandatory requirements of existing law, the President has failed to "find" the existence of the gigantic war in China. We, therefore, believe that any neutrality law should provide for the finding of a state of war between foreign states by the Congress, as well as by the President.

Further:

We all want to keep out of war. We cannot do this by passing laws. Congress alone has power to declare war, but modern wars are no longer declared. The execution of our foreign policy, the conduct of our foreign affairs, is the responsibility of the President under our Constitution.

With all of his great power, however, the President has no power to keep our citizens from doing many things which experience teaches us may be provocative of war. Congress alone has this power.

The overwhelming majority of the people of this country wants us to keep America out of war. The overwhelming majority of the Congress wants to keep America out of any foreign war. Therefore, thoughtful care should be given to any neutrality bill before it becomes the law of the Nation.

I shall vote against House Joint Resolution 306 unless the delegation of power therein conveyed to the President be modified and the bill otherwise perfected. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, it should be apparent to everyone by this time that whatever else this bill may be and whatever may be its merits or its faults, there is at least one thing which it is not. It is not a neutrality bill. It was a mistake to call it that in the first place and we ought to be candid enough to cease referring to it as a neutrality bill during the remainder of this debate.

Everyone who is familiar with the President's foreign policy, insofar as it undertakes to lay down a course of conduct for the United States in its relations with belligerent foreign powers, knows that the purpose of this bill is to give the President the authority to put that policy into effect, without the necessity of further consulting the Congress in the future regarding the things he has repeatedly declared he intends to do in the carrying out of that policy.

Let us as intelligent, responsible legislators not futilely try to deceive ourselves in this regard. Let us not be so naive as to pretend that the object of this bill has anything to do with neutrality. Let us take it and consider it and debate it and vote upon it for exactly what it is—a bill demanded by the President and prepared under the order of the President to put a new and novel foreign policy invented by the President into actual and immediate operation. Read the bill section by section and line by line and you can find in it no other purpose and no other object.

Now many persons honestly agree with the President's declared policy as to what our relations with belligerent nations ought to be. Others just as honestly oppose it. But no one can honestly say that he does not know what that policy is and no informed person can seriously contend that neutrality has any place whatever in that policy. The very basis of his policy is one of unneutrality, and at no time has he overlooked the opportunity in his numerous statements upon the subject very frankly to make that fact perfectly clear to everyone.

Compare the President's famous Chicago speech a year ago with his recent message to the Congress in which he formally advised us of his intention to send in this bill. Compare these two declarations of the President, so widely separated in point of time, with every other declaration he has made and every action he has taken upon this particular subject in the meantime, and you will find no difference in any of them.

In his Chicago speech the President made the first official announcement of his policy, which shocked the country from one end to the other and which brought forth an almost unanimous adverse reaction from the people. It was in that speech that he proposed to quarantine the aggressor nations through a program of parallel action between the United States and the democracies of Europe. It was not that the people did not despise these dictators as much as the President did, for there is no true American whose soul is not filled with revulsion against their actions and their whole theory of government. But the people realized that however reprehensible the dictators may be the quarrels between them and the democratic states of Europe were not our quarrels, that whatever our individual feelings might be, as a nation we should and must mind our own business. And they realized further that to translate the President's proposal into an active national policy would be tantamount to an act of war. The people did not intend and they do not now intend to become a party to the eternal quarrels and wars of any of the European nations whether they be dictatorships or democracies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we all know, and I assure you I am not talking politics or even criticizing the President when I say this—we all know that opposition never yet has caused the President to change his mind or his course of action once he has determined upon that course. And so, from the date of the Chicago speech right down to this minute the President has never ceased to insist that the welfare of this Nation demands that we take sides, definite sides, with one group of countries as against the other; that we inaugurate this policy and announce it to the world not merely after hostilities in Europe begin but before they begin; and he has declared repeatedly that he needed and wanted sufficient and ample authority by law to do this.

In his recent message to the Congress, which was the forerunner of this bill and in which he demanded this legislation, he again declared his intention of bringing the dictators to bay through parallel action with the European governments alined against the dictators. He said, of course, that he did not propose to lead this Nation into war, but that he intended to accomplish his purpose "by methods less than war but more effective than words." The authority by which he then proposed to do this is the bill, House Joint Resolution 306, which we are now debating, under the wholly misleading title of a neutrality bill.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this bill because my study not only of the bill itself but of its background and of the mistakable reason for its introduction has convinced me in my own mind that the President's declared policy is wrong, and that it is an unprecedented departure from all of the historic traditions and policies which have made for the peace and independence of this land. Certainly I do not believe that the President wants to lead us into a war. Nobody believes that. On the contrary, I have always been of the opinion that the President sincerely believes that the adoption and announcement of a definitely unneutral foreign policy in advance of war will

enable us to avoid war by cooperating with the democratic governments to stop their neighboring dictators now. As I say, I believe the President is sincere in thinking this, but I am just as sincerely convinced that he is wrong.

I oppose this bill because, in my humble judgment, it is inherently calculated, rather, to lead us into war than to keep us out of it. I believe that through the exercise of the powers the President says he wants to exercise in this regard, and which this bill gives him blanket authority to exercise, the commission of an act of war by this Government in event of general European hostilities, in spite of all our efforts to avoid it, is well-nigh inevitable.

The fact that it is proposed here to furnish the implements of war to any belligerent nation which may be able to come to our shores and get them, coupled with the deliberately considered and admitted fact that only one group of nations would possibly be in position to do that, namely, that group with which the President has declared he intends to cooperate by every method short of war, is a fact which should give cause to every Member in his consideration of this bill. And it is a fact which should forever dispel from his mind any illusion he may heretofore have had that neutrality is the purpose of the bill. It is a fact which should cause him soberly to inquire of his own reason and his own judgment whether the policy to be established by this bill will not point the United States definitely on the road to war—a road which nobody wants to take, and a road which at the present time there is no utter excuse or reason for taking.

Time, I regret, will permit me to say nothing about the other provisions of the bill, except that they are without precedent in the whole legislative history of our country. Under these provisions the President is given the power virtually to order the lives and the conduct of our people in whatever manner he may choose; not merely in event of a war to which this Nation is a party, but in any war between any belligerent states. It is a power and a discretionary authority that has never been given to any President and which no other President has ever asked for.

Mr. Chairman, there may come a time when this Nation in defense of its own rights will go to war. And when that time comes we will go not only willingly but enthusiastically. But we will go to defend our own democracy and not for the futile purpose of again trying to make the world safe for democracy.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, this Nation is at peace. In spite of all the propaganda and the hysteria to the contrary, there is no reason why we cannot and should not remain at peace, at least so long as our rights as American citizens are not interfered with or threatened, if only we will continue to look to our own defense instead of to the defense of those European nations who are perfectly able to take care of themselves, and who will take care of themselves if once we let them understand that their quarrels are not ours and that we do not intend to become a party to them.

It is my conviction that the vote on this bill will decide whether from now on, as a nation, we are going to mind our own business and whether we shall continue to follow the admonitions of Washington and of Jefferson to keep free from all entangling European alliances, whether they be with democracies or dictators. If the people of this country, having full understanding of the question here involved, could speak with authority for themselves today, I think I know what their verdict would be. As one of those who represents them in this body, and who is responsible to them, and to them alone, I intend to vote to sustain that verdict. [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, ladies, and gentlemen, I oppose the passage of this bill because it is contrary to the American way of doing things.

The Constitution itself grants the power to declare war to Congress, and I believe that authority should be jealously retained by Congress; also, the power to name aggressors or to outline "unsafe zones" too dangerous for American travelers, American ships, or American exporters amounts; in fact, to the power to make war.

As Walter Lippmann says:

> It is not to be denied that the power to name an aggressor and to seek to injure him is war, though it has been described as "something short of war."

I think the bill confers too much war-making power on the Chief Executive. Here in this great democracy of America we know that war power is always safer in the hands of the people. We want to keep it as near there as possible; at least, we should keep this responsibility with the peoples' chosen representatives in Congress, where it was vested by the framers of our Constitution.

God forbid that we who, under our tradition of government, rule supreme and make of this a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, should ever relinquish that right and give to one sole, single individual this greatest power of all.

Let me remind you that many historians claim that some of our Presidents have deliberately manufactured war. Let us safeguard our Nation so that hereafter no one could do that if he would.

As Senator BORAH said when he questioned the wisdom of permitting the sale of arms to nations at war, "it would make an arsenal out of the United States."

For the life of me, I cannot see where it would serve the cause of peace or humanity in any way. I feel sure that only harm, great harm, would come from it.

Under the sale of arms proposal in this bill, we would have to stand prepared to supply guns and ammunition and airplanes to any nation engaged in conflict, subject, to the proviso, that the arms customer must come to our shores in his own ships to get them. In practice this would mean that we would become the armory for the belligerent who had control of the seas. The question is, Can we occupy such a status and fail to become involved in the conflict ourselves? I fear not. In other words, is this state of affairs neutrality? I answer emphatically no. It is the very opposite of neutrality.

On the other hand, our present act, without these new and untried measures proposed in this bill, may act as a guaranty to keep us out of a European conflict, if we will. America needs only to invoke the present act to halt shipments of arms and implements of war, loans and credits to belligerents and to remain definitely neutral, if we will.

The people of this country are overwhelmingly determined to stay out of war, and I think it can be done if we only maintain the will to do it and safeguard the maintenance of the vital interests of a free, independent United States through traditional American methods.

We all want world peace, of course, if we can get it; but we must not overlook the fact that it is our responsibility—our solemn duty, if you please—to promote North American peace. We must think of those who will carry the guns and pay the bills if war comes. That is why I am so irrevocably opposed to the passage of this bill. That is why I trust that the Members here will not be influenced by the emotions, the sympathies and the fears of a world crisis and commit a great wrong by the passage of this act.

After all, neutrality legislation is nothing new. The first act in America was introduced by George Washington in 1794, and the principles of that neutrality were so well founded that they have been adopted as a standard of conduct by the majority of nations, and are just as true today as the day they were first uttered.

This is no time for hysteria. It is no time to change the fundamental way of doing things. It is no time to broadcast to any nation in Europe that we are on its side. Our side is still these United States of America and safeguarding American blood and American treasures, even the priceless treasure of the American spirit, are our first responsibility.

It seems to me, ladies and gentlemen, that this bill is a concession to the gods of war and I, who worked in a munitions factory during the last war, know full well what vengeful

gods they are. Their creed is profits, blood money though it be, and they are dedicated to the destruction of human life. Surely it would be a backward step for this Nation to open avenues now closed by our present neutrality act for the sale of implements of death.

As proof that this bill is not a neutrality bill and that it definitely places us in the unneutral class let me quote. The Associated Press says that under this bill "if war should come to Europe, America's vast resources would concededly be available to Great Britain, France, and their allies."

If this bill were to pass, and in the event of war our war implements would be available to a nation, who could "cash and carry"? We all know what nation would qualify. Great Britain would have the money, or know where to get it, and in all probability she would have control of the sea. Therefore, under this misnamed, "misdubbed" Neutrality Act, America's resources would be available to Great Britain. Neutrality, indeed. What wrongs may be committed in your name.

In this connection it might be well to remind you of Sherwood Eddy's statement:

> Preparedness prepares for war but does not prevent it.

It is that thought which makes me so anxious to see the defeat of this measure, for I sincerely believe that the passage of this bill, with the present situation as it is, will be a definite step away from real neutrality. It will be contrary to our American tradition and will serve as fuel to war rather than to deter it. I fear its passage will delay the time when the Golden Rule is the universal law and all nations live in peace with one another. [Applause]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

THE ROOSEVELT-BLOOM BILL

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, after the confusion which has largely marked neutrality hearings before Senate and House committees, it strikes me that we are faced today with a peculiarly solemn responsibility to begin at the beginning of the whole problem, and to cut through a tangled underbrush of catch-phrases to find for the country a pathway to real and permanent peace. It seems obviously desirable that we take as our starting point the accepted definition of neutrality—if it is our sincere purpose to achieve neutrality.

Neutrality, properly understood, means impartiality, the refusal to take sides, the refusal to help either side to any foreign war. It could mean a willingness to help all sides alike; but geographical and other circumstances beyond our control make an equal extension of aid to all parties to any foreign war a practical impossibility. So, recognizing actualities, neutrality must mean for us a refusal to aid either side.

It is highly important, at the outset, to note that every alternative to such a refusal is sponsored by persons or elements who have made no secret of their partisan preference to one side of a possible war in Europe. Nor is this preference erased or concealed by any amount of fancy rhetoric.

Noting this as pertinent background to the immediate controversy, it is vital that we ask ourselves certain questions:

First, in the event of a war in Europe, do we actually want to enact legislation calculated to give expression to this obvious will of the people to remain neutral?

Second, if so, then how deep, sincere, and earnest is that desire?

Third, are we willing to limit our attitude to a meaningless gesture?

Fourth, or are we determined to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary to accomplish this natural desire for peace?

Bearing these questions in mind, let us address ourselves to the various courses open to us at this time. And let us consider, in the light of logic and the lessons of history, what are the probable consequences of each course.

Completely unacceptable to persons with a memory of what occurred from 1914 to 1917 is the proposal by certain legislators to repeal all neutrality legislation and to rely upon the body of international law which prescribes both the rights and responsibilities of neutrals.

When the World War broke out 25 years ago there was no neutrality legislation on our statute books. With complete freedom, there was a disgraceful unneutral management of our neutral obligations. Our foreign policy was made to follow the lines laid down by the British Foreign Office. Favoritism toward the Allies, plus a shocking amount of State Department muddling, produced tensions which led us straight into involvement as a belligerent. With an even more unneutral Executive to reckon with today, we dare not trust to international law alone.

Under consideration by the House today is the Roosevelt-Bloom bill. I will not call it a neutrality bill because it does not provide for neutrality. It is worse than no bill at all. Proponents of real neutrality should have nothing to do with it.

This bill, which the President has ordered us to pass, would open up unrestricted trade to all belligerents on a credit-and-carry basis—the title to the goods to pass to the purchaser before the goods shall leave an American port. What this bill would do, therefore, relative to war in Europe, would be to make the United States the effective ally and source of supply for Great Britain and France against those countries' enemies—because Great Britain and France have command of the seas and the ocean-carrying facilities with which to come to American shores and carry away American goods.

This is entirely consistent with the President's well-known favoritism for France and Britain. It is not, however, consistent with his equally well-known dislike for Japan; for it would favor Japan in the Pacific as much as it would favor Britain and France in the Atlantic—and this despite the fact that Japan leans toward the enemies of Britain and France. Thus would we be, to say the very least, working at cross purposes.

At its worst, however, the Roosevelt-Bloom bill would have, inevitably, the effect so well described by my distinguished colleague from Indiana, the Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW, when he said:

> A vast trade in war supplies built up with a belligerent would be a tremendous force to upset the neutrality of the United States. It would have the effect of a million hawsers, pulling America into the war on the side of the belligerent with whom our citizens would have these favorable trade relations. It is nothing more or less than human that the beneficiaries of such trade would bear down upon our Government to protect their enormously profitable business; and all of this would add to the complexities of maintaining a status of neutrality, and would certainly enhance the probability of America becoming involved in war.

There remains, then, just one general course of action practically capable of providing us with reasonable certainty of actual neutrality.

If we dare not trust to international law alone, if we cannot afford to take the risks of a cash-and-carry policy which would have the actual effect of one-sidedness, then we must seek neutrality in a negative direction. That is to say, we must simply refuse to give any support to either or any side of a foreign war. Only thus can we hope to remain truly neutral.

In the Senate legislation to this end has been sponsored by Senators NYE, BONE, and CLARK of Missouri. Friends of real peace have enthusiastically endorsed that legislation. But their equal endorsement has been consistently and intelligently accorded to similar legislation, commendably simplified, which was offered in the House at the beginning of this session by Representative LUDLOW.

The Ludlow bill, H. R. 163, was buried in committee. It provides that:

> Upon the outbreak of war between two or more foreign nations the President shall issue a proclamation forbidding (1) exports of all kinds and (2) loans and credits to said belligerent countries or to the nationals of said belligerent countries.

Along with a preponderant majority of my constituents who by the thousands have made their wishes known to me, I share Mr. LUDLOW's confidence that this bill would do more than any other neutrality bill that has been proposed in

either House to keep the United States free of foreign entanglements and free of any part in the mass murder that is war.

There are those who state that the United States cannot avoid being drawn into the next world war regardless of what type of neutrality legislation we adopt. But Dr. Charles A. Beard, eminent historian and political scientist, has lately declared:

> In my opinion, the United States should and can stay out of the next war in Europe, and the wars that follow the next war. * * * If it is the duty of the United States Government to promote, protect, and defend the security and welfare of the American people, then its foreign policy should be determined with reference to that objective. * * * It should not dabble in quarrels and squabbles in Europe or Asia, about the origins of which it knows little or nothing. It should make known to the world, clearly and positively, that it does not propose to take part in any European or Asiatic war over any European or Asiatic interests.

If the President is indisposed to such a policy, then it becomes the solemn obligation of the people's Congress, by means of mandatory neutrality legislation, to require him to do so. Opponents of mandatory neutrality complain that it will "tie the President's hands." It will not tie them from the execution of peace. It will tie them from the execution of war. For such special safeguards, one would like to believe, the President would be grateful. But, grateful or not, those safeguards should, in the interests of this Nation and its people, be provided.

Advocates of strict, mandatory neutrality are by no means insensitive to the fact that democracy is in danger. We must, indeed, defend it. But it is principally endangered by war. As Americans it is our first responsibility to see to it that that threat is averted. For if it once disappears from America democracy will, in all probability, be banished from the earth.

For modern war does not thrive in a democratic atmosphere; that atmosphere must disappear as the first requisite of waging a modern war. Indeed, in this very House there are today a set of bills comprising the administration's so-called industrial mobilization plan, which are ready for adoption the instant this country shall be drawn into a state of war. And that industrial mobilization plan, theoretically implementing a war to make the world safe for democracy, would actually constitute an end of democracy and an enthronement of military fascism the like of which America has never known.

We cannot defend democracy by destroying it at home. We cannot end fascism by extending its scope to include the American Republic.

The price for peace to me seems reasonable. But at its highest, it is small indeed by comparison with the horrible price which war exacts. But the price for peace can be paid in only one currency—the currency of strict, honest, straightforward, sincere, mandatory neutrality. The Roosevelt-Bloom bill does not prescribe that brand of neutrality. The Roosevelt-Bloom bill, indeed, does not promise us any neutrality policy worthy of the name. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURGIN].

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite your attention to the preamble in House Joint Resolution 306, and particularly to this expression:

> That the policy of the United States is one of neutrality, in accord with the rules of international law, and that, in order to carry out this policy, we are willing to place certain restrictions on certain natural rights of our citizens.

The United States wants peace. There can be no doubt about that. I believe that feeling exists in the heart of all of our people, regardless of party, race, or creed. We want to keep war out of the United States, and we want war kept out of the world. I believe this will or desire for peace permeates the thinking of every man in public life, from President Roosevelt down to the least and last man. No one, I think, in this House will vote for any legislation except with this in mind. I believe the President's action in the past trying times has been a potent factor in discouraging the spread of the war spirit in other parts of the world.

Since we want to live in peace with our sister nations, we are willing to abridge some of our natural rights by making it unlawful to do something that we have a natural right to do. In trying to carry out the desire of our citizens to keep out of war, we have enacted a law that we call the Neutrality Act. No other government in the world has so restricted the actions of its citizens in this particular as has our own Government. A prominent citizen, testifying before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, made the assertion in regard to neutrality that "there ain't no such animal." This I believe to be a true statement, even if the grammar is bad. We must be realistic, and face the fact that neutrality means being impartial. It is impossible for individuals to be impartial in regard to any contest, and particularly when it is between nations. Congress can enact a statute of impartiality, and that is what this bill is intended to do.

The act that we are considering today provides certain changes in the present neutrality law. These changes conform largely to the suggestions made by our able Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, on May 27. Secretary Hull has shown himself to be actuated by the highest principles and motives in the conduct of his office. The suggestions that he has made, which are embodied in H. J. Res. 306, have met with wide approval by the press of the United States, regardless of political affiliation.

I realize, as Secretary Hull did, that no law which we can write can be guaranteed to keep us out of war. All we can do is to see to it that our legislation, first, minimizes the chance that war will break out at all—the only really safe way of keeping out of war; and second, if it does break out, that it will not involve us.

The most important change suggested to the present neutrality law by House Joint Resolution 306 is the repeal of the arms embargo. The United States has had a long experience with embargoes, and a very unhappy one, though some of the honorable gentlemen seem not to have discovered that fact. On the one occasion when we tried it on a large scale—1807—it first nearly wrecked the country; later, reenacted in a different form, it brought us into direct conflict with both France and Engand, who were then engaged in the Napoleonic wars. It was tried again a third time, and the effect was that it led us directly into the War of 1812. When, as some people now urge, an arms embargo is proposed as a method of keeping the peace, I should like to point out that all the evidence of history suggests that it is not a panacea for keeping us out of war.

We have also heard a lot of talk about keeping the United States "truly neutral." This is a familiar argument for an arms embargo. Yet, actually, the effect of an arms embargo is the equivalent of presenting one or two nations with an Atlantic fleet and a free blockade.

A third point sometimes made is that in case we sell arms abroad, the United States will become an arsenal for warring powers. It is true there might be an increased manufacture of arms and ammunition, but that is not the kind of thing which would really be sought. What warring powers need today, even more than arms, are supplies of oil, of automobiles and motors, of machines, of machine tools, or chemicals and the like. Nobody here is offering to embargo those. In the last war we sold $9 worth of supplies to belligerents for every $1 worth of arms, and today we know that the proportion of arms would be far less, since the recognized armies of today want machinery even more than rifles.

In my opinion, Secretary Hull has worked out the best formula, and it is substantially this: Let our trade of all kinds be open to anyone. Keep American nationals, so far as possible, out of the line of fire, so that we are not involved. Arrange matters so that goods traveling to belligerents on the high seas shall be owned and paid for by foreigners, and what happens to them is their affair and not ours. In other words, mind our own business, and do not, by embargoes, use our laws to supplement and assist warlike powers in blockading their enemies. This more nearly approximates the settled international practice and settled international law. I submit, accordingly, that House Joint Resolution 306, as now before the House, should pass. [Applause.]

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LEWIS of Colorado] having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the House Joint Resolution 306, Neutrality Act of 1939, had come to no resolution thereon.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. St. Claire, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5269) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes," and agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 33, 141, and 153 to said bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MAGNUSON, indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a letter from Pat Shields, assistant financial secretary of the Montgomery County (Ohio) Fish and Game Protection Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Colorado). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects: First, the State of Colorado, and the other the Taylor Grazing Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein certain figures that I have compiled on reciprocal trade agreements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in connection with the remarks I made this afternoon with regard to the neutrality bill, to incorporate certain extraneous information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on a measure before the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on one subject in the RECORD, and I ask permission for another extension in which I may include two very brief resolutions by the California Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on unemployment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the New York Journal-American on Selling America Down the River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5427. An act making appropriations for the Labor Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6392. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Department of Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1302. An act to continue in effect until June 30, 1942, the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935, as amended; and

S. 1805. An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), pursuant to the order heretofore made, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 29, 1939, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries at 10 a. m. Thursday, June 29, 1939, for the consideration of H. R. 6572, relating to marine war-risk insurance.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries at 10 a. m. Tuesday, July 11, 1939, for the consideration of H. R. 6881, to implement the provisions of the Ship Owners' Liability (sick and injured seamen) Convention, 1936.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, June 30, 1939, beginning at 10 a. m., there will be continued a public hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 6369) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; to create a Railroad Reorganization Court; and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Thursday, June 29, 1939, for the consideration of H. R. 6830.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

There will be an executive session of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation at 10:30 a. m. Thursday, June

29, 1939, for the further consideration of H. R. 6984. Committee meeting in room 128, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, June 30, 1939, for the public consideration of H. R. 5726, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by providing that the shipper shall be liable for charges in certain cases.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads Friday, June 30, 1939, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2748, to provide power-boat service in Alaska.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

912. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a compilation of all the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors passed between March 4, 1913, until and including the third session of the Seventy-fifth Congress, January 3, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 379); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

913. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend section 812 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, as amended, relating to kidnaping; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

914. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend section 45 of the United States Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

915. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 13, 1939, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Salmon River, Oreg., authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

916. A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report on investment trusts in Great Britain which supplements the Commission's over-all report on its study of investment trusts and investment companies made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 380); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SIROVICH: Committee on Patents. H. R. 6874. A bill to repeal section 4896 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 8), and amend sections 4885 and 4934 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, secs. 41 and 78); with amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SIROVICH: Committee on Patents. H. R. 6875. A bill to amend section 4903 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 51); with amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4783. A bill to provide a right-of-way; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4784. A bill to provide a right-of-way; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLASON: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6870. A bill to grant to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a retrocession of jurisdiction over the General Clarence R. Edwards Memorial Bridge, bridging Watershops Pond of the Springfield Armory Military Reservation in the city of Springfield, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6925. A bill to waive the age limit for appointment as second lieutenant, Regular Army, of certain persons now on active duty with the Air Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6913. A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes; without amendment (Rept. No. 975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 955. An act creating the City of Dubuque Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to purchase and/or construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Dubuque, Iowa, and East Dubuque, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 976). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1907. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Poplar, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 977). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATRICK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5781. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge and causeway across the water between the mainland, at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.; with amendment (Rept. No. 978). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATRICK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5785. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Mississippi to construct and operate a free highway bridge across Pearl River at or near Georgetown, Miss.; with amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATRICK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5786. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Mississippi, or Madison County, Miss., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pearl River at or near Ratliffs Ferry in Madison County, Miss.; with amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5963. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near a point between Morgan and Walsh Streets in the city of St. Louis, Mo., and a point opposite thereto in the city of East St. Louis, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 981). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELLY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5964. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River between St. Louis, Mo., and Stites, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5984. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of certain bridges across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.; with amendment (Rept. No. 983). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6049. A bill authorizing the village of Cassville, Wis., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cassville, Wis., and to a place at or near the village of Guttenberg, Iowa; with amendment (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6079. A bill granting the consent of Congress

to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Black River at or near the town of Black Rock, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6111. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from a point in Walsh County, N. Dak., at or near the terminus of North Dakota State Highway No. 17; with amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6353. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Hartford, Conn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6475. A bill to authorize the city of Duluth, in the State of Minnesota, to construct a toll bridge across the St. Louis River, between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6502. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota or the Minnesota Department of Highways to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Little Falls, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6527. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to replace a bridge which has collapsed, across the Mahoning River at Division Street, Youngstown, Mahoning County, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 990). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6578. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Northern Natural Gas Co. of Delaware to construct, maintain, and operate a pipe-line bridge across the Missouri River; without amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6748. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Winona, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7015. A bill to reenact section 259 of the Judicial Code, relating to the traveling and subsistence expenses of circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CULLEN:

H. R. 7016. A bill to amend the revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 7017. A bill to authorize the participation of States in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and reservations under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7018. A bill to amehd section 289 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7019. A bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for the killing or assaulting of Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7020. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1528) in regard to service of process on the United States in foreclosure actions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7021. A bill to provide funds for acquisition of a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishing thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States at Warsaw, Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution providing that the farmers' market in blocks 354 and 355 in the District of Columbia shall not be used for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LARRABEE:

H. Res. 234. Resolution providing a method for acquiring data to determine the feasibility of using power in excess of 50 kilowatts in standard broadcasting; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado:

H. Res. 235. Resolution to provide an additional allocation for carrying out the provisions of House Resolution No. 130; to the Committee on Accounts.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 7022. A bill granting a pension to Cora McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 7023. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Solomon Kreitman; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7024. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice the healing art in the District of Columbia to Dr. Marcel T. Kahn; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 7025. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 7026. A bill for the relief of Alfred Arrowood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWERT:

H. R. 7027. A bill for the relief of Casimer Borowiak; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Miss SUMNER of Illinois:

H. R. 7028. A bill granting a pension to Tennessee R. Ashworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4075. By Mr. BARRY: Resolution of the board of estimate of the city of New York, regarding deletion from the relief bill of the allocation of $125,000,000 to Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4076. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, relative to Eel River flood control and channel rectification; to the Committee on Flood Control.

4077. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 14, relative to the Voorhis bill, and memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to take immediate steps for the passage of such bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4078. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 13, relative to the holding of an interstate conference on agricultural refugees, and memorializing the President and Congress of the United

States to sponsor such conference; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4079. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 29, relative to memorializing Congress regarding the national-park system in California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4080. By Mr. FAY: Memorial of the Board of Estimate of the City of New York, memorializing the Congress of the United States to delete from the 1940 relief bill the provisions which would reduce the appropriation for public works to $125,000,000 and which would cause other deprivations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4081. By Mr. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, members of Local 43, U. F. W. of A., urging enactment of House bill 960, extending civil service and classification; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

4082. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 5620, the so-called General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4083. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Board of Estimate of the City of New York, urging Congress to delete from the 1940 relief bill the provisions which would reduce the appropriation for public works to $125,000,000 and which would cause other deprivations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4084. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the American Manufacturing Co. of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging passage of Philippine legislation now before the House Committee on Insular Affairs, provided it contains a provision limiting all imports of Philippine-made cordage and twine to 6,000,000 pounds annually; also supporting the Welch amendment relative to allocation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4085. Also, petition of the Asbestos Workers' Local No. 12 favoring the relief bill and also the Starnes bill, providing for the increase of funds for Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4086. Also, petition of Justus D. Doenecke & Son, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the Bloom neutrality bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4087. Also, petition of the National Grange, expressing opposition to Senate bill 2009, pertaining to the regulation of transportation by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4088. Also, petition of Iowa Bankers' Association, protesting against the inclusion of bankers under the terms of the Wage and Hour Act; to the Committee on Labor.

4089. Also, petition of the New York Board of Trade, favoring enactment of Senate bill 1871, known as the Hatch bill, to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4090. Also, petition of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc., pertaining to public hearings for producers and others affected by House bill 6316, known as Schulte milk bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

4091. Also, petition of the Social Service Employees' Union, U. O. P. W. A., of New York City, urging enactment of the Wagner-Rogers bill; to the Committee on Labor.

4092. Also, petition of the Paul Revere Sentinels of New York City, opposing enactment of the Bloom neutrality bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4093. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York Board of Trade, Inc., New York City, favoring the passage of the Hatch bill (S. 1871); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4094. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, concerning the enactment of the Hatch bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4095. Also, petition of the American Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Philippine legislation limiting all imports of Philippine-made cordage and twine to 6,000,000 pounds annually; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

4096. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Board of Estimate of the City of New York, respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to delete from the 1940 relief bill the objectionable provisions as proposed by the Appropriations Subcommittee headed by Representative WOODRUM of Virginia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4097. By Mr. WELCH: Joint Resolution No. 29, of the California Senate, relative to memorializing Congress regarding the national-park system in California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4098. Also, Joint Resolution No. 28, of the California Senate, relative to Eel River flood control and channel rectification; to the Committee on Flood Control.

4099. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mr. S. Howard Leech, of Baldwin Park, Calif., and 147 others, comprising various lines of business, trades, and professions, stating that every qualified American citizen 60 years of age and over should receive as a matter of right and not of charity a monthly pension, annuity, or dividend, of a sufficient amount to enable that citizen to have sufficient buying power to purchase good food, good clothing, have a comfortable home, and to enjoy the common necessities and comforts of life; and requesting that House bill 5620, which is known as the General Welfare Act, be reported out to the floor of the House for a full and free discussion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4100. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul K. Blakkan, of San Francisco, Calif., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6470, Works Progress Administration appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4101. Also, petition of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Works Progress Administration legislation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

---

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1939

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

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast appointed our times and the bounds of our habitation, who openest for us doors which no man can shut, and who searchest out all the hidden things of men: Help us in these moments of dedication, as we cast ourselves on Thee, to realize the greatness which is ours as children of the highest.

Give us ever true discernment for the hour, that we may seek freely the day's truth and compass heartily the day's duty. In the examination of great questions, keep us serene and calm, and make us ever mindful of the fact that kindness is strength and candor is the courage of the soul. Make us able to go whither our sense of right would lead us; and grant that in the stormy days of manhood's striving, as in the shadowed peace of sunset's glow, we may cherish in our souls visions of the things that shall be hereafter, when all of life's tomorrows shall be sunlit with Thy love. We ask it in our Saviour's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, June 28, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. 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 | Burke | Frazier | Hayden |
| Andrews | Byrd | George | Herring |
| Ashurst | Byrnes | Gerry | Hill |
| Austin | Capper | Gibson | Holman |
| Bailey | Clark, Idaho | Gillette | Holt |
| Bankhead | Clark, Mo. | Glass | Hughes |
| Barbour | Connally | Green | Johnson, Calif. |
| Barkley | Danaher | Guffey | Johnson, Colo. |
| Bilbo | Davis | Gurney | King |
| Bone | Donahey | Hale | La Follette |
| Borah | Downey | Harrison | Lee |
| Bulow | Ellender | Hatch | Lodge |